

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 18 September 1986

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

MILLION MINUTES OF PEACE

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

PARLIAMENTARY SITTINGS

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Parliament should sit no less than 80 days in any calendar year.

To highlight the unacceptably few days a year on which this Parliament operates, Mr Speaker, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a statistical record of sitting days for the last 26 years, including the number of those days when private members business was allowed during the last 14 years.

The **SPEAKER:** Can the honourable member assure the House that the material is entirely statistical?

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

NUMBER OF SITTING DAYS— HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

		Private Members Days
1960-61	56	
1961-62	43	
1962-63	48	
1963-64	52	
1964-65	37	
1965-66	82	
1966-67	73	
1967-68	59	
1968-69	68	
1969-70	67	
1970-71	75	
1971-72	74	8
1972-73	52	11
1973-74	69	9
1974-75	74	12
1975-76	45	8
1976-77	65	9
1977-78	56	6
1978-79	55	8
1979-80	46	4
1980-81	56	8
1981-82	68	9
1982	27	6
1982-83	26	7
1983-84	56	8
1984-85	60	10
1985	31	7
1986—To opening	13	
Total	1 533	130
	in	in
	26 years	15 years
Average of less than 59 days		Approx. 8½ days average
Total No. of days available		9 497
Less—Saturdays & Sundays		
+ 5 weeks annual leave		
+ 25 days holiday & sick days		4 004
Therefore total No. of working days available	5 493	
Actual days Parliament sat	1 533	
Normal working days not in Parliament	3 960	

Mr S.G. EVANS: This table shows that Parliament sits on average fewer than 59 days a year. For those who are interested in statistics, Parliament has sat 1 533 days out of 9 497 days in 26 years. If we deduct Saturdays and Sundays, plus five weeks annual leave, as well as the equivalent of five weeks for sick leave and public holidays, that is 4 004. There have been 5 493 ordinary working days for Parliament to sit; in fact, it sat on less than one-third of the normal working days available, leaving 3 960 days to do other work.

One needs to reflect on some of the changes and attitudes that I have noticed during my short time in this House. Governments have continually complained of members wanting to exercise an elected member's expected right to challenge by the use of extended debate. This is one of the few avenues available for individuals or Oppositions to make more than the ordinary protest, by voting, at Government moves that are unacceptable either to that member or, more particularly, supporters in the electorate.

During the 1970s we saw the massive increase in the number of ministerial press secretaries and other minders. Governments have used the power of these hordes of press secretaries and minders to inundate the media with professionally prepared propaganda. They successfully create an image in the press circles that a member's rights to speak should be restricted as much as possible—in particular, those in Opposition. While the press itself fights for its rights to have all of the freedoms possible, it stands aside, condones and appears to assist the relentless but successful reduction of an elected member's rights. Of course, one cannot be too hard on the media because a good story is the important thing in that very competitive field, and a well prepared one is easier than trying to make a story out of a long speech.

Of course, they find it easier to work with or through colleagues than elected members from different professions and social groups. Likewise, the ministerial press minders have their close personal relationships that have been developed over the years to be able to have a better chance of releases being used—that is human nature.

Also, who wants to sit around until the early hours of the morning hearing more members of Parliament saying things similar to what has already been said? However, what is forgotten in all this is that each member is a separate elected member and, just because a Party colleague may say something, the right should not be denied another to express their view, even though it may be the same or similar. So, the conditioning is perfectly done to condemn the late sittings and thereby reduce the opportunities for elected members to express a view of their own or more particularly that of their electorate. The alternative is so obvious: to sit more days and do what the electorate believe they pay us to do—represent them in Parliament.

Automatically, it is claimed by those who are impatient or the more articulate, whether in the press galleries or ruling parties, that if you cannot say what you want to say in a shorter period of time, then bad luck. I well remember the view expressed by the Hon. Cyril Hutchens, along these lines:

Parliament is not intended to be made up of only the highly intelligent or the articulate or a particular group of gifted people, but people from all different backgrounds and abilities who are able to come to a conclusion to the best of their ability and within their philosophy for what they see as best for the people of the state and/or their electorate.

I often wonder what patience a ruling Government would have for a person with a severe stuttering handicap or part disability. On past indications—none. In fact, our Standing Orders do not allow for the insertion of a view by a person

who has lost their voice permanently or temporarily, except by a suspension.

Mr Speaker, I know that you, as an elected member of Parliament, objected to, and in fact detested, the practice of long speeches or speakers making the same points and fought to have change. We should remember that some people are gifted with the ability to be short and concise in speech, others long and prolix in the contribution. That does not make either a better representative of the people. Denying those who, because of a handicap, find it difficult to be concise the right to fully explain the position by gradually shortened speech time does not lend itself to a better democracy.

Likewise, these same representatives (and there will always be some on both sides) feel the cold shoulder of a media that is pounded by the Ministers' minders. These minders sole job is to make sure the critics or alternative views of the Government are kept from the people as much as possible, and I admit that they are successful. This modern trend has, without doubt, reduced the effectiveness of individuals, and therefore quite often the people's representatives', rights in Parliament, further strengthening the power of the Executive.

The other changes I have seen are first a reduction in time for questions without notice from two hours to one hour per sitting day. Also, before this change, latitude was given for members to explain a question first, before placing the actual question. It might surprise members to know that, when those conditions for questions prevailed, the Hon. Hugh Hudson claimed the record of 11 questions in one day. With the present new system, one is lucky to be allowed six questions per year. When I came to Parliament with the 39 member Lower House, there was no time limit on speeches, and those introducing Bills read all of the second reading when introducing them.

So, one must ask why, if we have a greater number of people with degrees and professional qualifications through a claimed better education system, we need to introduce time limits on speeches. We have moved from unlimited time to 20 minute speeches in but 15 years of this country's 150 years of so-called democratic government.

The stupidity of Governments is shown by the regular rush just before the end of a season to push through a whole lot of new or amending laws—some introduced but with a few days to go and with the threat that the Government wants this through and will, if necessary, use the guillotine. That denies members the time to seek community view or even fully debate the proposals.

When we average fewer than 59 sitting days a year, Government cannot logically claim that we do not have time to sit more days, because many members still quite successfully run their business, professions or trades, or take on a host of voluntary community work. I know that if Parliament sat 100 days a year I could quite easily carry out the duties of an electorate twice the size of Davenport. Admittedly, I would resign from the 16 charity and community committees to which I belong and employ somebody to look after my few thousand flower bulbs. What happened between February and August this year was a disgrace. Between October 1985 and August 1986 this Parliament sat on only a dozen days; in fact, it was a bakers dozen—13!

Does any member argue that that is a proper use of this parliamentary resource? Was there no issue that should have been debated in Parliament? We all know the answer: the Executive is now all powerful and the role of Parliament is being diminished daily. People who want the Executives of Party machines to be all powerful take the attitude, 'Who

needs Parliament? It is a confounded nuisance to government, anyway'.

If, as some argue, Parliamentarians are busier today than in the past, why is it, when we have more Parliamentarians than before the 1970s, more Government departments and more laws, that we sit on only 59 days a year? From my knowledge of this Parliament, there has never been a session during which all Government and private members business has been properly finalised. There is always a lot of business not completed. In fact, at the time of prorogation, since 1968, 160 Bills have lapsed; in other words, Parliament did not sit long enough to dispose of the business before the House. More importantly, the vast majority were Government Bills, which Governments, at the time of introduction, claimed were necessary to be included on the statutes: if that was not so, why introduce them?

In the same period, five Governments and 102 private members' motions lapsed, many so important that they deserved proper consideration. This does not, of course, take into account the number of matters that were rushed to a vote with many members being denied the right to make the contribution that they wished to make. Surely we, as members, do not see as unreasonable the proposition of having to attend Parliament 80 days a year. We can be assured that the public would expect at least that amount of effort from us. When people approach me and ask whether I will raise in the Parliament a matter of concern to them, they just cannot believe when I explain, first, that parliament does not sit for another four months or more; secondly, that I get only six questions a year without notice; and, thirdly, when I put a question on notice it takes up to a year to receive a reply.

I add that I asked one question last session about which I know the Public Accounts Committee had details but about which I did not get an answer until this session started some 12 months later. However, that money was available because a statement was made by the Chairman to the press about that matter. How can a Parliament operate effectively when it takes that long to get answers to questions? Yet, regarding my statement about questions on notice, that was the practice before question time was reduced so that we would receive answers to questions without notice on the following Tuesday; we were told that we would receive the answers then.

In fact, that was part of the excuse for reducing Question Time; that is, that members could ask questions without notice and expect a reply the next Tuesday. I accept that some of the questions now being put on notice are such that it would be unreasonable to expect a reply quickly. But, the fact is that virtually none are answered the following Tuesday. This Parliament is the place where matters of concern to our electors should be raised, and that cannot be done if the Parliament does not meet. What honourable member would be prepared to inform the public that the 28 days in total that the Government intends having Parliament sit this year is a fair go for democracy? That is the number of days we intend sitting in 1986—28 days! In all fairness there are members who, by the end of the year, will have spent more days interstate or overseas than they have spent in this Parliament. Which member would claim that it is sensible to sit as late as midnight or even until early morning, when we sit for so few days a year? Of course it is utter stupidity, and we all know it.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: Members opposite get excited, but what I have stated is the truth. We sit for only 28 days and members may be out of the State or overseas for more than that time in a year. Surely, that is known to the public and

the press. The 28 days is not known. It is not an unreasonable statement. If it has reached the stage where we do not have the courage to admit that a trip interstate or overseas is justified, what is wrong with us?

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member of Mawson gets excited because reference is made to the Parliament's sitting for only 28 days in one year, and she tries to justify the Government's actions in bringing the Parliament together for such a few days.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am grateful that the member for Hartley thinks that I am ruining it, Sir, but I am pleased that he has turned up to help me do it. I appreciate his sitting there listening to me—that is great. When sitting for such a few days, we know that it is stupid to sit late at night and in the early hours of the morning. However, when people who live for power are in Government, regardless of which philosophy, it is inevitable that they will abuse that power unless the Standing Orders stop them from doing so. No doubt, some members would argue in this debate that we now have two hours of private members' time every Thursday and that more time will be available for private members. While that could be the case, only time will tell. However, I make the claim now that there will still not be enough sitting days under the present program to complete private members' business.

Ms Lenehan: Don't you work in the electorate?

Mr S.G. EVANS: Then there is Government business. We were informed through the press, when this session opened, that the Government had a backlog of 100 Bills that Parliament must consider. I pick up the member for Mawson's interjection about my work in the electorate. There were 26 000 people in my electorate, nearly as many as there were in the member for Mawson's electorate, but more than the number of people in three-quarters of all electorates. I came back into this place, so I think that that is proof that I work in the electorate. Who could honestly claim that having a backlog of 100 Bills and sitting for only a few days is proper representation of the people by Parliamentarians? As I have said, in fact this year the Parliament will sit for only 28 days. Which honourable members would be prepared to say proudly to their electors that the Parliament sat for only 13 days from the end of October last year until 31 July this year—being one and a half days a month, average—and at the same time complain, as the Government did, that there was a backlog of 100 Bills at the beginning of this session?

I realise that this is a sensitive issue, and I think that that has been proven, particularly in relation to those in Government. However, if we are fair dinkum, we know that this Parliament should sit for more days a year. To sit for an obligatory 80 days a year would give the opportunity to have 160 hours for questions, instead of the 56 hours used for that purpose this year. Further, late night sittings could be avoided and the Government and private members' time could be properly handled. I ask members to support this very important motion.

The SPEAKER: Is there a seconder for the motion? There being no seconder, the motion lapses.

HOUSING LOAN INTEREST RATES

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House condemns the Federal Government for its incompetence in failing to take appropriate action to reduce housing loan interest rates.

I am tempted now, following the fall-out from the Federal Government's budget, to amend the motion to say, 'That this House condemns the Federal Government for its incompetence as far as the economy of this country is concerned'. The Federal budget was designed to reduce expenditure. It was designed to reduce the deficit and it was designed in such a way that in the short term it would bring down housing loan interest rates. We have read much in the past seven or eight months that housing interest rates would fall, that interest rates would fall and, really, nothing has happened.

In actual fact, if there is any section of the community that has been hardest hit, it has been those who have purchased houses and, particularly in South Australia, those who have purchased houses and borrowed finance through the State Bank at market rate terms. The Federal Government is the one that surely takes the blame and responsibility for the current level of interest rates. I personally believe that interest rates are about 50 per cent too high. If we are to do anything to help the housing industry and help young people achieve the great Australian dream of owning their own home, then we must ensure that they must have access to long-term low interest rates. If they do not have that access to be able to raise the mortgage, then this country will face economic hardship for many years to come.

Let us look at the situation just prior to the last State election in South Australia. In September 1985, at the State Bank of South Australia, loans of up to \$30 000 carried an interest rate of 14.5 per cent. From \$30 001 to \$50 000, it was 15 per cent on the total balance; from \$75 000 and upwards, 15.75 per cent; and \$999 999, 16 per cent. The new rates until 10 March 1986 were as follows: up to \$30 000, 16 per cent; up to \$40 000, 16.25 per cent; up to \$50 000, 16.5 per cent; up to \$75 000, 17 per cent; and up to \$100 000, 17 per cent. The new rates have been reduced in some respects from 10 June (when they came back to 15.5 per cent), but in the long term there still has been no effective real reduction in housing loan rates over the past almost 12 months.

As far as the State Bank of South Australia is concerned, it has the market edge and has always had an edge in housing finance. From 10 March this year, the rates on the general lending policy were amended. The home saver rate, as at 12 December 1985, for up to \$35 000 was 13 per cent, and over that it was 13.5 per cent. Now, the first home buyers up to \$40 000 pay 14.75 per cent and over \$40 000 it is 15.5 per cent. Others up to \$100 000 pay 15.5 per cent. It is quite clear in the home saver area that young South Australians in particular have been disadvantaged by 1.75 per cent and more. The difficulty with purchasing a house today under \$60 000 adds further to the burden of the impact of the housing interest rates.

As far as the commercial banks are concerned, the ANZ housing rate at December 1985 was 13.5 per cent, and that remains on all the earlier established loans. Since then, the Federal Government has deregulated the rate and the rates range from 17.5 per cent up to 19.25 per cent on overdraft and at a fixed ceiling of about 15.5 per cent on housing loans. The Federal Government has organised, by assisting and encouraging the banks, to peg the ceiling at 15.5 per cent. Through the commercial market, prospective home buyers are 2 per cent worse off.

Building societies' interest rates in South Australia have fluctuated wildly from 12.5 per cent to 13.5 per cent, depending on the size of the loan. In July 1985 the rate went from 13.75 per cent to 14.75 per cent. In February 1986 building societies sought a reduction in the interest rates, but as yet that has not occurred. Interest rates in

South Australia are quite high. We believe that the housing loan rates offered by building societies are too high because of the competitive nature of the industry.

The responsibility of setting interest rates, as far as the private banking sector is concerned, lies with the Reserve Bank, which can establish the ceiling and ratio of liquidity provided by the banking structure. However, we find, after looking at the Federal Government's budget, that it is claimed that, if it was to reduce the deficit and borrowings, that should have an impact on its own loan market; but that is not so. It will not be so and it is certainly not evident at present. The debt, and financing the debt, in this country is growing because of the impact of interest rates. That, in itself, is a generating factor and will cause more problems in relation to Government financing.

In our own State budget we find that interest paid by SAFA was \$509 million—five-eighths of the money raised by indirect taxes in this State. That is a huge impost on the taxpayers of South Australia. More so, the impact that it is having on those who want to secure their own home concerns me, as that will be extremely difficult if the current Federal Government is allowed to continue with its economic policy and because of the folly of what it is doing in relation to young people. I will seek further information about the finer details of housing incentives and housing loan interest rates. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House condemns Ministers, and the Premier in particular, for failing to answer questions on the Notice Paper in the name of the member for Hanson, some of which have been outstanding for over 12 months, and calls on the Government to practise open government and provide the relevant information of community interest.

Some time ago the Premier replied to a question of mine in relation to why questions on notice were not answered, and he was very critical of the type of questions that I was placing on the Notice Paper and of why I was seeking that information. The Premier and Government members would not understand, because most of them have not been in this place very long, that in a busy electorate office members are asked many questions by constituents, and suggestions are put forward to members. The electorate office then becomes a general information centre.

Then comes the opportunity for a member to act on behalf of his constituents and the taxpayers of the State, and this gives the Government of the day an opportunity to provide that member with information that can be put to use for the benefit of the people. It is all part of communication and community education. It is extremely annoying for a member of Parliament to be asked to obtain some information for and on behalf of his constituents through the Parliamentary process when he has to wait months and, on occasions, over a year, for a reply. I think the longest period of time I had a question on the Notice Paper for some 15 months. Presently I have an unanswered question on notice addressed to the Minister of Transport, and there is no reason why he should not reply; other Ministers have.

The worst offender in the past has been the Minister of Health, but the Premier and all the other Ministers have been equally tardy in answering the questions on the parliamentary Notice Paper. The information sought is avail-

able within the Government departments and, also, it is readily accessible to the Ministers' staff.

There is no real reason for not providing the information to the member who seeks it. Previous Premiers of this State who believed in and practised open government insisted that the answers be provided as soon as possible. Despite all the criticisms that may have been made of Don Dunstan, at least he insisted that, within reason, the questions should be answered and the information provided to the member as soon as possible.

As the member for Davenport has said already today, when the duration of Question Time was changed from two hours to one hour, members were encouraged to put the questions on the parliamentary Notice Paper so that they would be answered the following Tuesday. It is very rare for a member to place a question on the parliamentary Notice Paper Tuesday afternoon or evening and to receive the reply the following Tuesday. If that occurred, it would be an absolute fluke.

When a member has to wait so many months in order to obtain an answer for his constituent, it causes a great deal of frustration. I could well be forgiven for being a little paranoid when I say that I think that, as far as my questions are concerned, there is deliberate discrimination. If one happens to be in a marginal seat, one receives the worst bloody treatment from this current crop of Ministers, to the point where it is straight discrimination. If a member feels that he is being discriminated against, he can take no action. He can do nothing, except to protest by way of motion that his question should be answered.

I refer to *Hansard* in 1985, volume 2 of the Forty-fifth Parliament, page 1279. On that page question No. 27, which I had asked earlier in the session, was finally answered by the Minister of Housing and Construction. There was no great difficulty about that question, which asked:

1. How many houses have been built of asbestos and timber frames for the South Australian Housing Trust from 1950 and how many are now rented by the trust and in which suburbs?
2. Have these houses been inspected by the trust in the past three years and what decisions and/or policy have been made regarding removing of asbestos or replacing these houses?

I finally received that answer in October last year. I agree that there would have been some research involved, but the question was asked in July.

Question No. 29, which dealt with primary school accommodation, was also answered in October. Very little information would have needed to have been gathered on that question, because it related to the transfer of two portable units from West Beach Primary School to the Grange Primary School. All that information would have been on file in the Education Department and could have been sourced out, possibly within half an hour.

We know how tardy the Education Department is in replying to questions—almost to the point of paranoia. The member for Eyre had question No. 42, about uneconomical water schemes, answered in October, and then I had a question on the Controlled Substances Advisory Council answered. Those series of questions were answered about the same time as question Nos 100 and 125 through to 176. A range of questions were answered on that day, from Nos 27 to 176. That is a reasonable demonstration of the tardiness of Government Ministers and departments in providing prompt answers to reasonable questions. There is no excuse for that.

I know that some Government departments are annoyed at the number of questions that I am placing on the Notice Paper concerning the use of Government motor vehicles. At least \$1 million to \$2 million a year is being spent that would not be if all the cars were placed in the Government

motor pool and used as it is designed to be used, with stricter control being kept on the allocation and use of Government motor vehicles for private reasons. There is blatant abuse in this area by a small minority, and that is putting the use of Government vehicles at risk. The public are annoyed when they see Government motor vehicles travelling around at the weekend and after normal working hours carrying people who could not relate to a Government department or any activity involved in such a department. If there has ever been a cover-up, it has been in this area.

I take some of the answers with a grain of salt because I do not think that I have been given the truthful information in all instances. The Ministers would not know because the information that they have been provided snobs them as well. The whole principle of giving up the two hours of Question Time that we had when I came to Parliament in 1970 has been thrown out of the window. The promises given in those days were never intended to be honoured so that when we put questions on the Notice Paper we were further discriminated against.

The Government and the Ministers cannot complain because, when they were in Opposition, they did the same thing as we do. They flooded the Notice Paper with questions. There is now a lack of information being provided to the community and to Parliament to assist members of Parliament in doing their duty. The Premier and his Ministers should be strongly condemned for not attending as promptly as was the case in the past to the questions on the Notice Paper from members of Parliament. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NETLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the 'negotiable factor' of the staffing formula for the Netley Primary School be reconsidered to include provision for special education (remedial), computing support, science specialisation and other school curriculum development programs.

I have been approached by the Netley Primary School Council, which objects to the formula being used by the Education Department in relation to that school, which suffers disadvantages under the present formula. When I was first elected to Parliament, Netley Primary School was known as Netley Demonstration School. It is a school of which we in the district are extremely proud: it has earned and established a reputation for providing a high standard of education, and it is a school community that works extremely well. So it is disappointing for me that I must take this step and raise in Parliament, through this motion, the concern of the school council to ensure that at some time in the future Netley Primary School is no longer disadvantaged.

At the same time, the 'negotiable factor' is being established by certain persons concerned with the welfare and well-being of our primary students to bring education into the 1990s and to ensure that Netley Primary School and all primary schools benefit. I think it is appropriate that I read some of the correspondence on this issue that I have received from constituents: first, a letter from two members of the Netley Primary School Room Mothers Group, as follows:

Dear Sir,

As our local M.P., we would like to inform you of a current educational issue. On behalf of the Netley Primary School 'Room Mothers Group', we would like to give our full support to the 'Into the Nineties' campaign, organised by the South Australian Primary Principals Association (SAPPA).

For too many years now, primary school students' needs have been secondary to the students at high school. Our children are worse off every year.

Over the past three years at Netley Primary School, our teacher resources have dropped dramatically. Our specialist art and science programs are non-existent and although we have two full classrooms of expensive equipment, we have no teachers to carry on these essential subjects.

The South Australian Education Department, in its own guidelines 'Our Schools and Their Purposes', states that it seeks to allocate resources to all schools as equitably as possible, within the available resources.

All we ask is for an equal opportunity for our children in those vital years of their education.

The letter is signed by the two mothers concerned. 'Into the 90s' education guarantees equal opportunity for beginners through to year 7 students. The existing disparity between school beginners through to year 7 schools and year 8 through to year 12 schools is unacceptable.

Various principals and school councils claim that the current formula devalues the importance of children's learning and development during the crucial school years of R through to year 7: it denies the fact that secondary and further education experience is dependent upon successful R to year 7 learning experiences, and disadvantages children by denying the principle of equal opportunity for children in the school years R to year 7. I will now give some background information on this matter.

There is a huge disparity in resources between the various primary schools and high schools, and I will give an example of the disparity in resources between R to year 7 schools and year 8 to year 12 schools, using a school of 430 students. The basic staff in a primary school of that size is 20, whereas in a secondary school it is 34—a disparity of 70 per cent. There are two senior staff at the primary school and eight in the secondary school—a disparity of some 300 per cent. In relation to ancillary staff—and this is a base figure—there are 20 hours for the primary school and 100 hours for the secondary school.

That is a disparity of 400 per cent. The ancillary staff total is 120 hours for the primary school compared to 270 hours, or a 125 per cent disparity, as far as the high school is concerned. The Government grant base for the primary school is \$1 640 and for the high school \$8 480, a difference of 417 per cent. The Government grant per capita to primary students is \$32.40 and to secondary students \$79.20, a disparity of 144 per cent.

In the duties other than teaching there is a difference of 8 per cent in the primary school and 20 per cent in the high school, and the disparity between the two is 150 per cent. The primary principals argue that, given an improved formula, what can be achieved for the students would not be at the disadvantage of the secondary schools. It just means a reallocation and reorganisation of priorities within the primary school system.

We are fully aware, from media releases, of the reorganisation that is obviously going on in the Education Department to make better use of its existing resources. The department must learn to live within the budget and now provide to the primary schools the opportunity to re-establish the benefits which the students had.

At Netley we have the problem of a multicultural school, involving a wide disparity, where we need teachers who can assist the students in languages, because that is the age at which encouragement should be given with the teaching of more than one language. The staffing formula gives no flexibility to the specialist programs which were well established at Netley, particularly in drama and music. Music was one area in which the Netley school excelled. The other areas that have been affected include science: there is little or no science being taught now. There is no remedial education in many of our primary schools, and very little is being done in this regard. About 16 to 18 students need

remedial teaching which cannot be provided because the staffing formula is not flexible enough.

In the art and craft area the students are missing out because, again, they are not given the opportunity. Netley Primary School initially peaked at 740 students and, when I was first elected, in 1970, was known as Netley Demonstration School. It achieved a very high standard in teaching and in providing assistance to the teaching staff handling that type of school. Now, because of zero population growth and a whole change in attitudes, only 240 students are attending that school, involving about 170 families. The reduction in number of teaching staff is making a tremendous difference in relation to providing opportunities at that school.

In support of this program and the proposals 'Into the '90s,' I have also been approached by other schools in my electorate. I think it is only fair and reasonable that, whilst this motion relates specifically to the Netley Primary School, this is one way of enabling me to have this issue, generally, recorded in Parliament. It is unfortunate that, because of the school holidays and the parliamentary sitting program, the deputation I sought to have with the Minister could not be arranged before Parliament resumed, and the Minister then delegated someone in his department to receive that deputation, which is to take place shortly.

I think it is fair to note that J. Gleede, the parent of a student attending that primary school, wrote to me stating:

Dear Sir,

I wish to express my concern at the present disparities between the resources provided for children in the years R-7 (Primary) and years 8-12 (Secondary).

From the attached table of figures, one can see that the primary years are very poorly funded in relation to secondary. I strongly believe that this undervaluing of primary schooling should not be allowed to continue and call on you to work to improve the resource allocation to primary (R-7) schools.

Lockleys Primary School is now included in my electorate. The SAIT representative and the school council both wrote to me along the same lines on 20 August, stating:

Dear Mr Becker,

The Lockleys Primary School Council supports the following proposals of 'Into the Nineties'.

(1) To provide R-7 children in South Australia with one extra teacher per 100 children by 1992.

(2) To increase teacher aide time.

(3) To increase non-contact time for primary teachers to the same level as secondary teachers.

We believe the basis of all future learning, in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes, begins with primary school education. We recognise the necessity to implement OSTP if all children are to receive an enriching, balanced primary education. However, we are concerned that existing staffing levels in primary schools do not allow for the demanding task of catering for the individual, while presenting a broad curriculum.

We believe that additional resources should be provided for the demanding task of primary education and urge that additional staff, released by falling secondary enrolments, be reallocated accordingly.

For Lockleys Primary School the additional staff will enable the school to provide:

(1) extra teacher/librarian time to cater for ever increasing demands on the school's resource centre,

(2) time for the gifted and talented children,

(3) time for the slow learners,

(4) time for computer studies.

We look forward to the implementation of the proposals as outlined in the 'Into the Nineties' document.

That again basically illustrates the need by the school council. The letter from the SAIT representative on behalf of staff was exactly the same. It reinforces what Netley Primary School is endeavouring to achieve for and on behalf of its students.

As I have an appointment with Mr Mark Schiller of the Education Department and councillors of the primary school next Tuesday, 23 September, it is fair that I seek leave to

continue my remarks until the deputation has met with the Minister's nominee. I can then report further to the House on the attitude the Minister will take in relation to the 'Into the Nineties' program for Netley Primary School. I seek leave accordingly.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)

Mr BECKER (Hanson) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

Mr BECKER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Graffiti has been probably one of the biggest nuisances that we have come across in our modern society. There would not be a Government building, a private building, bus shelter, bridge, roadway or any type of fence, hoarding or structure that has not been desecrated or damaged in some way by so called graffiti artists or persons who wish to display their talents or protests by using spray cans, textas, paint, or whatever.

An honourable member: Some of it can be quite humorous.

Mr BECKER: I agree. As the honourable member said, it can be quite humorous and some of it is quite artistic. A cream brick wall on the south-western side of the intersection of Burbridge Road and Marion Road has on it graffiti which no doubt took the 'artist' many many evening hours over many weeks to demonstrate his talents with various spray cans and various colours. The damage to that wall would run into several thousands of dollars and it would be extremely difficult for the owner to remove the graffiti entirely and restore the wall to its original condition. In other words, that cannot be done, and it is now a permanent display, done by somebody who started doodling or daubing on that wall. The property owner is very annoyed that nothing could be done to detect the person and that little effort was taken or incentive provided by way of legislation to apprehend those involved. In travelling around the metropolitan area one sees many buildings and galvanised iron fences daubed with graffiti, a few illustrations of which I have here in a book. The white walls of shops adjacent to the Clarence Park railways crossing have been daubed, and houses, sheds and fences along the tram line have been subjected to a considerable amount of daubing by graffiti artists. The same thing has happened, of course, along our railway lines, and on the fences at the showground the graffiti is shocking. I believe that this is a reflection on society and on the city, town or suburb that allows graffiti to exist.

Mr Peterson: How do you stop it?

Mr BECKER: We will find out. The type of graffiti that we are seeing in South Australia is not uncommon to the cities of Melbourne and Sydney. In 1984, in Los Angeles, I saw the familiar pattern emerging with the type of graffiti and the type of scribbling used. I have no idea what language it is, but a pattern is emerging in this country as there was in Los Angeles, where preparations were in hand for the Olympic Games. I said that the graffiti looked terrible and asked what they were going to do about it, and I was told that murals would be painted over the graffiti in areas where the public would be using the roads and public transport routes, and that the mural designs would depict something to do with the Olympic Games.

I told them that similar action had been taken with some of our buildings, and that on Prospect Road three superb

murals had been painted on commercial buildings to cover graffiti. Those murals have never been touched, and they fit in well with the environment. Where it can be afforded, I would certainly encourage that type of decoration on commercial walls to discourage graffiti drawing.

Therefore, that is one way that we can discourage some of the graffiti people. People with galvanised iron fences really suffer from the problem. Australia would be lost without its good old galvanised iron but, when one gets up in the morning and sees the fence all covered with three and four letter words and all sorts of other daubings, one realises that it is certainly not in the best interests of the community.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson should be aware that displays are out of order.

Mr BECKER: Mr Speaker, I am looking at my folder and my friend the member for Gilles wanted to know what was in it. He is welcome to have a look at it. I have received many complaints from citizens throughout the metropolitan area about the damage to their properties caused by graffiti artists. The latest one that I received concerned the recent desecration of the walls of a church at Oaklands Park by a graffiti artist. I think that when graffiti artists stoop to doing that to church properties, they are getting down pretty low. But, no matter where one goes throughout the city, one finds that local government authorities, property owners, advertising agents, and so on, are annoyed at the amount of damage that is being done.

Outdoor advertising organisations and the association are also concerned that very expensive posters, quite legally displayed on hoardings, are also subject to damage by graffiti artists. This relates to not only cigarette advertising but also other commercial firms which go to a lot of time, trouble and expense to display their products by means of a simple message to the community. These displays are often damaged and used by graffiti artists to bring their protest to the public's attention. I believe that any group which wants to protest should hire an advertising hoarding, pay for it, and then quite legally make known their concern. But, of course, these people do not do that.

It has been put to me that, perhaps as part of this legislation, we should look at banning the sale of spray cans. I understand that this has been done in the city of New York. However, spray cans are very handy and helpful to the average handyman who wants to do some repairs at home and just touch-up paint work. Notwithstanding that, the banning of spray cans may well be one way of solving the problem, but I think it would be extremely difficult to police. Several organisations have suggested this to me and I will look further at the matter. In New York a quite substantial fine applies to selling spray cans to people under the age of 18 years.

Also involved in problems with the graffiti have been some of the political slogans, and probably one of the worst was the racist slogans that we saw throughout the metropolitan area earlier this year that stated, 'Asians out'. Members of the Asian community were offended by it, and quite rightly so. They had every right to be upset at the activities of the person who damaged Government signs, road signs, fences and properties with the simple message, 'Asians out'.

It is not the expression of the vast majority of people within this community in any way at all, and these people felt hurt that they were being singled out for this type of treatment. So, if my actions in bringing this legislation to the Parliament were reinforced, it was when I saw this type of graffiti starting to mushroom around the metropolitan area, and I felt that we really had to do something about it.

Asian migrants, like all other migrants to this country, have worked extremely well, have settled in quite quickly and are becoming very good and loyal citizens of our country. They are very proud of it and are grateful for the opportunities that have been given to them. I do not think that anyone in this Parliament or State would condone that type of graffiti. Therefore, I have pleasure in bringing this legislation to the attention of Parliament. I make no bones of the fact that, when I initially looked at considering legislation in January this year, I wanted to provide for a penalty of \$10 000. The *Sunday Mail* recorded the story, and the article states:

Graffiti artists would be forced to scrub walls for up to 2 000 hours and pay a fine of \$10 000 under a proposed Bill, sponsored by State Liberal MP Heini Becker.

Mr Becker said he would consider introducing the Bill into the South Australian Parliament because graffiti was 'getting out of hand'.

I know that a similar move was being prepared for the New South Wales Parliament. After discussions with persons involved in the legal profession, it was suggested that \$10 000 was a little bit out of kilter, and that the only way that we could handle this graffiti issue would be to amend the Summary Offences Act along the lines that I have proposed.

Clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 relates to commencement. Clause 3 deals with the description of posting bills, etc., and amends section 48 of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (b) in subsection (1). Clause 4 inserts new clause 49 which relates to writing on walls, etc. It provides as follows:

(1) A person who, without lawful authority, writes upon, soils, defaces or marks a building, wall, fence, structure, road or footpath with paint or chalk or by any other means shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: \$2 000 or imprisonment for six months.

(2) Where a court exercises its powers under the Offenders Probation Act 1913, in relation to a person found guilty of an offence against this section, the court should give serious consideration to including in the recognisance a condition requiring the person to undertake community service.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 increases the maximum penalty under the Act from \$200 to \$5 000 for the purpose of guaranteeing that there is a maximum penalty large enough to deter those who may seek to deliberately break this law to the detriment of small traders. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

It is a pity when a representative of the people is forced to seek increased penalties to deter corporate power being used to the detriment of small traders and the more home-tied, that is, the disadvantaged of our society. The Metropolitan Milk Supply Act has been operating quite successfully since 1946, without any serious threat of it being flouted.

However, in recent times it has become obvious that at least one corporate body is out to do all in its power to test that Act. For me, a believer in private enterprise, and in particular having been closely associated with the family who own this corporate body, it had to be seen as a real threat to many small traders. Therefore, I decided to take this action.

This corporate body has been discounting milk just outside the Adelaide metropolitan milk zone area for some time now and many small traders, either as home deliverers or local convenience stores, are suffering big sales losses. It is easy to argue that if people want home deliveries then they will support it so it will survive, but that is not how it works in practise.

What happens is that a supermarket can afford to discount a key item like milk, bread, etc., even at a loss, but pick up the profit on other items once the customer has been drawn into the traditional consumer trap by catch lines.

This means that the local deli has lost not just the sale of milk, but also the other items, and they cannot afford to run a discount war with supermarkets. Supermarkets are prepared to run discount wars and these have been so intense in recent times that annual reports show how far they are prepared to go to try and attract clientele.

The mark-up one national food retailer placed on turnover if reflected into a small deli operation would not even pay insurance, land tax, power, Government registration charges, or council, water and sewer bills, let alone mortgages and some wages for the operators.

Let us not forget that these corporate bodies in the retail food market have such power in their purchasing that they do not pay for all of their advertising. What happens is that they beat the manufacturer down to a bed-rock price but also make it a condition that the manufacturer pays for advertising.

Therefore, when we see a full page advertisement displaying many different types of food, the supermarket is not footing that bill in real terms, but each manufacturer is paying towards that part of the advertisement that their product takes up. The poor little deli operators cannot achieve such a deal so they pay full tote odds to the manufacturer, so that, in essence, they are paying for part of the supermarket advertising. In other words, the poor blighters are forced to help the major supermarkets advertise against themselves.

The plight of the milky home delivery is even more serious than that of the local deli, for they are dependant, in the main, on one item. What is happening in their case is that some people, are, of course, buying the discounted catch line of milk at the supermarket. Once this becomes a set pattern it is obvious that these small operators will not survive because the distance they travel between sales points on their round is increased. Some will suggest amalgamating several rounds to achieve the same result. That sounds great, but it is not economic to travel two, three or four times the distance to achieve the same number of sales, in particular, when the small operators cannot 'up' the price when a supermarket is determined to discount to the point of a loss on that product.

To the consumers I say, 'Wake up to the facts.' Never in the history of trading has the use of corporate power, to eliminate small traders, been to the long-term benefit of consumers. Once the market is captured and the small operators left on the 'scrap heap' the consumer is in the clutches of the corporate bodies—in this case supermarkets.

Just conduct a quick assessment of those small traders we all depend on for that personalised service. Sometimes

they give credit until tomorrow or the next day—try this with a supermarket. Many of the small operators, particularly today, are those who had put a little nest egg aside for the future but then suddenly found themselves out of work. Being determined to try to be contributors and not receivers of public funds, they re-mortgage their homes and with the nest egg went into business. The idealist will say, 'So what if they made a bad business decision, that is their problem.'

It is unreasonable to allow an opportunity for powerful operators to use their financial resources to pay small fines in a campaign to defeat small competitors who expect to be protected by the prevailing law in relation to their business.

The end result is obvious—small traders are crushed and big operators then play around with prices at will. Now, that does not necessarily stop with just small retail operators. The next move would be to force processors to bed-rock prices or even own a processing plant, and then put the screws on the actual dairy farmers.

What of the consumers? Yes it is easy to say they benefit from discounting, and some will in the short term, but only until that part of the market which the supermarkets wish to corner has been achieved.

I only wish I could get the message to the consumers as many seem to take the corner store and milky for granted. I wonder how often people give a second thought to the taken for granted benefits a local business or milky give—in particular, those that operate after hours. They do notice the out of ordinary things that occur in our neighbourhoods. They are a reliable source for authorities seeking details regarding persons seen acting strangely within the local neighbourhood.

In days gone by we not only had the milky, the postie, newspaper deliveries and some bread deliveries, as we have now, but there were also greengrocers, grocers, butchers, fishmongers, etc., and even the night carts. There is no doubt that the presence of those people in our community acted as an effective 'watchdog' for our families and property. One does not advocate that they return, but we should recognise this unrewarded but important role the present operators play in these days of violence and stolen and/or damaged property. Some such operators also issue credit to regulars who have achieved a satisfactory credit worthiness. Also, they will obtain products/brands not normally stocked by others, if requested, and this is a very convenient service. Unfortunately, the consumers do not notice the difference until these operators have been crushed by corporate power.

Quite honestly, there are some consumers who will drive a motor vehicle on a two kilometre trip, which costs at least 50 cents, to save 20 cents on 2 cartons of milk.

What happens to those home-tied, whether they be those with young families or those less mobile through age or infirmity, who rely on home deliveries? We, as a Parliament, should give these people prime consideration when taking any action regarding this industry. The following is the text of eight points made by the wholesale branch of the Milk Vendors Association (some are a repeat of points I have made, but, it clearly shows the concerns of these small operators):

1. Bottle sales would vanish; consumers would no longer have the choice to buy 'pasteurised only' milk, which is available only in bottles.

2. Small businesses (deli's, etc.) would suffer considerable loss of trade, which is generated by milk sales in their stores.

3. Many people, that is, the elderly, the infirm, those with young families, the disabled, etc., rely heavily on the home delivery of milk. Discounting of milk would result in this service being no longer available.

4. As daily production of milk is constant, and discounting promotes bulk buying towards the end of the week, the result of such practices would be that a storage problem would be experi-

enced by producers and/or manufacturers and would cause milk purchased by supermarkets to have a much reduced life when eventually sold to the consumer.

5. Discounting will cause much insecurity and instability in the milk industry, that is, lack of expansion by dairy farmers and milk processors which may result in lost job opportunities in these areas, as well as in milk vending.

6. Sales and consumption of milk most certainly would drop if milk is no longer delivered to householders on a daily basis. This has been the experience in other areas and States which no longer enjoy a home delivery service.

7. In South Australia overproduction in the dairy industry is a widely recognised problem and any means to maintain our consumption rate must be encouraged.

8. Should milk only be available through shops and supermarkets, a steep increase in the price can be expected. This is evidenced in a comparison with bread, which has practically ceased being home delivered, and has dramatically increased in price. Not so long ago a loaf of bread was sold for approximately the same price as a bottle of milk. At present a loaf of bread costs more than twice the price of a bottle of milk.

Due to the close ties I have with small business and consumers in the Hills area, where discounting is rife, I would have received more complaints than other members. However, I ask members if they believe in giving small business and those consumers who are home-tied more than others a fair go, to please support and give this Bill a speedy passage through the Parliament.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

PURCHASE OF HOUSING TRUST ACCOMMODATION

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Housing and Construction and the South Australian Housing Trust to vigorously promote opportunities for tenants of the trust to purchase their rental accommodation.

It is part of Liberal Party policy for Housing Trust tenants to be given an opportunity to acquire their rental accommodation. This is another way for the Government to assist young people to acquire their houses at a reasonable price. Since this motion was placed on the parliamentary Notice Paper the Minister of Housing and Construction, on behalf of the South Australian Housing Trust, has announced a scheme that I have been enunciating for some time.

Mr Tyler: That is not true and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: It is part of what I have been saying.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Since I put this motion on the Notice Paper at least you have got off your behinds and have done something. You put out a scrubby little piece of paper and you still cannot give the details. You are slow off the mark.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: That is your interpretation. It is not true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will refer to members opposite as 'members opposite' and not in the second person. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER: I object to members opposite calling out 'Liar'. You know, Mr Speaker, that it is unparliamentary, but I cannot identify the person who said it, although I have a fair idea. If they want to carry on like that I will accommodate them at any time.

Mr Hamilton: You have a hearing defect.

Mr BECKER: I do not have a hearing defect. The honourable member knows that. I know exactly what is going on. The Liberal Party has always held that policy and has maintained, and vigorously pursued during the last State election campaign, the opportunity for Housing Trust ten-

ants to purchase their rental accommodation. The Housing Trust has been doing that.

At long last I received some replies to questions placed on the parliamentary Notice Paper in relation to the sale of existing houses to tenants. In the period 1 July 1985 to 30 June 1986, 175 units (132 single units and 43 double units) were sold. This compares to 167 units (139 single units and 28 double units) during the same period of 1984-85. In addition, there have been 51 sales to existing tenants financed under the home rental purchase scheme from 1 July 1985 to 30 June 1986.

For the same period in 1984-85 there were 36 rental purchase scheme sales to existing tenants. In my opinion, there is no doubt that, while there has been a very small increase in sales, the publicity that was generated during and since the last State election campaign has helped to encourage the trust to sell its properties to its tenants. The interesting information contained in this reply is that the number of properties sold to non-tenants in the period 1 July 1985 to 30 June 1986 totalled 269. I would rather see the existing tenants being given the opportunity to purchase their properties. The Minister also stated:

Sales to tenants are made at valuation, determined by private valuers engaged by the trust. Sale prices of new dwellings are based on either market value or cost, whichever is the higher of the two.

The trust's policy is to sell houses to tenants provided:

- the dwelling is on a separate title or capable of being separately titled; and

- the tenant arranges his/her own finance if a loan is required.

The following restrictions apply:

- the sale of new constructed dwellings on completion in the inner metropolitan area is restricted to those tenants who have been in occupation for a minimum period of six months, due to the scarcity of land to enable replacement buildings; and

- the sale of dwellings purchased by the trust off the open market, generally in locations where the trust is unable to add to its stock of housing, is only permitted under special circumstances.

That is fair enough. The Housing Trust must maintain the level and the standard of its properties within the metropolitan area and to spread the stock of its rental accommodation more evenly in the metropolitan area. One of the problems has been that there has not been a large amount of integration of Housing Trust rental accommodation within the residential areas. That is why there are large subdivisions and tracts of simply Housing Trust properties. Of course, the Golden Grove development project is blending private enterprise with the Housing Trust and that is working extremely well.

That is the way the Housing Trust should be allowed to continue to develop and no doubt it will but, at the same time, the Housing Trust should give the longstanding tenants the opportunity to purchase their rental accommodation because, on many occasions, tenants put a lot of their own blood, sweat and tears into establishing their gardens and making improvements to their properties as they are able to afford to do so and then circumstances change, and they have the opportunity to purchase that accommodation and that must be encouraged.

It is pleasing to see that the extension of the system, as we suggested earlier, to encourage shared equity mortgages has been taken up by the Housing Trust and is being developed as one way of encouraging the tenants to purchase their property. I notice that there is a question on the parliamentary Notice Paper about obtaining the title. Of course, if people acquire 25 per cent, they cannot have the title until they pay for the whole of the property but, if they acquire 25 per cent, their interest would be protected by a caveat on the certificate of title, which is still held by the Housing Trust and the Housing Trust would make a record

of it to protect their interest in that property, as part owner of that property. We do not know how the trust proposes to pursue more vigorously this new initiative and to give tenants the opportunity to purchase their houses. Because it is early days, I would like to wait a little longer. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: The adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for—the honourable member for Hanson?

Mr BECKER: For 13 November.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson and the member for Murray-Mallee are completely out of order to be interjecting across the Chamber while the question is being put. The Ayes have it.

Debate adjourned.

OPIUM POPPIES

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to promote before the United Nations Assembly and the World Health Organisation a resolution calling on the Governments of Thailand, Burma and Laos to ban the growing of opium poppies.

In my discussions during my recent Parliamentary study tour, I found it obvious that part of the problem of heroin and heroin addiction originates in this area. It was made clear to me that we, in the Western world, should be encouraging those three countries in the golden triangle to ban the growing of opium poppies. This would have a tremendous impact on the economy of those countries, and there is a role here for the United Nations Assembly and the World Health Organisation. The assembly should be prepared to discuss this issue and bite the bullet.

Australia is having to spend \$100 million in the next three years to do something about drug offences and drug addiction. The biggest problems facing young people is the impact of heroin. Two young Australians paid with their lives in Malaysia because, it was alleged, they were trafficking in heroin. In my quick assessment of the situation, I found it more political than realistic. The Malaysian Government claims that heroin addiction is a security problem.

Anybody who has been addicted, even if he has gone through rehabilitation programs, has no guarantee that he will remain free of addiction. Malaysia and Hong Kong have found that up to 90 per cent of those who undertake rehabilitation programs have a relapse within the five years. The chance of total abstinence after five years is less than 7 per cent because the other 3 per cent would have died. That is the tremendous impact of heroin. Why do we not do something about the sources? I have already said that we shall spend \$100 million on an education program. Hong Kong reduced the instances of new heroin addicts from 54 000 a year to 14 000 a year in three years through a hard-hitting education program. However, 14 000 people are becoming heroin addicts every year.

It is the responsibility of countries such as ours to put a motion to the United Nations Assembly and express in the strongest terms our concern, and to encourage other nations to support the move that representations be made to those three countries in the golden triangle. If we do not, heroin will be flooding us, New Zealand, Canada and the rest of Asia and other parts of the world in such large amounts that we will not be able to stop it. I do not see why any country should be allowed to grow and prepare something that is so deadly to the western world. We have to spend \$100 million, but that is only the beginning of what Aus-

tralia will have to spend in dealing with this horrific problem of heroin.

Of course, there are suggestions that we should also look at increasing the number of customs surveillance organisations, that we should increase penalties and that we should do all sorts of things. However, I believe that we should be going right back to the basics—to the initial stage—whereby we ask the United Nations to call on the Governments of Thailand, Burma and Laos to ban the growing of opium poppies. We would then make a contribution to supplement the economies of these countries so that they can grow alternative crops to help them with their economic situation. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CENSURE OF MEMBER FOR MAWSON

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I move:

That this House censures the member for Mawson for the inaccurate, unseemly, totally misleading and self-seeking remarks she made in moving her motion on the Federal Liberal Council resolution on sex discrimination.

It gives me no joy to move this motion. First, it is important to point out that the Federal Liberal Council resolution to which the member for Mawson referred (and she quoted it) had nothing to do with the principles embodied in sex discrimination. The resolution was about the legitimacy or otherwise of the Federal Government's imposing its laws on sovereign States in a Federal system. I know that members opposite have a simplistic view about what comprises the constitutional law of a nation, but they need to understand that in real democracies there are at least two models of national constitutional entity. The American model and the Australian model are federations where the States have responsibilities themselves for laws which they make relative to the behaviour of citizens within those States.

Even though the external arrangements for all citizens of all States within a federation are made by the Federal Government, in the relationship between that nation and other nations the Federal Government, *per se*, within that country does not control the kinds of behaviour in which an individual can engage. So it is regrettable that the limited view of the world that the member for Mawson has is a view which she then seeks to impose as a straitjacket on the Liberal Party, which has an entirely different philosophical view of a constitutional arrangement between sovereign States and the federation to which they happily agreed to belong and to then become a group of nation States called a federation. I will not bother the House with the description of the alternative form of national identity that is possible for a group of like-minded sovereign States or provinces; suffice to say, however, that, if the member for Mawson wants some information on this, she could look at how the United Kingdom becomes a united kingdom and continues to be so.

Having explained that for the benefit of the member for Mawson and the House, I want to explain further to the member for Mawson why the other members view her remarks as totally inaccurate and misleading. The honourable member debated the issue of the Sex Discrimination Act, but that was not the subject of the motion: there was no intention that that matter be addressed specifically by the Federal Liberal Council. It is important to remember that no member of that council voted at any time to introduce legislation that would make women any different from men. There is no difference, and there never has been

according to the attitude of members of the Liberal Party and their predecessors, between individuals regardless of sexuality. That certainly occurred in the case of the Labor Party, and I will come to that in the context of the 'totally misleading' aspect of the proposition I will put before the House later.

The honourable member acknowledged that she cobbled together the original motion: she referred to a non-existent Act called the anti-discrimination Act, and she then sought leave to amend the motion. That proposition about which the honourable member gave notice to the House in the first instance would have been an easy step. She talked about a so-called attack by the Federal Liberal Council on women, the aged, youth, the disabled and so on in that initial motion. She had it wrong, but she did not bother to get her facts right. The substance of the original motion would have been so obviously inaccurate as not even to warrant further consideration: we could have voted and ditched the motion there and then.

However, the honourable member amended the motion by leave of the House and substantially changed the text and the manner in which it was directed, not only referring to a different and real Act (one which existed) instead of an imaginary Act but also narrowing the focus of the motion to mislead the House into believing that the National Council of the Liberal Party had indeed passed the motion that opposed the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Act. It did not oppose those provisions: it merely opposed their imposition by force on sovereign States.

We have democratically elected State Governments, which have a responsibility to their constituencies to do what they consider to be appropriate. It is not really appropriate for Australia to tell Papua New Guinea what it must do within its boundaries in relation to the cultural mores of the people and the laws that that country passes, even though at one time we did have that power. However, we did not enforce it. Papua New Guinea was once a neo-colonial State of Australia under the terms of the treaty with the United Nations, but we did not impose on that country laws that were inappropriate in relation to its cultural mores. We allowed Papua New Guinea to determine its own laws. The same applies to the relationship between the sovereign States and, in the case of South Australia, to the relationship between this province and the other colonies. Prior to federation, no other State was a province—South Australia was never a colony, contrary to what Dean Jaensch and other eminent left wing political scientists, like Neal Blewett, have said in recent times.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The mirth of members opposite illustrates once again their ignorance of how we come to be living in our society today. That is how the member for Mawson made an absolute fool of herself when she put her amended proposition. Let us consider some of the remarks she made which indicate where she went wrong and which have to be corrected. It is unfortunate that we have to do that but I guess that if she will not learn the easy way she will have to learn the hard way. For instance, she said:

In fact, the male dominated Liberal Party Federal Conference is the one which will prevail at the end of the day.

She tried to imply that a proposition passed by the National Liberal Womens Conference the following day was in conflict with the National Liberal Party Federal Conference resolution. That was just not so.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: You indicate that you have a capacity for a hiatus in logic. It is a *non sequitur*. It is just not so—

Ms Lenehan: Then all the women in your Party are the same—

Mr LEWIS: So far as I am aware—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson's interjections are out of order and the member for Mawson and the member for Murray-Mallec are both out of order in referring to members opposite in terms other than 'members opposite'.

Mr LEWIS: She ascribed in the course of her remarks immediately following that assertion that the only reason why members opposite—referring to myself and others in a very offensive and unseemly manner—supported provisions for equality of education for women, or anyone for that matter, was that there were votes in it. I take extreme offence at that. It was unseemly of her to do so.

The member for Mawson should know that of all the Houses of Parliament in the federation—with all the States and the Commonwealth included—the very first Parliament to pass legislation relevant to equal opportunities for women was this Parliament. It happened in this House of this Parliament and it happened in 1975. That is just over 10 years ago. I know the member for Mawson is a Johnny come lately, but it is a pity that she had not done her homework because elsewhere in her speech the poor girl had the gall to say that it was the Labor Party in Government just barely two years ago that introduced this kind of legislation in the first instance.

She stated that the Labor Party was at the vanguard of such things. That is not so. In fact, it was David Tonkin, the former member for Bragg, who in 1975 successfully introduced the Sex Discrimination Bill which became an Act in the same year. That private member's Bill was introduced in 1973, and I want the honourable member to understand that. It had to be put through and then proclaimed in 1975. We had an Equal Opportunity Act introduced by the Attorney-General in another place nine years later which made some additional provisions but not relating to sex discrimination; they were for all kinds of discrimination that were thought to be part of the mores of the culture of the society in which we live in South Australia.

We wanted to change, so the Attorney and other members believed, those attitudes, so we put into law practices that must not occur. It was never previously a requirement of the law that these discriminatory practices do occur. It became a requirement in law in 1984 as it related to things other than on the basis of sexuality that they do not occur. The member for Mawson needs to understand that: it has never been lawful, it has never been unlawful as it were to exercise equality of opportunity for everyone. It has never been unlawful to do that. It is now unlawful to discriminate on the basis of any of those things. There are two propositions. One is the corollary and the other the converse corollary. The member for Mawson needs to understand that in logic—

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Obviously, she did not in the course of the remarks she made when she put this proposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I should think that the Deputy Premier would know what I am talking about. The member for Mawson made statements which were obviously wrong in fact. Outside the House it would be fair to say that, in many instances, they were untruthful, and to use another word to describe them, but she ought to get her facts right. Whereas the member for Mawson said that the ALP was in the vanguard of ensuring equal opportunities for women,

that it is simply not the case: it is not and never has been, although it may well be the popular conception.

Members of the Liberal Party are accused of being vote seekers when they support these propositions, but they have never been foreign to us. We have always believed, and stated our belief, that there needs to be an equality of opportunity for everyone regardless of wealth, sex and ability. One can read the kind of literature which has been put to the electorate election after election over the last 40 years since the Liberal Party came into existence, and prior to that time by Parties like the Uniting Party and the United Australia Party, its predecessors. We have always been advocates of equal opportunity.

The first woman ever elected in South Australia, I would like to remind the member for Mawson, contrary to what she would have us believe in the course of her remarks, was the then member for Davenport in this House, Mrs Joyce Steele. She was elected and proclaimed elected in 1959 before the Hon. Jessie Cooper, who was the first woman elected to the Legislative Council. If that is not being in the vanguard of things politically, what is?

Let us take a look further afield at other achievements by the Liberal Party and by its members who happen to be women. We also have the first and second women Ministers in Government in this State. The ALP within the last year has condescended to follow suit, on the basis that it is doing something for its Party and for women who are Party members, but it is not a new thing for the Liberal Party at all.

The Hon. Mrs Joyce Steele, a former member for Davenport, the first woman elected to this Chamber (indeed, to this Parliament) became the first woman Minister—and that was in 1968, which makes it almost 18 years ago. The second woman Minister, of course, was none other than the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore, who was made a Minister in 1979, nearly seven years ago.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: No; they have hardly had one in there a few months and they crow about the fact that they are in the vanguard of things. If we believe that the member for Mawson is their spokesperson on these matters, why cannot the member get her facts straight? If we look at Western Australia, the first person elected there was Mrs Edith Cowan, in 1921. She was an Independent Nationalist, a member of a Party which was a predecessor of the Liberal Party. In the Council, for members who are interested, it was Ruby Hutchison in 1954.

In Queensland where another predecessor of the right-of-centre coalition existed, the Progressive National Party became part of the Liberal Party formed by Bob Menzies: in the Assembly it was Irene Longman in 1929. There was never a woman in the Queensland Legislative Council, which was, of course, abolished by the ALP in 1922. In Victoria, another member of the predecessor of the Liberal Party was Lady Millie Gertrude Peacock in 1933. In the Council in 1979 it was Hilda Gracia Bayler and Joan Coxsedg. That is the first instance in which a member of the Labor Party became one of the first members.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member seems to be straying from the content of his motion, which is one of censure of the member for Mawson. It is understandable that the member may choose to give one or two examples where he believes that the member for Mawson may have been inaccurate. However, in producing the material that he has over the past two or three minutes he is straying away from the censure motion of the member for Mawson and instead seems to be debating the content of the motion moved by the member for Mawson.

Mr LEWIS: I wish to respect your direction, Mr Speaker, but would invite you to consider that what I am doing is correcting and rectifying the inaccuracies and unseemly statements of the member for Mawson, in keeping with my remarks, which were totally misleading. She said that the ALP was at the vanguard, that is, the Australian Labor Party. If I am to correctly and appropriately demonstrate that my motion is valid, I thought it necessary for me to show where she was totally misleading in Australia and would therefore crave your indulgence to briefly and quickly make the point where I believe my motion to be valid in rebutting the proposition put by the member for Mawson.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is firmly of the view that the clearly worded intention of the motion moved by the member for Murray-Mallee is not to rebut arguments put forward by the member for Mawson. The intention is clearly expressed that the member for Murray-Mallee wishes to censure the member for Mawson and therefore the general thrust of his remarks should revolve around censure of the member for Mawson and not reviving or repeating matters of debate in the motion originally moved by the member for Mawson on matters relating to discrimination.

Mr LEWIS: I therefore accept your ruling, Mr Speaker, and will restrict my remarks to times only where the member for Mawson was inaccurate and totally misleading and therefore why I believe that the House will support my motion to censure her for those inaccuracies and misleading statements.

She was inaccurate in regard to Victoria, because it was Lady Millie Gertrude Peacock in 1933 in the House of Assembly and a Liberal in 1979 in the Council, namely, Hilda Gracia Bayler. Joan Coxsedg, a member of the Labor Party, was elected at the same time in 1979. In Tasmania both women were Liberals in the Assembly and Council, namely, Amelia Best and Mabel Miller, both in 1955. In New South Wales it was in 1925 that Millicent Preston Stanley was elected, again a member of a Party calling itself the Nationalist Party—a precursor of the Liberal Party. In the Council it was Catherine Elizabeth Green, another member of the Labor Party.

It is hardly fair, accurate or a reasonable construction on the facts to say that the ALP was at the vanguard of advancing women politically and increasing their opportunities to participate in the political process. I believe that other members will agree that that, and many other reasons that I would like to detail from the remarks which the member for Mawson made in using such adjectives such as 'snide', and so on, in describing my colleague the member for Hanson, validate the proposition that I put before the House.

It was really quite unfortunate that the interjection by the member for Mawson earlier today laid the lie to her attitude during the course of the delivery of her remarks on that occasion. She accused the member for Hanson again today of playing games when, in fact, he sought leave to continue his remarks instead of sitting down—as I invited her to do several times on that occasion. The member for Mawson accused me and other members of this House on that day of having no stomach to stand up and argue against her proposition, but she would not sit down and allow us to do so. This is the first opportunity that we have had to do so. Because of the evidence I have adduced, and the instances I have given, honourable members will have no difficulty whatever in supporting the proposition that I have put.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): My rising to oppose the motion will not surprise the House. I ask members to consider some of the remarks in the motion, which calls on the House to censure me for 'inaccurate, unseemly, totally

misleading and self-seeking remarks'. I find it interesting that the gaggle that sits opposite has to resort to some kind of football-like cheering to support—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. I believe that the member for Mawson was referring to me when she used the term 'the gaggle that sits opposite'. I find that unseemly and offensive. The honourable member may have used the term collectively, but I am, nonetheless, part of that, as I see it. Because I see the remark as offensive, I invite you, Mr Speaker, to ask the honourable member to withdraw her remark.

The SPEAKER: As the Chair understands it, the word 'gaggle' is a collective noun used for geese. If it is a collective noun, the Chair assumes that it has been applied collectively and it has not been the practice in the past for comments applied collectively to members of the House to be withdrawn. However, since the member has objected to the words, I ask the member for Mawson—if she wishes to do so—to withdraw the word objected to.

Ms LENEHAN: I do not believe that it is unparliamentary to refer—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That was not the point.

Ms LENEHAN: I do not choose to withdraw the remark. I find it rather amazing that some members opposite have to resort to this level of personal attack on a member of this Parliament who stands up and, in fact, supports a large number of members of their own political Party in voting against the motion put to the Federal Liberal Council. If, in so doing, members opposite want to refer to me as being unseemly—and I will quote from the *Oxford Dictionary*, which says that that means 'indecent, undecorous and unbecoming'—so be it, because I have been called names in this Parliament by many members opposite. I have been threatened by many members opposite, but I am still here in this Parliament and I am not going to succumb to those sorts of threats and that level of name calling.

In fact, it does not worry me—if all that members opposite have to do in representing their electorates is call other members names, threaten them and point the finger across the Chamber. My colleagues who were members of the previous Parliament well remember those threats and the veiled innuendos about knocking people off pedestals, etc., and so do I. One of my few qualities is that I have an incredibly good memory. Let me assure some of the members opposite that I will carry that memory with me. I oppose the term 'unseemly', as I do not believe that anything that I have said was indecent, undecorous or unbecoming.

I believe that the use of the term 'self-seeking', which means putting one's own welfare ahead of others, was absolutely ridiculous. Why would I want to stand up publicly in this place and oppose a motion that seeks to take away the powers of the Federal Government to prohibit discrimination on the basis purely of one's sex in the voluntary and private sectors and in those States that are not covered by their own legislation? I am here, I have arrived at my position in my career, so how could such a motion be self-seeking in terms of my own personal political achievements? I think the member for Murray-Mallee really and truly has stretched the credibility of the English language absolutely beyond the elastic limit.

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Any member who has studied physics would know what the elastic limit is. The member for Murray-Mallee seems to feel that he is the only person able to speak on anything to do with matters outside this Par-

liament, particularly pertaining to science and mathematics. I put to the House that the motion has absolutely nothing to do with Federal-State relations in terms of the way in which these things are joined together. I shall read again the motion that was moved by the Federal Liberal Council. What I and many other women, including members of the Liberal Party, who spoke against the motion found so offensive was the following:

That the Federal Liberal Council calls on a future Liberal Party Government to amend the Sex Discrimination Act of 1984 to the effect that it applies only to the Commonwealth Government and its instrumentalities and the instrumentalities directly under its control.

What any rational, intelligent and sensible person in the community interprets from that is that those people living and working in States of Australia that do not have their own legislation are then left without the protection of the legislation. It also means that women and men working in the voluntary sector or private enterprise are not covered at all. I want to go on and read what the National Liberal Women's Conference said on the very next day. This motion was carried unanimously:

The National Liberal Women's Conference confirms its support for the need for federal sex discrimination legislation which calls on the Federal Parliamentary Party to reaffirm its support for the principles of the legislation.

That is totally contradictory to the motion that was moved the day before. They are asking their Federal colleagues in the Federal Parliament to reaffirm their support for the Federal legislation that applies to the States which do not have their own legislation, which legislation applies to the voluntary sector and to private enterprise. It seems to me that that is not, as the member for Murray-Mallee suggests, misleading. It is in no way misleading, let alone 'totally misleading'. If I am misleading this Parliament, then so is every one of those women at the National Liberal Women's Conference who supported this motion unanimously. Is the member for Murray-Mallee suggesting that those women are being inaccurate, unseemly, totally misleading and self-seeking? I have picked up the very remarks that were made.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Perhaps they do not, but I do not need to get into personal name calling with the member for Murray-Mallee. If the honourable member wants to descend to the gutter and do that, that is his right in this Parliament, but I certainly do not intend to do that sort of thing. I have not done that throughout my political career in this Parliament, and my electorate has respected that. I had one of the largest swings at the most recent State election. Therefore, despite the mud that has been thrown at me since I have been in this Parliament, despite the personal remarks that have been made, and despite the attacks on me and my family, I increased my vote very significantly at the last State election. I believe that the reason for that was that I have fought very hard in relation to the issues that affect my electorate. If the member for Murray-Mallee finds my style offensive and self-seeking, then it is his judgment. People in my electorate have indicated to me and to the State that they want someone in here who is a fighter for the principles and issues that they want fought for. That is what I have done, and I will continue to do that. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.*]

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

In reply to Mr S.J. BAKER (5 August).

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The increases in workers compensation costs in the departments referred to are due to a combination of factors including a rise in common law payments and an increase in the incidence of cases involving repetition strain injury and stress. The Government is obviously concerned about these increases and has accepted the responsibility for undertaking a range of initiatives to improve the standards of occupational health and safety in the public sector. In late 1982 the then Minister of Labour, Jack Wright, established a coordinating committee for Government Workers' Safety, Health, Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation to examine the high costs to Government of occupational injury and disease in the public sector.

That committee is now a permanent standing committee and is charged with overseeing and coordinating occupational health and safety programs within the broad public sector. In December 1984 the Government released a Code of General Principles on Occupational Safety and Health and the purpose of this code was to put into effect the Government's policy of vigorously promoting improvements in public sector occupational health and safety. The code outlines responsibilities for safety and health and states in broad terms the action that shall be taken to fulfill them. The code requires greater management involvement in occupational health and safety issues.

As a result of the code, a framework has been established which for the first time will enable a comprehensive approach to occupational health and safety in the public sector. As part of that framework some 70 occupational health and safety coordinators have been appointed within the various departments and statutory authorities to coordinate and implement the State Government's program. In addition training programs have been developed for these and other officers and since early 1985 some 250 officers have been trained under the new training programs that have been developed under the auspices of the standing committee.

An occupational health and safety auditing program, which will monitor the performance of the various departments and statutory authorities, is at an advanced stage of development. A computer based system is also being developed to assist in the management of occupational health and safety within the public sector.

The change to the management of occupational health and safety in the public sector since the present Government achieved office has been dramatic. The Government has in the last two years established proper guides, defined responsibilities, implemented a framework for proper coordination, undertaken training programs, appointed coordinators and is well advanced in separately developing a monitoring and a computer based system. The combined effect of these initiatives will improve the standard of occupational health and safety in the public sector.

LOCAL EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

In reply to Mr M.J. EVANS (14 August).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The decision to confine the first (pilot) year of the Local Employment Development Program to five positions only and to local councils as distinct from a regional basis, was for two major reasons:

- firstly, a major rationale for the development of the proposal in early 1985 was a recognition of the increasingly significant role being played by local councils in employment and training effort;

- secondly, despite a good deal of discussion about the need to facilitate improved locally based coordination of effort, there had, to that time, been little action actually taken, in any of the States, to resource such an initiative. As a result, it was determined that a small-scale start to such a program was merited, in order that more careful consideration could be given to further developments in the operation of the program during that first year.

Since the State Government agreed to the introduction of the program, the Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations has established a national advisory group on local employment initiatives to advise him on the range of policy initiatives and support which the Commonwealth might take to support establishment and operation of local employment initiatives. This State is one of three States represented on that advisory group. The report of that advisory group should coincide with the Office of Employment and Training's own review of the first year of the Local Employment Development Program.

The proposal for a regional level allocation of funds for employment development officers is one in which the Office of Employment and Training has considerable interest. Indeed, one of the first years grants is in fact to a joint project between both Hindmarsh and Thebarton councils recognising the potential for joint cooperation between councils in addressing such issues. Discussion held by the office with a number of councils highlighted some difficulties in securing the cooperation of councils to take a regional approach to employment development. However, overcoming these difficulties is receiving greater attention during 1986-87 as the benefits of such an approach are recognised.

Besides looking at targeting program funds at regional level, the Office of Employment and Training is also examining scope for greater regional autonomy in determining funding priorities.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman for the year 1985-86.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Labour, on behalf of the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Pursuant to Statute—
South Australian Totalizator Agency Board Report, 1985-86.

TELEMETRY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Engineering and Water Supply Department—Upgrading of Metropolitan Region telemetry system.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

ASER PROJECT

Mr OLSEN: As the investment by the State Superannuation Fund Investment Trust in the ASER project is now

almost double the original estimate, will the Premier say whether this confirms a massive blow-out in the completion cost of the project? The Tokyo agreement signed by the Premier in 1983 stipulated that SASFIT's investment in the ASER project would be \$58.5 million in the form of equity and loans. In answer to a question that I asked him on 4 April 1984, the Premier said that this figure represented 1986 values. However, the Auditor-General's Report tabled this week reveals that the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust now expects to invest \$105 million in the ASER project, almost double the original estimate in current values. This suggests that the completed cost of the project is blowing out to well over \$300 million, and I ask the Premier if he will now finally confirm cost overruns in view of these official figures in the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know whether the figures in fact say exactly what the Leader of the Opposition is saying. The figures will have to be interpreted against what they are actually describing rather than what the Leader feels that they are describing. The investment in the ASER project is well protected as far as SASFIT is concerned, and it is a marvellous investment. Indeed, it is one of the greatest projects that we have seen in this State. Changes have been made in its size and scope since the Tokyo agreement was made. Even further changes are contemplated in relation to the possible exhibition hall that has been talked about. All these have been based on improving the return from that investment. The more money that we can spend in this State the better it will be for us all, because there will be more jobs and greater value.

SHELTERED WORKSHOP WORKERS

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, outline what incentives are currently available to workers in sheltered workshops to enable them to make the transition into normal work situations in industry? I have been approached on several occasions by relatives of workers in sheltered workshops wishing to know just what incentives are available to industry to enable such workers to make the transition from sheltered workshops into open employment. I am informed that many employers in industry are unaware of the various incentives that are currently on offer, and I ask the Minister to clarify the situation for the benefit of the employers and for the ultimate benefit of the workers themselves.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. He raises a very important issue that I would be delighted to refer to my colleague in another place and bring down a report for him. The graduation, if you wish, from sheltered workshop activity into open employment is a very important aspect of the work that sheltered workshops do in South Australia, and any incentive that would assist in that graduation is an incentive that members of this House and, I am sure, the honourable member would be pleased to have as part of their information bank. I will therefore get an early report for the honourable member.

ASER PROJECT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the Premier's refusal yet again to answer the Leader's question as to costings of the ASER project, and in view of the implications for South Australian taxpayers, will he give an

undertaking to discuss costs with the major investors and contractors involved and bring a report to Parliament next Tuesday?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What implications for the taxpayers? Obviously, the economic activity—the generation of employment—that is involved in this is of tremendous value to the taxpayers of South Australia. I have already explained in detail, in answer to questions in this place, about our exposure in relation to the convention centre, but apparently members opposite do not want to listen. In their desire to knock and undermine this project, which they have done from day one, they continue to resort to this sort of argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think they ought to come clean. They do not want this hotel opened. They were against the casino, which is employing 1 100 people and putting \$12 million into Treasury in this financial year, and they knocked that. They were opposed to that. They kept asking about cost blow-outs, escalations, and so on. Now they are doing the same thing in relation to this project. All I can say is that a project of this size and scope has enough problems getting done as it is without this absolutely protracted, unremitting knocking and attacks being made by the Opposition. How about supporting the project and not trying to undermine it?

DOMESTIC FIREPLACES

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction consider introducing construction standards for domestic fireplaces and a system of special builders licensing restrictions or endorsements for home builders who are allowed to build fireplaces? Three new home units constructed in my electorate of Newland have open fireplaces which have proved to be totally unusable. The fireplaces were a feature of the main living room and a selling feature of the units. In each case, faulty design and construction meant that virtually all the wood smoke poured into the living room and not up the chimney. Two of my constituents have had to spend \$1 000 and \$850 respectively to have the fireplaces converted into usable order. It has been put to me that fireplace construction is a dying art, now requiring special skill, standards and licensing requirements in order to protect the unsuspecting buyer.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Newland for that very pertinent question. I am not sure whether the problem is an isolated one concerning those constituents or whether it is more universal. I recall one member on the Government side who had this same kind of problem when they had their house built. I tried to get through to the building industry that, as a part of encouraging consumer confidence, it should provide value for money. We know that the tendency for builders today is to provide rumpus rooms, inbuilt bars, etc. I have always told the building industry that it should provide value for money, i.e., three bedrooms and a basic home, to encourage more people to buy their own homes.

The regulations under part 25 of the South Australian Building Regulations under the Building Act cover the safety and general performance standards relating to chimneys and fireplaces, but actual construction details are not included. I think that builders should be more aware that they must comply with those regulations, and build something that will work and be of benefit to the consumer.

The problem seems to involve the assessment qualifications of a particular builder who is building the home rather

than strengthening the regulations under the Act. If the honourable member provides me with more details, I would be only too pleased to refer the matter to the Minister of Consumer Affairs so that he may investigate the matter.

ASER PROJECT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I direct my question to the 'No answer' Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! That remark is out of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I make it as an observation. Will the Premier investigate whether Sabemo, the contractor building the Hyatt Regency Hotel as part of the ASER project, has sought legal advice on whether the company can get out of the contract? The hotel, the most costly single item of the project, is six months behind schedule following the BLF's persistent refusal to honour industrial agreements. The Opposition understands that the continuing delays have caused significant financial problems for Sabemo to the extent that it has sought legal advice about getting out of its contract. As this would have a very serious implication for the ASER project as a whole, will the Premier investigate the matter and report back to the House at the earliest possible opportunity?

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Premier, I point out that introductory remarks in the nature of those made by the member for Light may on future occasions lead to the withdrawal of the call for the question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member could hardly hide his delight in asking yet another question aimed at destabilising the ASER project. I am not aware of what the construction company may or may not have sought in relation to legal advice. If there is a problem, the coordinating committee appointed by the Government will report to me.

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister representing the Attorney-General advise when amendments to the Consumer Credit Act will be introduced in South Australia? I am aware that in Victoria, in 1985, a new Credit Act came into operation which provided considerably greater protection for consumers. Also, I understand that New South Wales has a similar Act, but that it is currently being reviewed. This matter was brought to my attention because, as I understand it, the Victorian Act has significantly altered the rights and responsibilities of a consumer when seeking and entering into a credit arrangement.

It also provides considerable protection to the consumer who has financial difficulties and cannot make the necessary payments. The article, under the heading 'What are the changes? Pre and post contractual disclosures', states:

It means that all contracts involving credit must now contain more information regarding the contractual conditions and in a form that is easily and quickly understood. It enables the consumer to fully appreciate all rights and responsibilities before signing the contract.

1. The contract must now contain a warning notice directly above the consumer's signature. It advises the consumer of several important points, for example;

(a) To read the contract in full.

(b) To fill in or cross out any blank spaces.

(c) To seek assistance from consumer affairs if you do not understand anything contained in this contract.

2. A statement of the contract finance must be clearly set out. It must include itemisation of the following charges: installation, maintenance, delivery, registration, insurance, legal fees and stamp duty. There will also be listed all credit charges: how much money is owed, what is the amount of each instalment, what is the

annual percentage rate and whether there are penalty charges. All of these lists must be clearly set out in large print so that consumers can know exactly how much money they will have to pay before they actually sign the contract.

3. Credit card statements must now include the date of the last day of the billing cycle and the amount owed by the consumer on the first and last day of this cycle. Dates and descriptions of the purchase must also be included along with any extra financial payment, for example, interest, stamp duty.

The Act does not include a cooling off period but it ensures that the consumer must receive a copy of the contract with a statement of obligations within 14 days of signing. Credit providers will be penalised if they do not meet all of the above conditions. In some cases of non disclosure, the debtor may not have to pay the credit charges.

As can be seen, my constituent believes that it is important that we amend the Consumer Credit Act in line with legislation in New South Wales and Victoria: hence I have asked this question.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is certainly a very important matter and, clearly, it is of great relevance not only to the honourable member's constituents but also to consumers generally in South Australia. In the absence of the Minister of Education, I will certainly ensure that this matter is referred to the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place for an urgent report.

Dr G. DUNCAN

Mr S.J. BAKER: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier. In view of the commitment that the Attorney-General gave in a ministerial statement on 13 August last year to provide full immunity from prosecution in return for fresh evidence in the Duncan case, have police given any advice to the Government on this matter and has any such immunity been granted?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think I should search the files and make sure that whatever information I give the honourable member in the House is absolutely accurate. I would have to say at this stage that I know of none, but I will obtain the detailed information for the honourable member.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr De LAINE: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate the degree of development activity occurring at Roxby Downs following the joint venturers' commitment to proceed with the first stage of the project? I understand that the Minister made a recent visit to the project, accompanied by some of our parliamentary colleagues, and I would appreciate him sharing his impressions with the House.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: As indicated by the honourable member, in company with the member for Albert Park, the member for Mawson, the member for Hayward and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles from another place, I journeyed once again to Roxby Downs last week and availed myself of the opportunity to bring myself up to date more fully with the present state of activity there. A feature of the last few visits to the area has been that very little surface activity has been visible from the air on arrival. However, I noted during the last visit (and this situation will continue in the future) that that has all changed: on the contrary, there is a great deal of activity on the surface as well. Of course the activity that one can see is associated with the provision of the plant, the refinery, the housing and other services that will all be part of this very large project. They are well under way.

The earthworks, for example, for the first housing at the town site are complete.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: A mirage.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It is more than a mirage. The honourable member can never hide his chagrin in this House that, carried away in a burst of self-praise back in 1982—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:—they quite rightly forfeited their opportunity to guide and govern the people of this State by their reckless and senseless behaviour, not only on the topic of Roxby Downs but on many other topics. Since that time we have been treated almost daily in this House to similar exhibitions of conduct that will ensure that never again are they likely to occupy the benches on this side of the House, much to the benefit of the people of South Australia.

Some members, even on the other side, would appreciate the more accurate details I have and I would like the opportunity to give that information to at least those members of the House. First, I believe members would be surprised to learn that underground workings now exceed 14 kilometres in length. A range of the work still occurring underground is now of a developmental nature preparing for the initial mining operation. This includes such things as water storage, further development of the ventilation system and the preparation of headings for stope development. For example, the next ventilation shaft to the surface will be four metres in diameter. Rapid progress is being made on driving the three kilometre long decline.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, that is a ventilation shaft and there are already a number of them up there. The three kilometre long decline—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Some positions in the Parliament, such as those of Ministers, Leader of the Opposition and Deputy Leader of the Opposition carry greater responsibility. Along with that they receive a slightly greater degree of tolerance from the Chair. I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that that slight degree of tolerance does not constitute some sort of immunity. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I take the liberty to point out that I have never, as a Minister, arrogated to myself any such wrongly allocated right. Very rapid progress is being made on driving the three kilometre long decline that will link the surface with the lower mine levels. A contract team is working from the surface down and a joint venture team from the joint venturers themselves is working from the bottom up, with seemingly perfect confidence that they will meet somewhere in the middle.

The decline, with a one in 11 slope, will be the entry and exit point for all men and materials required in the mine, leaving the Whenan shaft free for the lifting of ore. The decline portal is an enormous structure and a most impressive piece of engineering, as those colleagues of mine who visited with me found.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I have more, if the honourable member wishes. I can actually provide additional information. The final feature of our inspection tour of the Roxby Downs township site led to our inspection of the initial subdivision of the 270 residential sites. No doubt exists that this attractive undulating area is being developed in a very sensitive manner—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Would the honourable member like a copy afterwards? I can make one available later. This week contractors began the task of laying underground services, including gas, electricity and water in readiness for the building of the first 80 houses. I would have thought that that matter would be of interest to members opposite. They are always talking about Roxby Downs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am sure that members opposite would be glad to know that there is the construction of another major camp to employ 500 workers on the site. One would assume that the Opposition would have been pleased to know that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In answer to members opposite who—

The SPEAKER: Order! Some quiet on my left would be appreciated so that the Minister can wind up his remarks in silence.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In relation to Roxby Downs, I would like to deal with a matter raised yesterday in the other place by the Democrats Leader, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, who was critical that the catering at the project was being handled by a company known as SHRM—an offshoot of a French company—rather than a South Australian firm. The irony of this complaint is that Mr Gilfillan learnt of the SHRM involvement from an advertisement in the *Advertiser*, in which the company was advertising in South Australia for South Australians to work as cooks, kitchen hands, leading hands and cleaners at Roxby.

The reality is that it will not be possible to guarantee that 100 per cent of Roxby contracts will go to South Australian companies. Section 12 of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act calls on the joint venturers to use South Australian goods, services and labour as far as it is reasonably and economically practicable. All the evidence so far indicates that the joint venturers are more than adequately meeting the spirit of the indenture. Even in the case of SHRM, which is not South Australian based, the benefits for South Australian employment have been demonstrated by the advertisement to which the Hon. Mr Gilfillan referred.

As to the general participation of South Australian companies in the project, perhaps the following figures will quieten doubters such as Mr Gilfillan. I am informed that prior to commitment by the joint venturers, total expenditure on the project had reached \$200 million and local content was 83 per cent. Since commitment, running costs at Roxby have totalled a further \$25 million. South Australia's share of that expenditure is 92 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In reply to members opposite, let me say that I have been here since 1970—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I must have been here long enough, because I am on the right side of the House. Contracts let since commitment now total \$90 million and it is estimated that South Australia's share is 69 per cent. If members opposite wish to peruse the information further I can let them have separate copies of the details referred to.

TOURISM APPOINTMENT

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Can the Premier assure the House that there has been and will be no political influence brought to bear on the appointment of Assistant Director for the Regions in the Department of Tourism and that section 39 of the Government Management and

Employment Act, which prohibits ministerial direction in relation to appointments, will be upheld in respect of this appointment?

Final interviews are currently being conducted for this position which has attracted a wide field of well qualified applicants. Members of the South Australian Association of Regional Tourism Organisations regard the position of Assistant Director for the regions as being critically important, especially as the successful applicant will have prime responsibility for the implementation of recommendations of the recent Review of Regional Tourism.

A number of SAARTO delegates and regional operators have expressed their deep concern to me that the member for Mawson, who is a member of the Caucus Tourism Committee, recently openly indicated her support for a particular applicant. The applicant in question is a public servant who has had no first-hand experience in the tourism industry. Regional delegates are fearful that the influence of the member for Mawson on the interviewing panel, which comprises senior Government officials including the Director of Local Government, will result in an appointment which I am advised would be regarded with deep concern by the tourism regions in South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sure that the appropriate procedures will be observed. I do not think that, in peddling rumours of this kind, the honourable member helps the selection process or, indeed, is being at all fair to any candidates who might be going through that selection process.

LAND USAGE

Mr DUIGAN: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate where the final authority for land use management, especially in rural areas, currently rests? Further, how are the various lines of accountability to be brought together? It has been put to me recently that opportunities for tying together a variety of Government land use programs could be used to great effect. Although recent legislation has brought the administration of pest plants and vertebrate pests together, there still appears to be scope for improvement by bringing together under one policy and administrative umbrella bushfire control, pastoral leases, soil conservation programs, and other environmental protection programs. As this involves a number of agencies in various areas, will the Minister indicate the processes that need to be followed to coordinate these programs and make Government administration clearer and more efficient?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member identifies that a number of public instrumentalities have responsibility for land use management. For example, the Lands Department is one such instrumentality, and it administers pastoral leases in the north of the State and Crown leases generally throughout the State. It also administers the shack site legislation. One of my departments, the Department of Environment and Planning, has particular responsibilities for the national parks and wildlife system throughout the State. There are other Government departments, including the E&WS Department, which have significant land-holdings throughout the rural parts of the State. In the metropolitan area there is the Urban Lands Trust and the South Australian Housing Trust. That is by no means an exhaustive list.

That of itself is no recipe for confusion or necessarily overlapping of concerns and administration. We are blessed here with a spirit of cooperation in the Public Service which means for the most part that bureaucrats do not battle for

empire and are happy to cooperate with one another. However, the Government has been concerned to ensure that the best possible effort is maintained in the land management area, and for some time now a committee of departmental heads whose responsibilities are particularly relevant to this matter has been meeting under the chairmanship of Mr Don Alexander (Director of the Lands Department).

Specific problems are referred to that committee where there is a chance that there will be duplication or where certain matters may fall between the cracks of public administration. I and my colleagues (because I think that the honourable member's question could have been equally directed to the Minister of Lands) will take on board the matter raised by the honourable member. Members will be aware that legislation is to come before this Parliament in the not too far distant future in relation to the national parks system, the Pastoral Act and other aspects of land management. Where it seems appropriate that additional rationalisation can occur, I have little doubt that the Government will want to ensure that Ministers take the steps to ensure that it does occur.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier say when the Government will introduce legislation to prevent South Australian motorists being hit with massive increases in compulsory third party premiums and whether the legislation will limit claims for pain and suffering?

The *Advertiser* today carries front page statements by the general manager of the SGIC, Mr Gerschwitz, which totally repudiate the Premier's suggestions in this House yesterday that the Government has already taken significant action to hold down the deficit in the commission's compulsory third party fund and therefore limit future rises in premiums. Mr Gerschwitz has made clear that the Government's delay in acting on the major recommendations made in a report almost one year ago is why the fund faces a further massive deficit this financial year and why motorists face much higher premiums. In particular, Mr Gerschwitz said, 'What he recommended needs to be implemented immediately.' I therefore ask the Premier when the legislation will be introduced and whether it will implement one of the major recommendations, namely, that on limiting claims for pain and suffering.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I answered this question yesterday. I admit that the honourable member may have missed my reply because—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—just as now, there was considerable interjection from the same source, and therefore it was probably very difficult for him to hear my reply.

Mr Ingerson: What was the answer?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I said that we expect to be introducing legislation fairly shortly. It is in the course of preparation at the moment. The final decision whether and to what extent to limit the pain and suffering provision will be made at the time that that legislation comes before Cabinet. It will then be presented to Parliament. I reject the allegation that there has been undue delay in relation to this matter. As long ago as 16 June we announced that we were acting on it. I quoted in fact—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member asked a question, which in fact he is wasting the time of the House by doing because it was answered yesterday, and then, as I answer it, he interjects. I referred to that very point and

that press release yesterday. I read out the 12 things on which we had agreed to act, and I explained what the Government was doing in relation to them. I also said—and I remind the honourable member of this as well—that, in terms of Government intrusion, I read the remarks of Mr Gerschwitz as reflecting what was said in that report on third party insurance. Indeed, let me quote from it. Talking about the changes being made through political expediency, it states:

A prime example of this occurred in 1981 when the then Government, concerned about the likely effect of the full premium increase on the electorate and possibly the ballot box, directed the commission to ensure that the new premiums in respect of each category of vehicle shall not exceed 50 per cent above present premiums. This decision was calculated to result in a shortfall of premiums well over \$1 million. The investment income was lost—

and so on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member interjects again now because he does not like to hear it. I might say that I am being extremely courteous in answering that member's question, still in the absence of an apology for an accusation of criminal offence against one of my Ministers. I would like to hear his next question prefaced by that apology, so that I can deal with him on a courteous basis. It is very hard to do so in the absence of it.

VICE SQUAD

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister of Emergency Services satisfied with the conduct of the Vice Squad? In the *Advertiser* of Thursday 28 August, on page 13, a report of statements made by Mr I. Gilfillan, MLC, included the following:

The Vice Squad spent a lot of time hounding prostitutes in brothels which drove them on to the streets and into escort agencies.

I have been told that these and other comments made recently regarding the conduct of Vice Squad officers have been of concern to those officers, senior police and the Police Association. No public statement on the allegations or the conduct of the officers has been made by the Minister of Emergency Services as the Minister responsible. Will he now clarify his position?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: These matters, where a person has a specific allegation, are more properly raised with me, with the Commissioner or with the Police Complaints Authority. The Police Complaints Authority was brought into being by this Parliament, not without considerable birth pangs, but as a result of an heroic effort by my predecessor, Jack Wright, who very much put his stamp on the authority. I believe that the success of the authority is very much due to the herculean efforts which Jack put into what occurred at that time. I believe that where people have specific complaints it is important that they be lodged with that authority. There is little point in indulging in generalisations; that really gets us nowhere.

I have received no report from the Commissioner in charge of that authority which would suggest that, through the Commissioner, I should take any action whatsoever in relation to the people who are involved in the Vice Squad. I am sure that the Police Department as a whole would want people who have soundly based complaints to bring them forward so that proper investigation can take place. In the absence of any specific complaint to me or the Commissioner, I can only say that I am satisfied with the way that the Vice Squad carries out its rather onerous tasks dealing, as it has to from time to time, with areas of breaches of the law where those laws often do not have the full

support of the community and conflict, people sometimes feel, with what they want to do in their overall line of business. I urge that, where people believe they have complaints, they go through the proper channels, and then we can have them investigated. Where it seems there is any avenue for redress, I will act, and I am sure that I will have the full cooperation of the Commissioner in so doing.

Mr D.A. DUNSTAN

Mr BECKER: In view of today's admission by the Australian Labor Party State Secretary (Chris Schacht) that he did discuss job prospects with the former Premier (Don Dunstan), and with regard to information given to the Opposition that the member for Briggs has advised the Premier of details of a discussion he has had recently with Mr Dunstan on the same subject, can the Premier advise how many go-betweens he has currently in the quest to find Don a job?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thought that the Opposition was keen to ask questions on matters of public importance. I treat that as a joke question and I do not think there is anything that I need say.

CHILD-CARE

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Children's Services tell the House how many places will be set aside for occasional child-care in South Australia and when and where those places will be provided? On 27 August the Minister for Community Services (Senator Don Grimes) announced that 3 000 places for occasional care will be created under the new policy to form part of the Federal Government's target of 20 000 new child-care places by June 1988. The Minister stated that the new occasional care places will be created over the next two years. They will complement the extension in long day care services also taking place.

The Minister stated that up to 120 new occasional care centres will be established as a result of this decision. They will be funded by the Commonwealth, especially for families and women who are in the work force. Capital grants will be available to build and equip these centres. Recurrent grants will be provided for both operational subsidies and free subsidies for low income families. The Minister of Children's Services in South Australia would no doubt be aware of the chronic lack of child-care services in the western suburbs and in my electorate in particular.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will certainly refer this matter to my colleague the Minister of Children's Services for an urgent report with respect to the provision of child-care places, both occasional and full day care, over the next three years. As the former Minister of Children's Services, I was well aware of the deep concern by many members in this House for an improved level of provision in their areas.

The member for Henley Beach certainly ranked among the most vocal and persistent in that regard. I know that there are many needs in many areas and the provision of a detailed report on the matter by the Minister of Children's Services would be eagerly awaited by many members in this place. I will call for such a report.

VANDALISM

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier say whether, following recent vandalism at his home, Department of Housing and

Construction resources were used to repair the damage and, if so, at what cost to the taxpayer? While the Opposition sympathises with the Premier in relation to an attack on his home by vandals which apparently occurred during the past fortnight, we have been approached by a taxpayer who claimed that Department of Housing and Construction resources were used to repair damage to a window and a door. The taxpayer has pointed out that such resources would not be available to him or anyone else in a similar position.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Just what is the Opposition on about? This really is an example of the sort of politics that this State can well do without. First, I complain very strongly indeed about the honourable member giving publicity to an attack—on no basis, I might add—involving damage to my home. The honourable member would well know that we in public life are often subjected to all sorts of intimidation and threats. I and my family have been so subjected on occasions. The honourable member would also know that, to give publicity to these things simply encourages people who might quite often be unbalanced in their state of mind to repeat the exercise. It is disgraceful that the honourable member chooses to raise this matter in this way. That is the first point. Yes, as reported in the newspaper (and that was unfortunate), a window was smashed. Fortunately, there was no-one at home at the time. In fact, anyone who was in the room could have been injured. Indeed, the children of one of my colleagues were in imminent danger through that attack. That is on the record, and I hope that the media does not pick this up, for the very reasons I have cited. Secondly, the honourable member made the disgraceful allegation that I used Government resources to have the damage repaired. That is absolutely disgraceful. Like any other householder, my wife contacted one of the companies that repairs windows in such circumstances and she was advised on a Friday evening—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will set out the full details. She was asked whether we wanted the repairs done immediately. A cost of about \$100 was quoted for replacement of a single pane of glass due to after hours requirements. That cost would have been covered by insurance, as my home is insured, and I personally pay the premium. I happen to be insured with SGIC—perhaps the honourable member will allege conflict of interest, because SGIC is a Government body. In fact, it is specifically excluded from the Register of Pecuniary Interests. I have had policies with SGIC from its inception, and I pay the premium on a regular basis, having made one or two claims over that period.

The company advised that such repairs would be covered by insurance and that that is what they would cost. My wife said, 'No, that seems to me to be quite extravagant. You can come on Monday and fix it, and meanwhile we will make temporary repairs.' At our own expense, and in my wife's time, she got Sellotape and made temporary repairs to the damaged window concerned. On the Monday, the private company duly fixed it. We will be making the appropriate claim for the damage to both the wire screen and the window in the normal way. I set that out to put the record straight. This allegation is on all fours with a couple of other disgraceful questions that have been asked, one of them on notice, suggesting certain things.

At all times during the nine years I have been in Parliament I have tried to be quite scrupulous in the way in which I spend public money or use public services and facilities. Just sheer common decency would surely dictate that, if the honourable member suspected on a very sound basis that I

had contacted the Housing and Construction Department to repair a window, he would ask me first, just as a human being, before he raised the matter in this place. In the same way, the Minister of Recreation and Sport was entitled to be told by the member who intended to accuse him of a criminal offence that he had certain information: he should have been asked, 'Do you have anything to say before I raise the matter publicly?'

If, having done that as a human being with common decency, the member still felt that it had to be raised in the Parliament in the public interest, then it can be dealt with accordingly. However, not to do that and on such a trivial and outrageous matter is disgraceful. I would not have thought that relations between members of Parliament had deteriorated to this extent, or the Opposition got so desperate that it is using this sort of gutter stuff in relation to what ought to be matters of public importance and politics. The member for Morphett is certainly totally demeaned in my eyes and I hope he renders a suitable apology.

COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDERS

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Correctional Services provide the House with the total statistical number of community service orders handed down in the last 12 month period by district courts in South Australia and, further, will the Minister also provide the statistics on a court by court basis? In a previous question in this House I raised with the Minister of Transport the possibility of amending the Road Traffic Act to include as one option for courts the handing down of community service orders. It has been put to me by people involved in the community service order program, both those people administering community service orders and those community groups and organisations in receipt of work carried out under community service orders, that this is, indeed, a very important way in which people can pay back to the community for the sort of offences that they have committed. I would be interested to find out from the Minister to what extent community service orders are being used by the district courts in South Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for her question. As she says, she has had a great deal of interest in this aspect of correctional services for quite some time. Certainly in the district she represents, and represents very well, community service orders have been very successful, indeed, as they have been throughout the State. I do not have the figure that the honourable member requested, but I will certainly try to get these statistics which she requires because it will be interesting to see whether there is a variation between any of the various districts and the sentencing pattern of magistrates. I will have some discussions with the Attorney-General and the Office of Crown Statistics to see whether we can extract the figures that she wants and have some interpretation on those figures.

As Minister of Correctional Services I suppose the most high profile part of correctional services is the prisons area, but to me it is a very secondary part of the portfolio. Community correction is by far, in my opinion, the most important part of correctional services because the community is never going to have enough money, nor is it desirable, to incarcerate everyone who offends against the laws of the State. Community service orders are certainly a very good alternative available to the various courts and have been used to date very successfully, indeed. The expansion into the areas mentioned by the honourable member of payment of fines rather than going to gaol for non-

payment of fines will certainly, we hope, make a great deal of difference to the number of people we have in our prisons mainly for the reason that they are poor. It is about time that South Australia stopped gaoling its poor, and that program will be introduced very soon. Certainly, I will have the statistics examined and extract the information that the honourable member requires.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Mr MEIER: My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the statements reported today from the presidents of two of the State's most respected educational organisations that the Minister of Education should be axed, that his personal style is 'regrettable, unfortunate, and lamentable', that parents and teachers get most of their information on the Minister's decisions by contacting the shadow Minister or reading the *Advertiser*, and that the Minister is regarded as being the biggest liability in the education system, does the Premier still have full confidence in the Minister of Education and, if so, will he now order his Minister to consult in future with parent teacher and principal organisations before announcing major decisions in the media?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, no major decisions were announced in the media. As I understand it, a discussion paper was issued for consultation and discussion. Secondly, as far as comments about the Minister are concerned, I suggest that they reflect more on the two gentlemen concerned than on the Minister. In the case of Mr Wilson, I was very surprised to see his comments on consultation, particularly as only a couple of weeks ago the Minister of Education and I both met with and spent some considerable time discussing Federal education budget matters with a group of people, which included Mr Wilson. The Government at all times has consulted with him. He has played a leading role in committees of inquiry, has made submissions, and has had a close relationship with Ministers of Education. It surprised me that he made those comments.

The other gentleman, Mr Talbot, has been waging an unremitting war against any changes in the system and by the Government for some time. I am afraid that I have to say, and I have said this to him both personally and in writing, that Mr Talbot's approach is extraordinarily discourteous and, certainly, he discourages very actively any consultation with him. On many occasions he has attended a meeting and then gone away and made statements that did not reflect what was said at the meeting. I am very pleased that Mr Talbot certainly exercises freedom of speech and thought—and freedom of interpretation, unfortunately. Again, I find that the language used was, as I say, more a reflection on those gentlemen than on the Minister—if they were correctly reported. I suggest that the honourable member take note of that.

The Minister of Education has been at pains to point out that there will be consultation and discussion on these issues. In fact, despite the comments that have been made, a number of other people have welcomed very much what that paper said and the opportunity to explore thoroughly the issues involved in the way that the Minister proposes to do.

QUESTACON SCIENCE CIRCUS

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology give the House some indication of

the public response to the Questacon Science Circus staged recently in Adelaide? I have been informed that the recent science exhibition held at Brookman Hall, at the South Australian Institute of Technology, was successfully patronised by large numbers of Adelaide schoolchildren. I have had reports of queues of children from years 4 and 5 and upwards waiting outside the Institute of Technology to participate in and view that exhibition. Can the Minister confirm that the apparent enthusiasm of Adelaide schoolchildren was likewise reflected in the attendance of the general public during the week of the science circus?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can certainly confirm that the enthusiasm of Adelaide schoolchildren was indeed reflected by the general public. In fact, all the organisers were caught considerably by surprise. They had known that the message they were bringing in the Questacon Science Circus was one of excitement, they knew that once inside people became very enthused, but I guess even they, knowing how exciting the message was, were not really necessarily expecting the response that they got. The fact is that the response was overwhelming. I am certain that a number of members of this place would have taken the opportunity to go there. I certainly took the opportunity, with my wife, five children and my parents, to go along and see the exhibit. The problem was that there were so many people there that one had difficulty getting to see some of the displays or taking part in some of the activities quite as much as one would have liked.

It really confirmed that there is a need for facilities such as these that are readily accessible to people within South Australia. I repeat the comment that I made when the honourable member earlier asked a question on this matter: I look forward to seeing the report from the Playford Trust, which is examining what options may exist for the creation of a science and technology museum here in South Australia. The need is clearly there. Those who attended the Questacon fair indicated that the need is clearly there, and it is something that will meet the needs not only of students but also of the general public. It will become a major recreational opportunity if it is possible for such a facility to be created here in South Australia.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether the Government supports the conclusions of the working group on options for salinity reduction that are contained in the group's report to the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council? Further, what action does the Government intend to take in the interests of South Australia to have those recommendations implemented? The Minister will be aware that the average salinity level in the River Murray at Morgan exceeds 830 EC units much of the time. That is the figure specified by the World Health Organisation as the upper limit of salinity that is desirable in water used for human consumption. Since the figure exceeds that limit most of the time and as the recommendations of the working group would have the effect of reducing salinity to below 800 EC units for 95 per cent of the time, it is very much in the interests of the health of the people at large in South Australia. Therefore, I ask the Minister what action the Government will take to implement the recommendations currently before the Ministerial Council.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is an important one indeed. I could write a book on this matter, but I will not. This is the nineteenth question today, which suggests that Ministers

have not been unduly prolix in the way in which they have approached their responsibilities on this occasion. The honourable member is correct in implying that people should not be fooled by the fact that at present the salinity at Morgan is 380 EC, because that is very much related to the extraordinary rains that have occurred, especially in the catchment of the tributaries on the Victorian side of the Murray. I imagine that those figures will remain reasonably low for some months, because at the end of the winter season there will be augmentation of the water from the melting snows in the Australian Alps. Therefore, with a little luck we may keep well below the magic 800 EC figure perhaps until April next year. However, the long-term problem must be seriously addressed. The 800 EC is related as much as anything to the fact that that produces about 700 EC at Waikerie, and that is the point at which damage is done to crops, especially citrus crops.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I am aware of that.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am well aware that the honourable member is aware of that, but he seemed to be couching his question in terms of the potability of the water and the point at which there would be danger to humans. In fact, we can tolerate rather higher levels of salinity, but the oranges and lemons cannot.

In reply to the first part of the question, the Government completely supports all the recommendations that have been made. The problems with those recommendations (and indeed it is the context in which the recommendations have been made) is that they must be addressed by four Governments. Therefore we, along with Victoria, took the initiative of setting up the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council a year or so ago so that proper institutional arrangements could be made and the budgets of all four Governments could be coordinated so that these sorts of recommendations could be implemented as they were made.

In our own budgetary arrangements, we have committed ourselves to placing a priority on the various recommendations that are coming out of these studies, and we are close to getting full agreement from the other Governments in relation to these recommendations. Make no mistake about it: some of them are expensive. Over \$40 million will have to be spent by Governments in salinity mitigation, much of which is something that would be of direct benefit to the Victorians even though it would occur in South Australia. The reason for that is that in relation to much of the salinity that is produced in the irrigation areas of Victoria there is nowhere to put the salt except back into the river, and that can be tolerated only where salinity interception from the natural groundwater situation in the lower basin permits that to happen while still keeping the overall salinity at Morgan below 800 EC.

Therefore, we do not believe that we can stand the full cost of all the works that are undertaken in South Australia. Naturally, we benefit from it, but our brothers and sisters in Victoria also benefit because it also helps solve their problem, which otherwise could only be solved by a pipeline to Bass Strait or some other very expensive treatment. So, we are trying to work through the fabric of the four participating Governments (Queensland was given observer status at the last meeting) and to work through the fabric of our budgets to ensure that these programs are supported. We are developing institutional arrangements which I believe will be finalised at the February-March meeting next year and this will ensure that the River Murray Commission has that expanded role.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

FIREARMS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Emergency Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Firearms Act 1977. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill repeals and re-enacts in an amended form the provisions of the Firearms Act which empower the Registrar to issue firearms licences. The amendment has as its principal objective the modification of the total prohibition of the possession of dangerous firearms. It is proposed that the Registrar may on application issue a special firearms permit authorising the possession of dangerous firearms for theatrical and other purposes. The Registrar will be empowered to impose such conditions as he sees fit in issuing a special firearms permit to ensure that the security and general safety of the public are protected.

The amendment will facilitate the activities of film makers and production companies in this State and will ensure that this State can be used as a location for the making of films involving the use of automatic and other types of dangerous firearms. In the past, this was only possible through the use of serving police officers and special constables as custodians of the dangerous firearms. The practice, although not improper, did result in a good deal of inconvenience and some additional expense to local and interstate film makers using the State for their locations.

The Government considers it highly desirable that these disincentives be removed while at the same time ensuring proper control. Honourable members may care to note that two large productions involving the use of firearms are scheduled for filming in South Australia over the remainder of this year.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for commencement on a proclaimed day. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the Act

to insert two new definitions in consequence of the new sections 11 and 12.

Clause 4 repeals the existing sections 11 and 12 and inserts new sections. The existing provisions for firearms licences are restated and new provisions are introduced for special firearms permits authorising possession of dangerous firearms. Such permits may be granted to persons of or over the age of 18 years for the purposes of theatrical productions or for purposes authorised by the regulations. The Registrar of Firearms is empowered to grant or refuse to grant such permits and to impose conditions on such permits in addition to conditions applying under the regulations. The Registrar may exempt the holder of such a permit from the conditions applying under the regulations if satisfied that it is safe to do so.

Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to section 16 of the Act in relation to the sale of firearms. Clause 6 inserts a new section 17a to provide that special firearms permits will be in force for the period determined by the Registrar but are not renewable. Clause 7 amends section 22 of the Act so that dangerous firearms in the possession of the holder of a special firearms permit are not required to be registered. Clause 8 repeals the existing section 29 and inserts a new section relating to silencers only. The new section 11 contains the offence relating to possession of dangerous firearms. Clause 9 makes a consequential amendment to section 34 of the Act in relation to seizure and forfeiture of firearms.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 September, Page 964.)

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Thank you for the opportunity to address the House in this budget debate. I gather that some confusion has arisen over the speaking order.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Yes, so did I. Do not talk to me about agreements.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to an honourable member opposite as 'the honourable member', not 'you'.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I have not spoken about 'you'. I said, with due respect, that I honour agreements, and 'do not talk to me about agreements.' I have not referred to an honourable member as 'you' but, if and when it is necessary to refer to an honourable member, I will. The honourable member for Henley Beach interjected quite unreasonably and on the basis of material about which he knows nothing whatsoever. He is not the Whip, either. Now, look here, yesterday the arrangement was, before I left this House for a Southern Vales meeting, that I would not be in the Parliament during last evening, but that I would be back today. I spoke not only to my Whip on this side of the House but also, with respect, to you, Mr Speaker, before the dinner break. Now then, if a subsequent agreement has been made with whoever on this side, the other side, the Clerks or the servants of this Parliament, I did not know about it until right now when I rose to speak in my place, as I have every right to do. Do not dictate to me about how and when I do it. What the hell next? Getting back to the subject—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: No fear. I have had enough of that sort of bugging around.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to moderate his language.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I return to the subject before the House. Several matters have occurred during this debate on the budget, not the least of which were some references today to expenditure and extravagance and what have you that is alleged to have occurred within the ranks of the Government, both within administration and those sensitive personal areas about which we have heard a fair degree of comment during Question Time just concluded. I refer particularly in that context to the remarks made by the Premier in his scathing attack on our Whip, the member for Morphett, over a matter that he raised, quite legitimately in my view, during Question Time. He indicated to the House generally that he considered it was appropriate for members to raise matters of that kind with their colleagues on the other side of the House. As a general rule, that sort of thing has occurred. As a matter of courtesy between members, regardless of their politics, discussions have occurred over the years, and I hope that such discussions will continue.

In relation to that principle and that long-term practice that on most occasions has been exercised, this afternoon I went to the Minister of Housing and Construction to raise with him directly and privately a matter about which I thought he ought to know in relation to his portfolio. I made that approach prior to asking him a question in the House about his responsibilities. The Minister, in quite direct terms and in his own right, invited me to go back to my seat and raise the question at the appropriate time. He did not want to know about it. Question Time having finished and this opportunity having arisen, I propose to raise just that matter.

Certain publicity in recent days indicates that there has been a bit of controversy in this Parliament, outside the realms of this House of Assembly—indeed, in the Legislative Council—where the President has upgraded the facilities of her own offices. Be that as it may, a number of questions have been asked in the other place in relation to the costings associated with that upgrading and refurbishing.

I want to know whether the Minister responsible for the maintenance and refurbishing of this House was either formally or privately approached by the President of the Legislative Council in relation to that refurbishing work in her parliamentary office. If the Minister of Housing and Construction was approached, I would like to know what was the ceiling, if any, on the expenditure proposed for that work. If, on the other hand, the Minister was not approached in this instance and the work was commenced under the prerogative of the Legislative Council President in her own right—and that may well be the situation—then what other authority, if any, occurred in this instance before the work was given the okay?

The question has been put to me outside the House on the basis of the press reports as to whether there was an open cheque, because quite clearly the press reports that have been provided to me and those that I have been able to obtain from the library in very recent times indicate that there is no reference to this side of it. There has been, as far as I am aware, no public statement by the Minister responsible in ordinary circumstances for House maintenance.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Ask me a question.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The Minister interjects from out of his seat, over and over again during my comments.

indicating that he wants me to ask him a question. This is the real position as to why I am raising the subject in this debate, because to get a question asked in this place is virtually impossible.

An honourable member: Talk to the Whip.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I talk to the Whip, I talk to my Leader, and I talk to my colleagues in the Party. There are 16 on this side of the House. But, the delay that occur during Question Time because of protracted answers and long ministerial statements by Government members denies all of us collectively from a fair crack at Question Time that has for a long period—certainly for the 14 years that I have been in this Parliament—been in the main available to us. It is no longer the privilege of a member to be able to come into this House and ask questions during Question Time as a part of their ordinary responsibilities to the electorate at large, leave alone their own particular electorate.

It constitutes a gross deterioration of the procedure for that to have occurred. It may be our fault. It may be as much our fault on this side of the House as it is on the other, but collectively we have gone down the wrong track, in my view, to allow Question Time to be pruned and to allow the exploitation of Question Time each day by Ministers. In fact, the demonstration today in this House by the Minister of Mines and Energy was probably one that takes the belt. I should think it was the longest, most protracted, boring and unnecessary reply that I have ever heard.

When I was Minister of Agriculture a few years ago, I was accused of having long replies, but, by hell, it was nothing like the one that we were given today. I have lost the record belt, if ever I held it, to the Minister of Mines and Energy, because he took up an inordinate amount of our total Question Time in giving to the House an answer that has undoubtedly been reported publicly on numerous occasions concerning environmental, structural, aesthetic, social and industrial details associated with the Roxby project. Fair dinkum, those matters were absolutely irrelevant to the question that was asked and to the members of the House during this important period.

It was important enough, I believe, to have been put on paper and circulated if the Minister wanted to get his name attached to such complicated detail. That would be fair enough, but to use this Parliament and its vital Question Time to pour that sort of garbage on us is absolutely disgraceful. I have used this opportunity today to vent my feelings about the so called agreements. By hell, look here, Mr Speaker, and anybody else who happens to be present: no-one ought to talk to me about agreements. When I get into an agreement, I honour it. There is no member—male or female, Labor or Liberal or Independent—in this House who can set out a situation that demonstrates that I do not honour my agreements. I will take exception and react violently on any occasion when it is suggested otherwise. It is using up my time, I know, but let us have the position quite clear on that subject.

Mr Ferguson: Let's see you hit the table again.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I do not hit the table, but you would not want to make those provocative comments too often and you would not want to make them outside. It is not my form to run to the courts, but I will see you down on the flat at the Torrens any time you like. This Chamber is a great place to throw away threats and provocative remarks about members on the other side for temporary political reasons but, when matters of straight and tight principle are involved, then I like the comments, characters and personalities involved to be straight also.

There are numerous matters that one should address during an important debate on the budget but, given the limited time that we have and given the other distractions that required addressing, I am left with little time to speak on other matters. One matter of concern that has been brought to the attention of the House several times in the past 12 months is the land taxing practice of this Government and, I suppose in all fairness, previous Governments of this State. Under the Land Tax Act some property near metropolitan Adelaide is known to be within the boundaries of the defined rural area. Quite clearly, that land taxing practice has created anomalies in those regions. That has been quite destructive to the landowners and quite unfair, and I am sure that was not intended by the relevant Government which introduced the Act.

I have discussed the matter with officers from the Land Tax Division of the Lands Department, and they are aware of the problems. Certain recommendations have been made to the present Government to have those anomalies redressed. I have spoken both formally in the House as well as privately to the Premier, and I obtained an undertaking from him today to include, when drafting the legislation, the necessary adjustments to the Land Tax Act so that those people within the so-called defined rural area are not unduly and unfairly taxed at the current levels.

As indicated by my colleague the member for Chaffey and the shadow Minister of Lands, in the very near future the subject of valuations will be debated on motion. It is my intention to participate in that debate because, quite clearly (and this is in support of the motion's intent as outlined by the member for Chaffey this afternoon), there are some quite gross distortions in the application of values for the purpose of rating and other taxing measures within the State. I can understand that the Valuer-General and his staff may be having difficulty in keeping up with the fluctuations reflected in actual land sales. Over the past four or five years rural land values have skyrocketed to a ceiling about 12 months ago and, within the last 12 months, those rural land prices have plummeted to varying degrees, depending on the soil type and proximity to ports and other facilities around South Australia. That has happened in such an irregular way that it would take an incredible valuer and an enormous staff to keep up with those fluctuations.

It is in that respect that I accept that it is the responsibility of the landholders to put forward their respective views, either in the formal detail that they are invited to submit on a quinquennial basis—five-yearly or 10-yearly, whatever it is—to assist the department or, by way of submission, to formally object to the land valuation recorded against their names. There is one hell of a mess in the community at large, both in the rural community (to which I give prominence) and, as I understand it, in the outer and inner metropolitan areas.

Valuation yardsticks are subject to all sorts of variations, and I suppose that fluctuations in land prices and in the economy in the past 12 months have had quite a bearing on this matter. I appreciate the opportunity to participate, albeit last and in a rather frustrating situation, in this budget debate and I look forward to the matters to be addressed by members of this House during the Estimates Committees. I look forward especially to the accompanying legislation that the Premier has signalled he intends to introduce, on matters related to future State taxation, for our consideration.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I do not wish to detain the House unduly in my reply. I think that the substance of most of the speeches that have been

made in the course of this debate do not warrant an over-long reply. There has been the usual tedious repetition, the usual trotting out of matters that are raised again and again and the usual political points, but not very much in-depth analysis of the budget and what it contains. There are exceptions. A number of specifics have been raised (in fact, the member for Alexandra raised a matter which I think is quite appropriate), and some of those things obviously will have to be looked at but, as to the substance of most of those speeches, really there is very little to which to respond. I suppose that is not surprising because, while the Opposition has tried very hard indeed by all means possible to find ways to criticise this budget, overall it has been forced to the conclusion, whatever it may say, of most commentators, that the budget is soundly based, that it is an appropriate document for the economic situation in which we find ourselves, and that it is a reasonable basis on which to gird ourselves for the difficult times ahead in relation to public finance.

I will devote my remarks specifically to some matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. A useful starting point would be to remind the House of the five criteria by which he said that the State Government should be judged for its economic performance. He set out those criteria. I am not suggesting that they are comprehensive or in all ways appropriate, but he then went on to analyse the budget, supposedly in relation to these criteria. His analysis was completely faulty, because I suggest that, using the very measures which he himself erected, the Government's budget passes the test with flying colours.

Let us look at those points. He stated, first, that Government policy should not discourage other sectors of the economy; secondly, the Government should limit its taxing and regulatory functions; thirdly, it should exercise its powers and opportunities to encourage economic development and diversification; fourthly, it should not favour one sector of the community at the expense of another; and, fifthly, it should be frank with people about economic problems and what needs to be done about them.

I suggest that the budget does in fact deal directly with each of those points. Let us take the first one. This Government has done an enormous amount to assist and encourage industry in South Australia, and the budget is a demonstration of the amount of resources we are putting into that process. We have established the Small Business Corporation to help small business enterprises, and its work has expanded and developed. We have established the Manufacturing Advisory Council to address the very real problems that manufacturing is facing as a result of national and international trends.

Through the Department of State Development, we have established the State Development Fund. Incidentally, the Leader of the Opposition listed three or four things that he said had not happened, and he included the establishment of the State Development Fund (which has been established) and the Manufacturing Advisory Council (which has also been established), as well as a couple of other things (which indeed have been done). All of those actions are directed to the concept of diversifying, encouraging and developing our industrial base.

Regarding the question of limiting taxation and regulatory functions, this Government has done as much as any Government in Australia to keep down taxes and charges. We have tackled the issue of deregulation, commissioning a major report and putting into effect a number of measures. We have appointed a deregulation troubleshooter as a consequence of recommendations contained in that report. I remind the Opposition that under the 1986 budget we have

actually reduced some areas of taxation. The payroll tax exemption level has been raised yet again to provide \$2 million in relief to business. Land taxes are to be cut by \$11 million.

So in a time of economic difficulty, by prudent financial management, we are able to provide a \$13 million tax cut for the business sector. To refresh the memory of members opposite still further, I remind the House that last year we brought down the biggest tax relief package ever seen in this State. We have shared the benefits of economic recovery and growth. It should be obvious, even to someone as economically illiterate as the Leader of the Opposition, that those cuts in taxes and the freeze on Government charges resulting in about \$70 million being returned to the community have done a great deal to lower the tax burden in South Australia.

From time to time members opposite make much of the increase in tax receipts, implying that this reflects an increase in rates—a conscious Government action to raise taxation rates. That is a quite deliberate and dishonest misrepresentation, but it is made constantly by the Opposition, and particularly by the Leader in all his statements about tax. It is time the Leader came clean and stopped using figures that relate to the Government's actual tax receipts, however constructed, and the rate of tax which a Government imposes. The Opposition's approach fails to acknowledge that an increase in tax receipts results from improved economic activity in this State. Our revenue is tied to the level of that activity.

If there are increases in certain areas, such as employment, we receive more income. If receipts for payroll tax increase, it is because more people are being employed; it is not the result of the rate of that tax being increased. In fact, we have progressively reduced the rate of that tax over the past four years, budget by budget. Likewise, if land tax receipts increase, it is because the value of properties has increased and, if stamp duty increases, it is because the size and number of transactions have increased. That represents a buoyant economy. Far from being a point of criticism, that should be a point of congratulation to the Government. To try to confuse the tax receipts with the rates of taxation is an act of gross dishonesty.

Even when one considers tax receipts (and that is used as the basis for many of the Leader's contributions) one sees that, once again, the Leader is being quite misleading and dishonest in his approach. He said that 'the tax take goes up 10.3 per cent' in the budget, and he claimed that that increase was higher than the inflation rate. The Leader is showing his usual tendency of failing to analyse figures. Included in this taxation category are increasing gambling revenues (which include the full year effect of the casino), licence fee revenues (which represent revenue brought forward by moving from a three-year licence phase to a five-year licence phase), and a contribution from the Woods and Forests Department. If the Leader had put aside these factors, he would have seen that the increase in taxation receipts (and I stress again that we are not talking about rates but about receipts) was only about 7.8 per cent, and that is less than the inflation rate. So, rather than being condemned—

Mr Ingerson: They are still up.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If they were down even more, heaven help the economy, because that would suggest that there was absolutely no growth in our State economy. I would have thought that that was the last thing we wanted. I suggest that, rather than being condemned, the Government should be praised for the contribution it is making to the extra economic activity in South Australia and the way in which it is restructuring in order to ensure that we are

less dependent on what one might call straight taxation revenue. I have dealt with the first two criteria, and I suggest that the Government has passed both tests.

The third criterion is the degree to which the Government has encouraged economic development and diversification. Again, that is a test that we pass with flying colours. In relation to diversification, Technology Park was the focus of an ambitious plan to diversify our industrial base into the important high technology field, and that is one of the fastest growing and successful developments of its kind in the world. It is growing faster than any comparable development in the United States, the United Kingdom or Western Europe. Incidentally, Technology Park is just the flagship, the tip of the iceberg, in our diversification measures. In relation to handling our finances, the establishment and the resounding success of the South Australian Financing Authority means that the Government is maximising the return on these funds, which can then be put to use for the good of the whole community. The complete bankruptcy of the Opposition's economic analysis is nowhere more evident than in its attitude towards SAFA. It calls on the Government to do all it can to encourage economic development, to improve the State's financial base and reduce our dependence on taxation, yet in the next breath the Opposition undermines the role of the South Australian Financing Authority by concocting the most extraordinary allegations about SAFA's financial dealings.

The role of that authority is one of the few areas of substance that the Leader addressed in his budget speech but, as is the case with his other statements and analyses, the Leader is quite wrong in the assertions he makes about SAFA. A substantial part of the Leader's speech dealt with a series of scurrilous allegations about the way in which SAFA marshals and invests its funds. The Leader accuses SAFA of acting in collusion with bodies in other States to somehow circumvent the Australian tax laws in raising funds. He further accuses SAFA of circumventing Loan Council constraints on borrowings.

These are serious allegations to make against those persons responsible for administering the South Australian Financing Authority and the approvals under which they operate, and they are demonstrably false. I dealt with these allegations on Tuesday in relation to a transaction that was called into question, and for the benefit of members I will restate the case. The South Australian Financing Authority, in all its detailed dealings, acts entirely within the spirit and letter of relevant taxation laws. In accordance with normal practice, SAFA obtains legal advice from the Crown Law Office about its borrowing activities and contractual arrangements. Where other technical or specialist advice is required, that is also obtained.

The money raised by SAFA is part of the State's approved Loan Council borrowing limit for 1986-87, and details of the authority's activities are furnished to the Loan Council. There has been no collusion between SAFA and bodies in other States about various means of raising money. SAFA acts independently of any other Government financing organisation, and I am sure that, given the outstanding success of SAFA over the past three years, other States would certainly be willing to become involved or collaborate with SAFA. Indeed, if there is an appropriate opportunity for or an advantage in that, no doubt it will occur. Perhaps its success might rub off on other bodies.

If we are talking about collusion in relation to the instance raised, perhaps the Opposition should put its own house in order before making such accusations. On the same day as members opposite were making accusations about SAFA, alleging collusion, similar questions were being asked in the

Victorian Parliament by the Liberal Opposition and, if the New South Wales Parliament had been sitting, no doubt Liberal members there would have been doing the same.

So much for collusion! The Opposition in South Australia seems to have embarked on a campaign to undermine SAFA and to do everything possible to minimise the financial viability of the authority and the profits it makes for this State. I would warn all members opposite that that is a very short-sighted course on which to embark. I say that because the success of SAFA is very important to the long-term future of the State's finances. Its successful management of large sums of money has helped cushion the State against unexpected shortfalls of funds, and that money is put to use for the benefit of the entire community.

I refer members to the authority's annual report, which I tabled earlier this week. Its funding goes to such areas as: public housing; transport; the Grand Prix; the development of timber products; the re-equipment of the Central Linen Service; the construction of further premises at Technology Park, and so on. These are all projects of value which can be financed and have been financed through our having such a successful agency. In addition, loans provided by SAFA assist in financing the overall expenditure of Government authorities.

The Opposition in the past two days, since the Leader spoke, has also made much of some comments of the Auditor-General in his report, concerning SAFA. I will deal briefly with some of these. It is true that, in the report tabled in the House earlier this week, the Auditor-General advocated the establishment of a reserve out of the annual surplus of SAFA. The Opposition made much of this, obviously not realising that the Government and SAFA, noting the desirability of doing something of this nature, had already made such an allocation.

In 1985-86 an amount of \$75 million of SAFA's surplus was allocated to a newly created general reserve enabling SAFA's contribution to the budget to be maintained in the unlikely event that SAFA's income flows declined significantly. From the Government's and SAFA's point of view, the reserve is an important visible element in ensuring that SAFA's high status as a borrower is maintained, both domestically and overseas. So, the Auditor-General's comments have been taken note of, and that is clearly covered.

The Opposition also tried to whip up controversy over the Auditor-General's comment that 'if recurrent expenditures became locked into a level of contribution from SAFA, care should be taken to ensure that it is within SAFA's longer-term financial capacity to sustain that level of contribution'. Again, the point made by the Auditor-General is a valid one and one which has been taken into account. The creation of the general reserve I have just outlined is part of that process. In addition, over the past three years, the Government has allowed SAFA to retain substantial surpluses so it can build up its capital base and further strengthen its income earning capacity. If the Opposition had taken the trouble to read the SAFA annual report, it would see that the authority is now very strongly capitalised.

Mr S.J. Baker: It is the worst report I have seen—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member says that it is the worst report he has seen in his life. That is an absolutely extraordinary statement to make. The detail is there. The Government's careful and responsible approach to the matter can be illustrated by figures in the report. In 1986-87 the surplus is conservatively estimated at \$210 million. Only \$164 million has been earmarked for distribution to Consolidated Account. So, while it can be seen that SAFA is being prudently and carefully managed, it is at the same time taking an innovative approach to max-

imising its earning capacity. Rather than knocking that and knocking that authority's success, the Opposition should be praising it and be pleased that we have such a valuable instrument of State finances.

Fourthly, the Opposition listed the need for the Government to treat all sectors of the community equally. I am not really quite sure in what context the Opposition Leader is making this point, but I can assure him that this Government has an exemplary record for promoting equity for all sectors in the community. If the Leader is speaking in the budget context he need only look at our capital works program. The schools, the hospitals, the roads, are provided to all sectors of the community in all parts of the State. No one sector is favoured above the other. If the Opposition Leader's comments are taken out of the budget context, this Government also has an exemplary record. In the area of industrial relations we deal equally with both unions and employers. One need only look at the operations—

Mr S.J. Baker: We have noticed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member says that he has noticed. I am glad that he has. That is one reason why we have the best industrial relations record in the country. The Industrial Relations Advisory Council and the Manufacturing Advisory Council established by this Government are evidence of the sort of consultation and forum we provide. We believe all sectors have a contribution to make, we welcome that contribution, and we are committed to maintaining the machinery by which they can make that contribution.

The fifth and final point in the Opposition Leader's list is the need for a Government to be frank and open with the people in discussing the economic problems facing the State. We have no problem whatsoever with that. The finances of this State are open to scrutiny and this Government provides as much, if not more, information about the State's financial affairs than any other in the nation. We have instituted regular economic reports on the state of the economy. We are looking at ways of improving our economic forecasting advice and encouraging the full and frank appraisal of our economic status and its direction by independent bodies also. The budget details we give are extremely comprehensive, and in fact we present them in a number of forms in order to make even clearer what is the true financial position of the State.

The financial dealings of the South Australian Financing Authority are tabled regularly in Parliament and, of course, the Auditor-General reports annually to Parliament on financial matters across all Government departments. There is no attempt to stifle debate or to hide information from the public, the Parliament or the Opposition. And that is the way it should be. I might add the attitude of this Government is somewhat different, for instance, from that of the Queensland Government, which is much admired by the Leader and his Opposition members.

I recently asked my Treasury officials to analyse the Queensland budget. In their briefing they informed me that there was much important information lacking in the budget papers tabled by the Queensland Government. For instance, they could not find in the budget papers any new borrowings received into the Loan Account for 1986-87. The Queensland Government also neglected to list any new borrowings that would go into trust and special funds. There was a dearth of information on how the Queensland Government would actually finance its budget. All of that material is extremely accessible and openly set out in our budget documents. That type of approach that we see in some other States certainly would not be countenanced by us here.

Having gone through those five criteria, I suggest that we have demonstrated exactly where this Government stands in relation to them. Two other areas were raised by the Opposition which, in the interests of accuracy, should be addressed. The first is the increased level of borrowings in this budget. By the use of emotive language the Opposition has attempted to discredit the plan to increase our level of borrowings to finance essential services. It has suggested that we are somehow placing an unacceptable burden on future generations by increasing our level of borrowings. It ignores, or is incapable of understanding, the basic philosophy underlining that approach. It also deliberately distorts the figures relating to the level of borrowings.

The fact is we are not placing an undue burden on future generations, we are not acting recklessly when we increase the level of borrowings, and we are not being irresponsible in the public works program we have laid down for ourselves. The action we have taken on our capital works program in fact satisfies the call the Opposition Leader made in his budget reply that the Government should exercise its powers to encourage economic development. The Opposition still does not seem to appreciate the link between a Government's capital works program and the beneficial effect that has on the private sector. The vast majority of our capital works are subcontracted to the private sector.

If we followed the simplistic approach the Opposition advocates of turning off the supply of funds to our capital works projects, it would have a devastating effect on the private sector and it would deprive the community of essential facilities which it demands and indeed which the Opposition insists it should have when it demands that we spend more. Those opposite who profess to be the great defenders of the private sector might ponder what would happen if that sector was deprived of the money it now receives from the capital works budget of the Government of South Australia. Approximately 85 per cent of those capital funds goes directly to the private sector. It would have a major effect on employment and economic activity in this State for there to be a massive short-term reduction in those funds.

I assure all members that we can afford the level of borrowings that the 1986-87 budget has laid down. Our level of indebtedness has fallen significantly since we came into office in 1982. In 1982-83 the borrowing level of the South Australian public sector was \$381 million in real terms.

This year, even with the increase in our capital works program, that borrowing level will be \$359 million, still a decrease of \$22 million or 6 per cent below the 1982-83 level. Our level of debt per head of population, likewise, has improved. In June 1983 our net indebtedness per head of population was \$2 526, while this year it is estimated to be \$2 426. That means that in fact it is \$100 below that which applied three years ago, and that represents a very significant decrease.

The second matter with which I wish to deal concerns the alleged blow-out of public sector employment. Nowhere does the Opposition make any attempt to analyse the figures of public sector employment to back up their allegation of a blow-out in the public sector. Some 1 481 of the so-called new jobs that the Opposition has referred to were the result of a bookkeeping change in bringing organisations previously not reflected in the Health Commission figures into the budget sector. In other words, they were not new jobs at all.

In other areas there were some increases. For instance, extra teachers and ancillary staff were taken on in our education system in order to improve the quality of education in South Australia. Extra police and cadets were

employed by the Police Department in order to keep the Police Department up to strength, and this also reflected the introduction of the 38-hour week. The Children's Services Office also had an increase in terms of employment. In further education, more lecturers were employed than was originally budgeted for to implement the Youth Employment Scheme, aimed at helping our young people.

That is where those increases occurred in Public Service departments, and I freely admit that they occurred. The commercially oriented public sector, which is not directly influenced by the budget and which was not part of the 0.7 per cent growth referred to in the 1985-86 budget, also showed some increase in employment. I am very glad that it did, because that increase reflects the success of those enterprises. In the State Bank, for instance, an extra 291 full-time equivalent employees were taken on. That reflected the increased demand for the services offered by the bank and that in turn reflected its success in the marketplace and its improved profitability in activity, which also came into the budget. So, we got the double effect of a large number of jobs for young people in a very worthwhile career in the banking and finance sector and, far from costing the Government anything, in fact those people contributed to the increased profit earned by the State Bank. The more people that can be employed there, the better, I say.

There is no question of a blow-out at all. On the contrary, it was very good news indeed that it happened. If I was a shareholder in the ANZ, National, Westpac or any other bank in the private sector, I would be proud of that effort. I would certainly not denigrate it as being undesirable, as the Opposition continually does. As all of us are shareholders in our State Bank and its prosperity, it is welcome news when it is in a position to employ more people.

But let me get back to the Public Service departments which should have been the focus of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks. I have outlined those areas where there was an increase above budget, and I invite the Opposition to tell us which of the areas referred to, whether it be the Education Department, the Further Education area, the Police Department, or any others, it would like to cut back. Having outlined developments in those areas, I make the point that if in fact they were extracted from the list of increases and the remaining public sector departments were looked at only it would be seen that we had come in below the budget, that it was a 0.6 per cent increase instead of a 0.7 per cent increase. So much for what the Leader of the Opposition says about a blow-out. But I readily concede that in those key areas there were increases above budget. Again, I invite the Opposition to say why it wants those cut-backs and about where it would like to see those cuts occur. When it does that, if the Leader for instance decides that he will do that, perhaps he had better tell his shadow spokesman about it and advise him to start complying with the policy of the Opposition, because he is totally at odds with the remarks that his Leader has made.

The Opposition wants it both ways. It wants to spend more but reduce the income and taxation. So, in all those areas that were supposedly analysed in relation to employment blow-outs, I think the Opposition would recognise that it is talking absolute nonsense. The facts are that the State's finances are being well managed at a time of economic difficulty and, as I have pointed out, we have continued to cut taxes in this State in order to help the private sector. We have maintained our commitment to an active capital works program to act as a stimulus to the private sector in order to create jobs. We have shown an innovative approach to financial management which is now returning considerable benefits to the State. It is a far cry from the

economic shambles into which the State descended during the time of the last Liberal Government of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member.

The Government has continually reduced the State's deficit. It now stands, at the end of the last financial year, at \$41 million, compared with \$66 million that we inherited from the previous Government. We have strengthened our financial base. We have ended the plunder of capital works funds, which was practised by the previous Government as its bandaid to cover the financial debacle that it was presiding over. The Government has ensured that the benefits of the growth and improvement of our finances over the past two years are available so that we can handle the problems that we have in this period of transition and constraint. By prudent financial management we have been able to avoid the necessity for drastic cuts in services to the community with the consequent loss of job opportunities and confidence in the State. In the face of that, all the Opposition can do is to nitpick, chivy and complain and trot out the same false arguments in support of its remarks. I commend the budget to the House.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House note grievances.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I have listened to the Premier's response to the debate—

Mr Tyler: Didn't you learn anything?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: For a young fellow, who has been here for only a few months, he has a lot to say and he has one hell of a lot to learn! I have listened with a great deal of interest to the response by the Premier to the debate on the budget. I am absolutely staggered when I hear the Premier say what a magnificent record the Government has, when he is presiding over record bankruptcies in this State. They have never been higher in the State's history, and yet the Premier stands in this place and says what an incredible job the Government is doing. The Premier claims that the increased charges, costs and taxes are as a result of increased valuations, that properties in this State are worth just so much more. In itself that is an absolute fallacy. Why on earth does the Premier think that I gave notice today of a motion calling on the Minister of Lands to immediately instigate an investigation initiative to determine why the valuations determined by the Valuer-General's Department are so far out of touch with reality? If the Premier was to get out into the real world and determine the facts, he would be much more aware of just what is going on.

Valuations of land and property in country areas (and I use my own electorate as an example) in most instances are grossly out of touch with reality. At the moment the only properties that are selling in the horticultural areas in my electorate in the Riverland are those properties that are being purchased by people coming into the towns looking for rural residential living. They are very small acreages with perhaps a reasonable dwelling on them. They are being purchased by people who have significant jobs in one of the industries in the area.

They are prepared to pay a high price per acre for the property. In fact, the acreage of vineyard land with the property may be only three or four acres, but that valuation per acre has been applied to the area as a whole. So, a person with 40 or 50 acres has the same valuation applied per acre or per hectare and there is no buyer. One can therefore place any valuation on a property, but it is worth-

less unless someone will pay the price. Unfortunately, people are paying rates and taxes on a figure that has been determined by artificial circumstances.

For the Premier to claim that the increase in rates and taxes is the result of increased valuations is ridiculous, because in many instances in this State valuations have dropped dramatically. I refer the Premier to the latest edition of the United Farmers and Stockowners journal, which deals with this matter at length. The Valuer-General now admits that there are massive reductions, especially in relation to the value of agricultural and horticultural land.

The Premier has responded in relation to the massive increase in the number of public servants. At a time such as this when the whole State and nation is under real economic pressure because we are not competitive on the world scene, to increase the number of public servants, which is a direct charge on the taxpayers of this State, is absurd. Any industry or business that is under pressure must cut its expenses, but apparently that is not the case for the Government: it continues to increase its expenses and pass that cost to the taxpaying public.

Another clear indication of what is going on may be seen in the return for primary products, whether agricultural or horticultural. Here we have a situation, especially in my district (although it applies to the wheat industry across the State and the nation) where the return to the grower for his product is getting less year by year, yet his charges continue to rise year by year.

The Government tries to justify the increase in water rates by saying that the Electricity Trust of South Australia has increased its charges to the Government for power to pump water, but the Premier does not comment on the \$28.5 million that the Government rips off the Electricity Trust in the form of a 5 per cent levy on all costs or rates that are levied by the trust. So, the Electricity Trust has to make \$28.5 million profit before it can break even because of the rip off that it must withstand from the South Australian Government. So, it is absurd for the Government to issue a press release saying that, unfortunately, water rates must rise because the Electricity Trust has increased its charges to the Government. There is only one reason why the trust has increased its charges: because of the take by the South Australian Government.

We in South Australia already have the highest water rates of any Australian irrigation area. We also have the highest power charges, yet the products that we are producing in the interests of the State and nation continue to decline in price. Once again, we cannot continue to be productive, yet, if there is one thing that we must do in this nation, it is encourage people to produce, because everyone else in the community ultimately lives off the efforts of those who produce, whether they produce for the home market or for the export market. Anyone who tries to prove otherwise to me will have a difficult job indeed, because that is the reality of life.

Even though those people out there who have been and are being productive are getting virtually nothing out of it, they are the basis of the whole economy of the country. The days have gone when we could rely heavily on the mineral wealth of this nation to back up our lack of competitive performance on the world scene in relation to the products that we produce. We must now get out there and perform on an equal footing. There are two reasons why we cannot compete: the level of taxes that have been applied by the Federal and State Governments, and the fact that our productivity is not up to the same level as that of other nations. Until the Federal Government and the State Government give us the incentive to get out there, to work once

again, and to be productive, the situation will not improve: it will continue to deteriorate. There is no doubt about that.

There is no incentive for people to get out there. In fact, in many instances those people who have been productive for many years would be economically far better off if they got out of what they were doing, invested their money in a finance company, did not have a worry in the world, and became non-productive. They would then be far better off financially. However, if everyone in the community did that, the economy of the country would be in diabolical strife virtually overnight. We must be productive, and the Government must encourage those people who are prepared to get out there to produce for all they are worth because, without that, there is no hope.

Mr RANN (Briggs): First, I congratulate the Treasurer on a budget that continues a program of reform and sustains economic activity and employment, especially in the area of public housing and construction. It is a budget that avoids tax increases in a time of economic stringency and Commonwealth cut-backs, and it succeeds in bringing down tax cuts in an area that is likely to assist small business in our State.

Turning to activities in and near my district, I was certainly pleased to see the Government's allocation of funds to complete stage 1 of the Lyell McEwin Hospital and for design work on stage 2, as well as funds to construct the Golden Grove Primary School complex and to maintain high levels of public housing activity in the northern suburbs. I was also pleased to see increased resources for the police, the Country Fire Services, and for the new taxi subsidy scheme for the disabled, which is so very important in the outer suburbs.

Another area in my district concerns Technology Park, and I was pleased to see the Government's positive budgetary commitment in this area through allocations to complete the construction of Endeavour House. This building is the third Government financed multi-tenant facility at Technology Park that is designed to cater for the needs of small start-up high technology industries. I understand that Endeavour House will be completed about the end of October and that all available space will be fully committed before the opening date.

It is also exciting that small companies established within Innovation House and Innovation House West not only are expanding rapidly but also are considering the prospect of establishing their own buildings at Technology Park. The micro-electronics company Austek continues to expand rapidly and is likely to take on up to 50 extra staff during the next year or so. If that happens, Austek will have to start looking around for a building of its own at the park. Werner Electronics is also experiencing rapid growth. Back in February it had 14 staff, whereas today it has 38 employees and is continuing to expand. It is also opening offices in other State capitals.

Next month, British Aerospace will open its own \$5 million building at Technology Park. This company will locate its design, engineering and administration divisions at the park. The work being undertaken by British Aerospace is world leading. It will be working on instruments and components for the European earth resources satellite and is currently working on several contracts for work on the F18 fighter. It is working on what is called the head-up display unit which enables the image of cockpit instruments to be reflected in front of the pilot's eyes without impairing his vision.

British Aerospace is also engaged in the development and manufacture of what is called a Fault Tree Analyser, a

sophisticated, portable computerised device that tracks faults in the electronics of the F18. Valued at \$500 000 each, it is being sold to the Royal Australian Air Force and to Canada and Spain—a remarkable achievement. British Aerospace is currently negotiating to sell 57 of these devices to the US, and it is hoped to further develop it for other aircraft, which will give it enormous commercial potential. There is no doubt that British Aerospace's new facility at Technology Park will be a major Australian centre for space related research and development. It will work, for instance, on the development of medium sized ground stations for the Ausat satellites. British Aerospace already has contingency plans for other building phases on its Technology Park site, with the development of space hardware and software being a priority.

British Aerospace, of course, is not the only company constructing its own building at Technology Park: Disposable Products has already begun construction of a \$4 million building, due to be completed early next year. Disposable Products will be involved with the research, development and manufacture of laboratory and medical instruments.

In short, the budget is giving further tangible backing to Australia's most rapidly developing technology and science park. I congratulate the Premier and the Minister of State Development and Technology. Our Tech Park has established its credibility as a prestige business address that is attracting interstate and overseas interests. That, in turn, is contributing to the Salisbury area's growing reputation as the high tech and defence research hub of Australia. That is not idle rhetoric. In Adelaide's northern suburbs we must turn our backs on the whingers who try to talk down the real progress that is occurring.

In his budget reply, the Leader of the Opposition showed once again that he does not understand economics. He confuses tax receipts with tax rates. His attack on SAFA revealed an extraordinary lack of understanding. I admired, however—and I must say this to be positive—his tenacity in sticking to a script written by others. But, like his questions in recent days, if someone had shuffled his pages, there would be more than the member for Davenport left in the dark. It did not even have the trappings of substance.

The fact is that every Gardiner opinion poll commissioned by the Liberals over the last three years showed that the Leader of the Opposition was not perceived by the public as a credible economic manager. His offside, Mr Dean Brown, rated a little bit higher. He was seen in those polls for what he is—a person committed to talking down our State, relishing setbacks but with no ideas of his own. In his Party meetings, the Leader, when he displayed the latest poll charts, used to stick them on the wall and say, 'I am going this way and I am going up a little higher. This is going down'. However, he never revealed what was in those polls. 'Don't worry,' he said, 'They'll do it my way.' He even sacked Gardiner because he did not like the truth that he was being told just before the election.

However, the Leader's days are numbered. Within a year he will be replaced. He has been involved in a few political manoeuvres recently. That is why he blocked Michael Wilson's bid for the Vice Presidency of the Liberal Party and opted for that strategic genius, Bruce McDonald, who led the New South Wales Liberal Party to the worst defeat in Australian political history a few years ago. I think that Bruce McDonald's record should be examined very closely by the Opposition before they promote him even further. That is why the Leader of the Opposition has embraced the New Right. He has no ideas of his own and no credibility, so he has nothing to lose by jumping on board any band wagon.

Earlier this week I was reliably informed that the comeback aspirations of Mr Dean Brown are alive and well. There are two members opposite who are prepared to step aside to facilitate a by-election. I would welcome the leadership aspirations of a man who cannot even win a safe Liberal seat. A few weeks ago I mentioned that the Opposition, following its Riverland conference, resolved to adopt New South Wales style sledge tactics. They came unstuck a few times, as we know, with the mud bouncing back. But, we have today seen the Opposition again resort to the same style, with the member for Morphett asking an infantile question of the Premier—one that outdid himself as one of the most outrageous charges that I have heard in this Parliament. Like the member for Bragg before him, the member for Morphett is innocent. He did not write that question, and he is just nodding in acknowledgment. It was prepared for and allocated to him, and he will raise the matter about its credibility at the Party meeting next week. The Leader of the Opposition came rushing over to see me last time when I made a similar allegation that proved true, but, to delight the Leader of the Opposition, the fact is that it was not prepared by a member of his staff: it was actually with his own backing.

I would also like to talk about the Leader of the Opposition's adoption of the New Right approach and, it seems, his undying support for the Federal Leader. He has rediscovered John Howard, even though his Federal Leader contributed to the demise of the South Australian Liberal Party at the last election and continues to dismiss his South Australian counterpart as a political lightweight. Yet, John Howard, the so-called economic wizard, is really a sorcerer's apprentice in economic affairs.

Let us look at his record. When John Howard became Treasurer in 1977, unemployment in Australia stood at 5.6 per cent. When he was dumped in 1983, unemployment was at 10.3 per cent—almost double. Economic growth in Australia during the Howard Treasuryship slumped from 3 per cent down to minus 1.3 per cent. Compare that with the Keating average of 4.5 per cent economic growth. Inflation also rose during the Howard term to 11.5 per cent. Of course, he got every single one of his five budgetary forecasts wrong, culminating in the \$2.8 billion blow-out, bringing the deficit in 1982-83 to a staggering \$9.6 billion. That is the message that should be put out to small business. If that is what the Leader of the Opposition wants—more of the same—then I think he will be shown for his stupidity.

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

MR S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Before commencing the points on which I intend to speak, I want to make some comments as an independent observer. I have learnt in this House over a long time that once somebody is on the improve and starting to gain ground and appearing a bit dangerous, the quickest thing to give the public an indication that somebody is concerned is when personal attacks are made—not just by persons who are in the Parliament but by individuals who are out of the Parliament and who may have administrative positions within political Parties or organisations. Twice now the same member, the member for Briggs, has made that sort of attack, and I think that the Liberals could gain some real thrill from it, because it merely shows that they are making the ground that they wanted to make. I imagine that this is the first indication from the ALP that it is losing ground and that the Liberals are getting in front. I make that comment as a casual observer, because it shows how easy it is for a Government to indicate to an Opposition that it is frightened because that Opposition is gaining ground.

The member for Briggs made the point about good budgetary processes and saving money. I want to refer briefly to the Ombudsman's Report. The way in which the report is presented disappoints me. I fought to have the Ombudsman's Office created in this State, but I did not have any backing in the beginning. Both political Parties, led by the Hon. Don Dunstan and the Hon. Steele Hall, opposed it. I thought that it was an achievement to create the office of Ombudsman and that it would involve a good down to earth practical report. When it was prepared, it was done with some conservatism as far as material is concerned. The report has been tabled in recent times, and its inside cover is blank.

The second page uses about one-sixth of the space, so about one-twelfth of two pages is covered. On the next page about one-third of the space is used—and we talk about saving money in the State! We then have a cartoon. Who wants a cartoon in a document that reports on Government activities? I am not blaming the present Ombudsman, because some of this practice began with the previous Ombudsman. Parliamentarians can get only three cassette tapes in our office, and I am told that I am one of the few members of Parliament who run out of tapes, but I cannot get more than three cassettes (although it appears that others can). Yet we have this sort of waste in the document to which I am referring.

Page 9 contains another cartoon which takes up a third of the page, and page 8 also takes up a third of the space. The cartoon on page 9 depicts somebody saying 'Welcome to the farm,' or something like that. It could just as easily have a heading 'The Ombudsman visits all parts of the State or country centres.' Why waste the page with that? People are not worried about the cartoon: they want to know the facts. Page 10 contains a half page cartoon. Page 13 is not quite filled, and half of page 14 is gone. We then come to the smart comments. Fancy having as a heading 'A poultry matter', which implies that it could be 'paltry' or it could mean the chook. There must have been a tremendous amount of research in order to find all the fancy comments and quotes, such as that of R.H. Tawney contained under 'Matters of policy' which reads:

The only sound test . . . of the political system is its practical effect on the lives of human beings.

Under the heading 'A poultry matter' is the following quote:

What would be a nuisance in Belgrave Square would not necessarily be so in Bermondsey.

Half of page 16 is virtually blank and two-thirds of page 18 is blank. Page 19 contains the heading 'Mending the market rate'. What market rate does that refer to? What sort of heading is that to have in the report of an Ombudsman? Are they talking about the market rate of the Central Market, the East End Market or the financial market? Why not have a heading which refers to State Bank home loans and market rates? Page 20 contains the heading 'Silence does not imply consent' and then a quotation by W.S. Gilbert which reads:

The meaning doesn't matter if it's only idle chatter of a transcendental kind.

The righthand column contains the heading 'Greener pastures', and it talks about the Engineering and Water Supply Department. When one reads about 'greener pastures', what does one think of—a farm, or some place where there is some intensive cultivation? When we read the text under the heading we find that it refers to a complaint by a person against the Engineering and Water Supply Department and how it greened an area. Page 21 contains a nice picture of the disputed area, but I cannot see the greenery because it

is not a colour photograph—perhaps it might be next year. So, a third of page 21 is wasted.

Page 22 contains the heading 'A well spent penny may save a pound' and this is in the time of dollars and cents. Why do we have this trivia? As far as I am concerned, it makes a joke of the report. I believe that we do not need it. Page 23 contains the heading 'When a 20-year term is fair'. What sort of year is he talking about? Is he talking about a term of 20 years in gaol, or is it a 20-year term involving a loan? When one reads further, one sees it relates to the term of a loan agreement and the fancy quotation from Lewis Carroll states:

'Then you should say what you mean' the March hare went on. 'I do'. Alice replied: 'at least—at least I mean what I say—that's the same thing, you know.'

Why do we have something like that in this report? Who undertook all the research to find these quotations to put into a Government report? Page 25 contains another cartoon and on page 24 there is the heading '*Entre nous*'. This report is published for the average person in the community. I may be a little below average, but I do not know what '*entre nous*' means. I would have to go to the library and ask whether it is French, German or Dutch. What does it mean? It is in a report presented to the people by an officer who is supposed to be there as the people's protector, but how many people would know what that meant? I would say that probably only 25 per cent would know, and possibly only 10 per cent. Page 25 has the heading 'Short reckonings make long friends'. That is a strange heading when it refers to delays in payment of Government accounts. I think that it is a cover-up. That same page also contains the heading 'Tomorrow never comes', and I knew that. There is also the quotation 'Hasten slowly' and then it talks about complaints involving legal practitioners. Why not head that part 'Complaints about legal practitioners'?

Page 26 contains the heading 'Crossed power lines', and that refers to confusion among landowners, CSIRO and ETSA, about the loss of power supply. That page also has the heading 'Disappearing art', which refers to a 12 year old boy who had his art books stolen from a Government building, and he was entitled to get them back. Why not say 'Art books stolen' or 'Student's books stolen'? Writing a report in plain simple language, without fiddling around with fancy quotations, is a disappearing art. Page 27 contains the heading 'Salve for every sore'. One would think it related to an injury or some medicine, but it does not. It relates to the Department for Community Welfare, the adoption of a child from overseas and an adverse report.

Page 28 has the heading 'A storm in a can' which relates to the local board of health and has nothing to do with a can. Also on that page is the heading 'Mending manners' which refers to people and bad manners on the bus: juniors not standing up in order that the aged may sit down. Page 29 contains the heading 'Swimming pool charges in hot water'. That refers to the Berri council charging school children 20c more than it charges for families with pool membership. Why have that heading?

Page 31 uses only a third of the space, and it refers to Electricity Trust power bills. It contains the heading 'Lead kindly light' which one would think referred to singing carols in the Ombudsman's office. Page 30 uses only a third of the space and talks about horse sense, referring to the rules of the South Australian Trotting Control Board. At the back of the report, three pages are completely blank, and then there is the quotation by J. Wesley:

Do all the good you can, by all the means you can, in all the ways you can, in all the places you can, at all the times you can, to all the people you can, as long as ever you can.

That is all there is on that page. We talk about saving money and budgeting to do the right thing by the people. Hundreds of these books have been printed and it really makes a joke of the Ombudsman's office, for which I fought (and others condemned me for it), but I wish things were being done properly.

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

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I refer to some of the remaining points of the budget that I think are worthy of special note and those which are particularly relevant to my interests. I note that the allocation to tourism, which is obviously something we would all applaud, in the research area is \$167 000. If one does a job properly it is quite obvious that research into what is done is needed, and I applaud the Government's foresight in providing such a massive increase in that area of tourism.

Members obviously will be aware of what a major money spinner the tourism industry is in this State. Depending on what reckoning one goes by, it is the second or third major industry in South Australia and one which is an effective and growing revenue raiser for our State. There is a massive return on investment in tourism; if a dollar is spent on tourism in the right way and with appropriate research, it will return far more than a dollar spent in any other area, so there is still massive potential for growth in that area. I applaud the Government's foresight in providing \$167 000 for research into tourism. Also, \$2.2 million has been allocated for advertising and promotion in the tourist area. It goes without saying that the returns on that investment will be quite substantial, and I doubt very much whether there is a better area where that money could have been spent.

I mention also a budget allocation to an organisation with which I have a good deal of sympathy and to which I spend a good deal of time listening. I refer to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron, which is based at West Beach but has outreach services all over the State. I note that, by way of grant, the West Beach squadron received \$28 000 for running costs and another \$9 800 for fuel.

While that is obviously only a contribution towards the total cost of its operations, and much of the effort, time and money comes from the members of that worthy organisation, I am sure that that major increase, of almost 100 per cent in one case, has been recognised by members of the squadron as a major contribution from this Government, one that indicates our support for the squadron and its work. The Whyalla branch of the Sea Rescue Squadron has been granted \$3 000, plus \$2 000 for fuel, and a similar grant has also been made to the Victor Harbor squadron. This represents the Government's commitment to keeping the squadron afloat, as it were—keeping it operating. We can regard it as sea capital, in a sense. These grants go some way towards the fuel costs of the squadron and encourage those people who have enormous commitment to the task. An allocation of \$458 000 has been made to the helicopter rescue service, and that is worth noting. In fact, the allocation has been increased this year.

The Sea Rescue Squadron at West Beach, the branch with which I am most familiar, runs the blue water rescue service which operates beyond the waves, theoretically, beyond the scope of the Surf Life Saving Association, which has the task of rescuing swimmers and surfers from where the waves break inwards. The Sea Rescue Squadron has the task of going virtually anywhere at any time and under any conditions to rescue anyone in need of rescue. As members will be aware, in excess of 40 volunteers donate their time, boats, cars, tow vehicles, petrol, and their many years of

experience to that task. Whenever flares from offshore are reported to the police or when fishermen are overdue, the squadron is only too happy to put to sea at all hours to effect whatever rescue it can. Although two teenagers drowned tragically in the upper part of the gulf early this year, the squadron was the first on the scene, and certainly those deaths were not the fault of the squadron.

It is worth pointing out the frustration that members of the squadron feel when irresponsible people let off flares frivolously or when false reports are made to police about missing fishermen, and so on. The squadron is often sent off on expensive and frustrating wild goose chases. I take this opportunity to record my frustration in relation to people who do that sort of thing, and I urge the people of South Australia to act a little more responsibly—and I direct my remarks particularly to those who contemplate watching a flotilla of squadron craft which have been launched for frivolous reasons. It is quite obvious that that sort of thing falls into the category of false calls for ambulance or the police and it should not be encouraged in any circumstances.

I note that there has been an allocation of \$1.3 million for compensation for injuries resulting from criminal acts—compensation to victims of crime. That allocation is most welcome in terms of those who are unfortunate enough to suffer injuries as the victims of crimes of violence, and certainly it indicates that this Government is caring and compassionate towards people in those circumstances.

Regarding law and order, another initiative that I applaud and endorse is the establishment of the Police Complaints Authority. This issue has already been raised in the House today in a question to the Minister during Question Time. My experience (such as it is) with the Police Complaints Authority suggests that the \$265 000 that has been allocated to support the authority for the coming year is money well spent. I believe that Andrew Cunningham is an excellent appointment as Commissioner. He is highly qualified and in my dealings with him I have found his judgments to be fair, reasonable and reasoned.

I find no reason for anyone to be anxious about the way in which he performs his task. In correspondence with him, I have noted that very often the actions of the police have been upheld. The Police Complaints Authority tends to come down fairly regularly on the side of police action, although a number of frivolous complaints may be involved, but that is another reason why an independent Commissioner is absolutely essential.

I can understand why there was initially some reluctance on the part of the police in relation to the establishment of the office of Commissioner. I believe that the police, like teachers and politicians, often feel set upon. They can be (and frequently are) publicly criticised for what they do, and very frequently they are criticised unfairly. While it would be unfair to say that police, teachers or politicians are paranoid I believe that the word 'circumspect' could be applied to their attitude in this matter. It is obviously understandable, but I believe that it has proved to be completely unjustified. As I said, frequently the Commissioner upholds the actions of the police.

The importance of the commission, as I see it, is that it gives ordinary people a second line of defence or appeal when they feel they have been treated unjustly by the authorities. People have a tendency to want a second line of appeal in that situation. The authority is seen as independent, and indeed it thinks independently; it acts independently and it reaches independent conclusions. If members feel any doubt about the way in which the authority works, I can relate the case of one of my constituents who appealed to the Commissioner. It was alleged that my

constituent was threatened by a senior police officer at a social function. The problem arose when constables were called to break up a melee. My constituent alleges that they recognised the man and backed off with the complaint, trying to sweep the whole thing under the carpet. My constituent was not satisfied with that. He felt there were grounds for appeal. In due course he appealed and the complaint was fully investigated.

Although the Commissioner felt it was impossible to substantiate either story (and, of course, the two stories were at odds) at least my constituent, and I, had the opportunity to report the threats that had allegedly been made by the police officer so that, if any further trouble arises in that case, my constituent, and indeed the Commissioner, will know exactly where to turn. There is a permanent record, something that is there for all to see. Ordinary people find it very comforting that this authority exists, and I applaud that allocation to the Police Complaints Authority.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I did not have the chance to participate in the debate on the Appropriation Bill, so I will make one or two observations about budget strategy now. Much of the detail of the budget has already been canvassed, and canvassed thoroughly: the Opposition, to its credit, has highlighted issues of concern now and in the long term. The Premier's speech in response to the Opposition's submissions in the debate on the Appropriation Bill again was totally predictable, the Premier having failed to recognise that, however well we think we are doing, we can always do better. While some elements of the budget are sound, a number of factors require explanation. Promises have been broken, and we spent some time canvassing that area.

Importantly (and members opposite would recognise this), details about the South Australian Government Financing Authority were missing and, when we questioned the Premier in this House about significant elements of SAFA, we received no response whatsoever. Whenever we ask a question, the Government continues to say, 'This is a knock, knock campaign,' or, 'It is negative.' If questions were answered in the first place, we would not have to pursue them. But because the Government does not see fit to answer those questions, we must pursue them.

I believe that the press has come to grips with the fact that the Government does not have many of the answers. The Government is being led by the nose in certain circumstances, and in other circumstances it does not want to find out. I was interested to hear the contribution of the member for Briggs: he belongs in the category of people who cannot help themselves. He talked about the valiant efforts of the Bannon Government in sustaining employment in South Australia.

I am not going to debate the role of government in the field of employment. Obviously when a Government of either persuasion manages to experience an economy on the uplift congratulations are handed out. By the same token, when the economy starts to go in to downturn there is a certain element not of distrust but question marks about how well the Government has performed. I will not argue about the processes, but it has been seen fit by the Government to pat itself on the back during times of slight recovery. If it wishes to pat itself on the back during those times it should be prepared to take the criticisms that inevitably must occur when the cycle turns around, whether it has contributed to that cycle or whether that cycle is beyond its control. I will not wax long on whether the cycle is out of control, but I simply say that the State Government can

play an important part in attracting industry to the State and, indeed, sustaining employment. To date, that effort has been lacking on the part of the Bannon Labor Government.

If members wish to look at the employment figures and take out the cyclical effects, we find that employment opportunities in the State have declined. It is similar to seasonally adjusting figures for monthly or quarterly variations. If we follow the same process we will find that the level of upturn experienced in South Australia has also been quite significant. Our level of downturn has been quite significant. That is not knocking but explaining that there are real problems ahead—problems that will not be recognised or catered for by the Government.

In the budget strategy the Premier has had the ability to make allowance for more difficult times. He has seen fit not to do so. I have covered part of the argument in a private member's motion. Importantly, we know that the receipts area is going to become more difficult because of the economic situation. We know that the Commonwealth is not going to continue to provide funds in the way that it has in the past. Therefore, prudent economic management says that we have to think two to five years ahead and in so doing set it up to sustain that activity.

It has been pointed out that, if we borrow extraordinary amounts of funds in one year, they have to be repaid later. Economic theory by John Maynard Keynes suggests that when you have an economic downturn deficits may be appropriate if, indeed, you can smooth out the rough edges of the downturn and stop a dramatic effect on employment and activity. However, that means that there must be some form of predictability that the downturn will be of a short term nature or that it has reached the bottom and needs impetus to get off the bottom. Neither of those conditions applies at the moment, so the Premier and Treasurer will have to continue to pull rabbits out of the hat. That is why we think it is important to understand that, if the financial situation is not as strong as it should be, at least we as a State can come to grips with that fact. It is all very well for the Premier to say that we are knocking the State. That is his one and only line. He is a wound-up record that continues to play the same line. He used it very successfully last year, but after a while it does wear a little thin.

If anyone wants to refer back to the record of the Labor Opposition during the Tonkin Government, which was a Government of achievement—everybody admits that it achieved a lot during that period, and I do not have to run through all the enormous projects put in train at that time—one will find that for the whole of that three-year period—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What are they?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have numbered them before if the honourable member would like to look back at some of my speeches. For the whole of that period the Labor Opposition knocked the whole time.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Constructively.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Constructively! You have never been constructive in your life. Those who can remember the vicious and vitriolic campaign waged during that period will understand that the Labor Party does not play it according to Hoyle. The rules are made and broken by them continually. The 'knock knock' campaign had some advantage in electoral terms, but is now coming to an end. Some people must be wondering why the Premier of this State cannot answer the questions put to him—quite legitimate questions.

In reference to the contribution by the member for Briggs on Technology Park, we all agree that it is something of which we can all be proud. I have a feeling that he sits

down, reads a few pamphlets, regurgitates it to the House and then sends out a press release. He is saying, 'That is information that I have found out for myself.' I have been a proponent of Technology House and discussed Technology Park with a number of instrumentalities overseas. I do not go around saying, 'Look what I have done while overseas.' I have made a positive contribution, but I do not stand and blow my bags as does the member for Briggs, who completely lacks substance. For him to talk about sleaze campaigns! He is the Commissioner for Dirty Tricks, the person who cannot appreciate the truth because he has for so long been telling untruths and been in a destabilisation mode absolutely fascinates me. That is something of which members opposite will have to be aware. In the member for Briggs they have a person who is so used to telling untruths that he really does not know the difference any more.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In this debate I would like to refer to industrial matters. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the criticisms of members opposite. To go back only a matter of weeks ago, the member for Victoria was talking about repetition strain injury and how he is most critical about this injury, which is becoming more and more prevalent in the work force. As a working man for some 25 years in the railway industry—and I still consider myself to be a working man, despite the fact that I am in this place—I have, like all members on this side of the Chamber been very much aware of the problems and traumas associated with injuries sustained in the workplace, in particular, the question of repetition strain injury.

Despite comments from members opposite, it is not something new. It has been around for many, many years. It is not just something that occurs only amongst the Australian work force. In fact, for 10 years it has been highlighted in some States. Ten years ago a number of RSI cases surfaced at the Ericsson Electronics factory in Melbourne. That company implemented several changes in work management and environment and largely eliminated repetition strain injury. RSI is known in Australia by some people who want to denigrate this injury by the colloquialism 'kangaroo paw'. It is well known as a problem overseas. In America, for example, which is held up by many members opposite, it is known as the 'cumulative trauma disorder'. In Scandinavia it is branded the 'overseas syndrome'. RSI, although it was not always known by that name, has been compensatable in Australia since 1949, which may surprise members opposite.

That was a long, long time ago. In fact, it costs more in terms of compensation than other disabilities and other injuries on the job. The size of compensation claims may now motivate organisations to look for solutions or to at least discover the causes of these problems that people experience. There is no question that it is a real problem. I have said in this House on a number of occasions (and I have seen this in my own office) that governments have a lot to answer for in terms of this injury. It is very easy to address perhaps some of the more emotive issues in the community. For example, during the International Year of the Disabled Person politicians in particular, and many other community leaders, were jumping up and down, and rightly so, about the need to assist disabled people.

It seems that RSI is one of those matters that many people have not addressed. My experience has been that when it hits someone in one's own home, a member of one's family, or a workmate, a person then really appreciates what the problem is all about. In 1985, in a period of only seven months, claims of over \$29.6 million were pursued

by the Manufacturers Mutual Insurance Company. That is a very startling figure and, of course, since then more and more claims have come to the public notice. An article that I have been reading today says:

Through our experience here at the hospital [in Sydney], just under 40 per cent of RSI patients are making claims. Contrary to popular opinion, many RSI sufferers even ask to have their physiotherapy before or after work so that they can get on with their jobs, which are very important to them. Most of the people we treat through the hospital are as normal as you or I, without any associated home problems or emotional hang-ups. There are theories that RSI is all in the mind, but I personally don't believe that. The patients that I treat have a real pain.

It does disturb me when members opposite criticise aspects of this matter and try to draw an analogy between this injury and the oft quoted 'European back' syndrome. I have just referred to people being prepared to undergo treatment outside their normal working hours because they believe in their job and are dedicated to the work they are involved in and do not want to lose any time, and this is in line with my personal experience. From my experience in the railway industry (and this applies to me as well) I know that often when people retire they leave behind many hours of sick leave, which, had one been of that inclination, one could easily have used up on the pretext that one was sick. I believe that the average worker in this country wants to do his or her job properly and to make a contribution to the best of his or her ability in the occupation being followed.

Another matter that I addressed yesterday, and that I have addressed previously, concerns the problems of migrants in this country. Many migrant groups, particularly in the manufacturing areas, not so much today but in the past, were unaware of their entitlements in terms of claiming workers compensation and, I would suggest, that, because of their financial situation or family needs, many were reluctant to go to their employer, in the factory or wherever it was that they worked, to lodge a complaint about a work condition for fear of losing his or her job because of having complained too often. I could refer to many instances of that relating to migrant people in this country. I believe that now there is far greater recognition amongst the migrant population in the community that, without fear or favour, they can point out to responsible employers that they have a problem, particularly in relation to RSI.

I know that in the past some employers have said that RSI is an emotional problem, a stress related problem associated with the family. That attitude has not taken into account ergonomic factors at the workplace or the problems associated with using outmoded and outdated equipment. Because this problem has been highlighted in recent times, there is now a greater awareness on the part of Government and employers of the needs of their employees and the importance of upgrading equipment and providing ergonomically designed furniture and machines. If that is not done, more and more employees will have to take time off, with justification, because of this injury. As I have said, I have seen this problem develop in my own office. I understand quite clearly the sort of trauma that a person goes through. There are those in the community who say, unkindly, that people are bludging on the system. However, I do not believe that that is the case.

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

COOPER PEDY (LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXTENSION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 3)**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate tonight. When I first came into this place I expected no quarter and I expected to give no quarter to my political opponents. I believe that it is very important for the Opposition to be equally as answerable to the Parliament as is the Government. Recent events—and I refer not just to what transpired here this afternoon—have caused me considerable concern about where members on both sides of this Parliament are going. I suggest that it is very easy to be critical of a person. I have thought about this matter over the past couple of weeks and I cannot recall (although if I am wrong, no doubt members will remind me), since being in this Parliament, having resorted to denigrating a member. I am strongly of the view that none of us, to use a biblical saying, is without sin.

Similarly, few of us have no skeletons in the cupboard that we would not like to be disclosed to the public. As a working man, during my lifetime I have moved around in industry and mixed with many working people who can give one a rough time. As a member of Parliament, I move around clubs and in the street and I speak to people who know my position. Where they are agitated about an issue they respond readily, whether I am letter boxing or merely walking down the street. My colleagues on this side know that I love working in hotels not only because I like talking to people there but also because I enjoy an occasional beer with them.

I recall one instance when I crossed the floor on the Casino Bill because I felt strongly on the issue, and I was subjected to considerable abuse in a hotel. I expected that and I believe that most politicians, if they are worth their salt, expect considerable aggression from their constituents and indeed from other people outside their district. However, personal attacks on individual members of Parliament I do not condone in any shape or form from either side. Indeed, I do not believe that such attacks are necessary. I have listened to remarks from the present member for Davenport and the member for Semaphore about what I perceive to be the denigration of members of Parliament.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: A certain standard of ethics must be maintained.

Mr HAMILTON: I agree that a certain standard of ethics should apply in this Parliament. Since I became a member, I have heard many stories about people. Those stories have not been repeated, and rightly so, because some of those stories are true and others are spread out of malice. I believe frankly and sincerely that what has taken place here today has been worthy of an apology to the Premier. I do not mind the hurly-burly of a bloke giving me a rough time, but I draw the line when it comes to the family of a member, because family members cannot respond. They cannot answer for their parent's actions, nor should they have to.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It's worse than a head high tackle. You don't get reported.

Mr HAMILTON: I will not pursue that. But, when it comes to the members of a Parliamentarian's family, they

are sacrosanct I do not believe that any member of Parliament should be subjected to personal attacks that cause considerable consternation to his or her children. After all, most children are sensitive to the occupation of their parent, especially if that parent is a member of Parliament. People, especially in the schoolyard and in the workplace, can be unkind in what they say. I hope that what I am saying is not taken as a matter of double standards. I believe fiercely in the institution of Parliament, given all its faults. I also believe strongly that this is the place in which to air our views.

When I first became a member many years ago, a Government member attacked my union. I was most put out because I considered the attack to be unwarranted, so I gave that member a serve outside the Chamber. Subsequently, I was taken to task by Des Corcoran, who told me in clear and uncertain terms that the debates are conducted within the Chamber and that once I walked outside the Chamber it was not correct for me to have a serve of the other member, even if I felt as strongly as I did.

Members know that I am emotional and that I have strong feelings on certain matters, but I believe that it is not right for members on either side to denigrate other members personally. I look around and see members in this place who have been attacked. All members should reflect on what has taken place here today. I do not want to seem to be patronising or to tell people how to suck eggs, but I am concerned about what has happened here. My remarks are not entirely due to today's events, as I spoke only this morning to my Whip about this matter. We should all consider the matter of denigration and attacks on members individually. I care not about the attacking of a member's philosophical belief but, when it comes to personal attacks that hurt, I believe that they are wrong. There is no question about that. Not only do such attacks hurt members themselves; they degrade the institution of Parliament.

Politicians cop enough flak in the community without the occurrence of the events of recent weeks. I endorse the comments of the member for Briggs in this regard. As a politician, I believe that the tactics of the Opposition leave much to be desired and that they do nothing for the Opposition itself. Members opposite are not fools. Most of them have had a good education and I say sincerely that they could be expected to do much better than resort to these tactics. I do not like these tactics.

Members will realise from the way in which I have spoken today that I have not raised my voice or tried to ridicule anyone. As I said yesterday concerning a contribution from an Opposition member when he referred to the past alcoholic problems of the Prime Minister, many of us have disabilities, some seen and some unseen. Once we start resorting to those sorts of tactics and talk about a member's personal problems, we bring this place into disrepute and do nothing for the reputation of politicians in this community.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in this grievance debate and wish to refer to one or two things that have been said by the member for Albert Park. Since I became a member, one thing that has concerned me has been the shabby way in which Opposition members have been treated by Governments of the day. We are asked to do a job as Opposition members, especially those who are given other responsibilities. The conditions under which members with responsibilities must operate in this place are deplorable and cause much ill feeling, concern, and pressure.

I was perturbed to learn this week that the President of the Legislative Council had had her office considerably

upgraded. I do not object to that, but I believe that it is deplorable when we consider the disgraceful conditions under which the Leader of the Opposition, who is the alternative Premier, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition must work in Parliament House. Yet the President of the Legislative Council, who occupies what I believe to be a relevantly insignificant position, has taken it on herself to have a lavish upgrading of her office, whereas the Leader of the Opposition has had to fight tooth and nail to get even a telex machine.

Mrs Appleby: Tell the truth about that.

Mr GUNN: We know the story. The Leader had to fight tooth and nail.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: That is one of the problems: two wrongs do not make a right. I had some involvement with the Tonkin Government to apply pressure to get facilities that would have been taken for granted in the general community, including photo-copiers and electric typewriters, for members opposite.

I believe that those sorts of things ought to be addressed in a sensible and commonsense manner, in a way that the public would expect them to be addressed. The sort of conditions that exist in this place are a great cause for tempers rising and people taking all sorts of actions which perhaps on other occasions they would not take.

The District Council of Streaky Bay has written to me about a matter which is of great concern in my electorate. Headed 'Re: Eastern Standard Time/Two Time Zones in South Australia', the letter states:

I am directed by council to ask you to vote against the proposals to alter South Australian time to Eastern Standard Time and also, to create two time zones in South Australia.

Council is of the opinion that moving to Eastern Standard Time and/or the creation of two time zones, does not have the support of the majority of people in South Australia. Any move to effectively lose our identity and individuality, in this the Jubilee 150 Year of South Australia, is an insult to the people who make this State 'great'.

The existing Central Standard Time, because of man's tampering with nature, gives the people of South Australia 30 minutes of permanent daylight saving for the whole year. There seems to be no justifiable or rational reason for imposing an additional 60 minutes of daylight on the people of South Australia. If there are good and sound reasons for Eastern Standard Time, daylight saving and two time zones, then it would seem appropriate to have the issue properly debated and put before all South Australians—not just a selected few.

The District Council of Streaky Bay respectfully requests that you, as a member of the South Australian Parliament, make sure that your vote on this issue keeps 'S.A. Great', together and not divided by time.

To do this you must:

1. Vote against Eastern Standard Time for S.A.
2. Vote against two time zones in S.A.

That letter is signed by Mr D. Lane, District Clerk. I assure those members of the District Council of Streaky Bay that I intend to oppose the introduction of Eastern Standard Time. I intend to oppose the ludicrous proposal to divide the State into two time zones. It would cause confusion and problems and it would be another disjointed action taken by the Government.

I believe that daylight saving should end when the school year begins, as that would alleviate some of the problems that people in isolated communities have to put up with, such as children in the west of the State catching school buses before the sun is up in the morning. If people do not think that that is a problem, I suggest that they go and have a look for themselves and talk to the people in those areas. The proposition to divide Port Lincoln and that area of the State from the rest of the State is ill conceived. It does not in my view have any support of any magnitude in the State and should not be proceeded with. I am tempted to suggest

that the Government has run this flag up a pole to test the water. We have seen these sorts of things done before. Anyone who has been around the political world for a while knows that it is an astute move by a Government when there is some controversy.

The second matter I want to raise is the Office of Children's Services. Since this organisation was set up, I believe that it has caused a considerable number of problems. The old Kindergarten Union was efficiently and effectively managed. I never received any complaints about the services that were provided by that organisation. I have received the following letter from the Murat Bay Children's Centre, signed by the President, Mrs Kloeden. In part, it states:

1. The CSO administration intends to carry out assessments of teaching staff with regard to:

- (a) advancement to full registration;
- (b) ending of probation period, by an administrator not qualified in teaching.

Further, it states:

2. Of great concern also is the matter of relief staff employment in preschools. This situation is summarised as follows:

- That if staff required time off from work to attend inservice training there is no relief staff funding available.
- That the CSO expect voluntary assistance to be arranged to cover the absence of the staff member; that is, unqualified, voluntary staff, who cannot even be relied on to 'turn up'.
- That if a parent does come to help, he/she more often than not has an extra younger child or two who must be tended constantly. The voluntary helper is usually more a hindrance on such occasions.

Further on it states:

- That, as a result of this policy, staff members find it impossible to attend inservice courses, make observation visits and to attend community education meetings. They are thus denied the opportunity of broadening their knowledge and experience and the chance to find stimulation through contact with others working in the field.

It then states:

4. The setting up of the CSO consultative structure was discussed—and criticised—at length during the inaugural subregional meeting of the Far West Area held at Streaky Bay on the evening of Tuesday 12 August. Parents and staff expressed great dissatisfaction with the structure because:

- Representation from our large region will not be sufficient to make our needs known.
- The region is seen as being too large, encompassing Yorke Peninsula, the Mid North, Far North, as well as Eyre Peninsula.
- The needs of people in these areas are very different.
- Representatives going to the Consultative Committee could come from services other than those predominating in our area and thus not represent our needs and views.
- Of the 33 members of the Consultative Committee, only six are likely to come from country areas (unless the ministerial appointments are made to country people, and this is highly unlikely).
- Country voices are already disadvantaged by distance and population size.
- Dissatisfaction that was expressed at the planning stage has been ignored. The original proposed structure went ahead without any changes being made.

These matters as outlined above, were discussed at the sub-regional meeting (12 August 1986). There was great dissatisfaction and anger expressed by parents and staff attending that meeting.

I have received another letter that states:

Enclosed is letter re concerns discussed by the management committee. As I told you on the phone, the Children's Services Office regional adviser, with nursing qualifications, had said that she was coming to our centre to carry out assessment on two teachers here. One is due to be assessed for full registration and for coming off probation; the other for coming off probation.

I understand that the South Australian Institute of Teachers was in contact with the Regional Manager, who has teaching qualifications. Today I received a letter from her saying that she was coming herself to carry out the assessments. It appears that our immediate needs are being dealt with satisfactorily—but what about the rest of the region? I think the other adviser is carrying out assessments elsewhere. I have been in contact with the SAIT Field Officer who was going to check with the registration board.

Great concern has been expressed by my constituent that a person who is not qualified will be making assessments of people who have been trained and who have expertise.

I believe that this is an area where the Government moved in with a heavy hand when it established the Children's Services Office, with no regard to the problems that would be created. The Minister was warned at length, and the problems that have been created are of the Government's own making. It should address and rectify those problems. This is a very important area, about which parents are concerned. The problems that I face in my electorate at Leigh Creek should not have occurred. I am not asking the Government to appropriate more money; I am asking it to reorganise funds that are available and to reorganise the Public Service, with those hundreds of people that it has put on. It appears to me that it ought to be able to direct some of that money towards improving the services that are already there, where they need expanding—

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

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): In this adjournment debate I would like to raise a couple of matters that were raised in the Parliament today. One was the question that was asked by the member for Coles in Question Time regarding the position of Assistant Director for Regions in the Department of Tourism, and the assertion by her that I had somehow influenced or was influencing that decision. I also want to point out to the House that exactly the same question was asked in the Upper House by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. I find this whole business extremely distasteful, because what has been done in both Houses today has amounted to gross political interference by these members in the Lower House and the Upper House. I would like—

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I note that once again the member for Hanson, in his—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume her seat. The honourable member must not criticise or refer to the Upper House and debates in the Upper House during her speech.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you for your guidance on this, Sir. I shall contain my remarks to the question that was asked by the member for Coles in this place. I would like to refresh members' minds about the type of question in which she asked the Premier to give an assurance that no political influence would be brought to bear on the appointment of this senior position within the Department of Tourism. The member for Coles went on to say:

A number of SAARTO delegates and regional operators had expressed their deep concern to me that the member for Mawson, who is a member of the Caucus Tourism Committee, recently openly indicated her support for a particular applicant.

In the interests of justice and fairness, I would like to set the record straight: first, I am not a member of the Caucus Tourism Committee; and, secondly, I categorically and absolutely deny that I have openly, at any public venue or at any public place, indicated to any SAARTO delegates or regional operators that I supported any particular candidate. I have very carefully searched my memory and I put to the House that the only possible interpretation that could have been made was from some remarks made by me earlier in a very casual environment during the recent break when the Industries Development Committee was on an inspection tour of a number of potential applications, one of which involved a proposal regarding a tourism development for the Flinders Ranges.

The Upper House member, the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, and I spoke with a senior member from the Department of

Tourism in a very casual way and on a general level about the number of women in senior positions in the Department of Tourism. We commented quite accurately—and the member of the department agreed with us—that there were no women in any senior positions within the Department of Tourism. We had a general discussion about the problems associated with job sharing and that that was often very difficult for senior positions. We canvassed generally a range of issues.

We had a general discussion about the position. I mentioned a particular person whom I know and who I knew was applying for the position. It was done in a general context in that situation. I place on the record quite categorically that I have not discussed that person or her application with anybody else. I have not discussed it with the Minister of Tourism; I have not discussed it with anybody in the regions, with any member of SAARTO or with anybody on the interview panel. The person with whom I discussed the matter is not on the interview panel and, in fact, as I understand it, will have no influence at all on the decision-making process. I did not know until I was told subsequently that the interviews actually are taking place today, but I have to ask myself: why, on the very day that the interviews are taking place, have these questions been raised in both Houses about my supposed involvement in influencing a decision within the Public Service? I can only say that that must amount to the most blatant political interference that I have come across in this Parliament, because it has effectively destroyed that applicant's chances of being appointed to the position.

I most certainly have not sought to influence in any way the decision by the interviewing panel. I have not spoken to any member of the interview panel and, to raise this on the very day and to describe the applicant without naming the person, can only amount to gross political interference in the process. It is a deliberate attempt to discredit that applicant which has been orchestrated, and I am supposedly to be used as the pawn. I can assure this House that I know my politics a little better than to even consider interfering in any kind of appointment of that magnitude and I find it grossly offensive that the member for Coles has named me and has used what amount to absolute untruths and has said that I have gone out openly indicating my support.

If a conversation conducted in a car travelling from Hawker to Wilpena when three people were present (and it was a casual conversation canvassing a range of issues about tourism and the application that might be coming before the Industries Development Committee) can be construed as some kind of open indication of support for an applicant, then I suppose I must be guilty, but no rational person in Parliament (and I include members of the Opposition) would in any way suggest that that amounted to some kind of influence.

As I said earlier I did not even know when the interviews were to be conducted. I did not even know whether the person concerned had been granted an interview. I find it quite unbelievable that this should occur at this critical time, to try to destroy a person's chances of getting a position. One would have to ask why. Why would the member for Coles want to destroy someone's chances? She has never heard me say anything about the person. I have not had any discussion with the member for Coles.

An honourable member: It is hearsay.

Ms LENEHAN: It is not just hearsay; it is gross exaggeration and a falsification of the facts, because I did not have a discussion with anybody else except this one member, as I have indicated to the House. I have not made that person's name public, because I tried to contact the person

but could not. Out of respect for the public servant, I do not think that I should name the person and I will not sink to the levels to which some people in this House have in naming public servants—and that will keep for another day—to attempt to discredit public servants without even paying them the courtesy of speaking with them. I am sure that the public servant concerned will offer me an explanation for the interpretation that has now arisen out of that very casual conversation that took place exactly as I have stated, and the Hon. Carolyn Pickles would substantiate everything that I have said.

It is a very sad day for this Parliament and for this State when parliamentary privilege is used to attack a member of the Public Service and to try to discredit that person and

prevent them from exercising what is a democratic right—applying for a position and perhaps getting into an area in which they want to work. I do not care who that person is. I think it must be stated as a principle that we cannot support this level of slur and innuendo or this level of gross political interference. It is a strong statement, but I will stand by it, because that is what the member for Coles has done in Parliament today. I believe that she should be thoroughly ashamed of her actions and what she has done in attempting to discredit and destroy the career of a member of the community and a member of the Public Service.

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 23 September at 2 p.m.