HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 23 October 1986

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

SITTING DAYS

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

That, in the opinion of this House, this Parliament should sit no less than 75 days in each calendar year.

When I moved a similar motion in which I had 80 days as the number of sitting days, no member of Parliament was prepared to support that proposition by even seconding it, although all members were not in the House. I recognise that some who might have been prepared to second it then were not here at that precise moment because, as has happened today, it was one of the first matters called on. I have reduced the number from 80 days to 75 because I thought that may appeal to members more than 80, if they thought that to sit for 80 days a year was too many.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Pick a number.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I have picked 75, because 75 is seven days fewer than the maximum number on which this House has sat, to my knowledge, in the last 20 years, approximately. I think 82 was the highest number and 59 the average. Quite a few have been in the 60s, but very few have been as ridiculous as this year, when we are sitting for only 28 days, even though we are told that there is a lot of business to be handled. The Government has told us that it has 100-odd Bills it wants to handle during this session.

We came back on Tuesday last, after a break, and sat until around 10 p.m. On the Wednesday, the second day back, we had four hours—from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m.—and ran out of something to do as far as the Government was concerned, yet on the Notice Paper there are more than 50 private members issues which members believe should be debated—and they are elected members of Parliament. They have been elected to represent the people, and have been given a task to do. They have placed on the Notice Paper matters that they believe are important either to their electorate or to the whole State.

Sometimes these issues have a political philosophy attached to them, but that is par for the game also: people expect that of us. However, we do not have that amount of time made available to us. I can give one example of a matter about which I have become concerned, but which I cannot raise, I suppose, before the Grand Prix, because there are not enough sitting days for me to be able to ask questions. We get about six or seven questions a year whereas, when we had a two hour Question Time, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, in Opposition, had 11 questions in one day—virtually double the quota a person gets today.

I want to raise for State Ministers to take up with their Federal colleagues the matter of Commonwealth Employment Service employees taking part-time jobs at Football Park during the Grand Final rather than making them available to those who look for jobs through the Commonwealth Employment Service offices. Likewise now, for the Grand Prix, they are putting their names down because they see it as one of the rorts (whether they use the right name or not) to work at the Grand Prix instead of making jobs available to those who are unemployed.

I give that as an example of a member being denied the right to get up before this House all the matters that he should get up. I can say that a woman who took a part-time job at Football Park saw two officers from the Norwood office working at Football Park and, when she asked them how they got the job, they said 'That is one of the perks of the game.' So, they are the sorts of things that we are denied being able to get into the House and fully debate, because Parliament does not sit for long enough.

I will not go back over the points that I raised in my previous speech on this matter. That speech is readily available to members to read, and I urge them to have the courage to stand up and tell me if they think I am wrong. Some members do not want to do that because they believe that people will judge that the Parliament should sit for more days than it does at the moment. This year we will average about half a working day per week sitting in Parliament. I do not think that that is a fair go in relation to what people expect of us. I will say no more, because I covered most of this topic last time, and private members' time is short. So, I ask that someone second the motion and be prepared to debate this matter—and perhaps tell me if they think I am wrong. I urge members of the House to support the motion.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr BLACKER: Yes, Sir.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act 1934. Read a first time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill reduces the number of House of Assembly members from 47 to 39 (a reduction of approximately 17 per cent) and the number of Legislative Council members from 22 to 18 (approximately 18 per cent). This country has a Government and an Opposition telling us that we cannot afford those things we have previously taken for granted in relation to our lifestyle. Therefore, it is obvious that everyone must tighten their belts—including Parliaments.

The building of the new Parliament House in Canberra at a cost of over $1 000 million and the increase in the number of Federal Parliamentarians at the last election from 183 to 224 is not a display of concern by Federal Parliamentarians about the taxpayers' ability to pay. In this country we now have a total of 821 parliamentarians, and all their support services to maintain. In fact, the latest figures in the 1986 Year Book show that the annual outlay on parliamentary government in Australia for 1983-84 was over $268 million. That was the latest figure that was available to me. Today, possibly it would be in excess of $300 million.

We can improve the efficiency of operating the South Australian Parliament and do it with fewer members. Some members have challenged me and asked me why I make such proposals. I do it because of a sincere belief that I have had for a long time—right back as far as 1969. In the remainder of this explanation, which later I will seek to insert in *Hansard* without my reading it, I make that point quite clearly. I challenge members who accuse me of grandstanding to ask the public what they think about this proposition. In introducing this Bill I have also addressed the matter of tolerances in the redistribution of boundaries. That is dealt with later in my explanation, because at the moment the tolerance is inadequate. I have in the past attacked the results of commissions. I did that quite openly,

because I believed that they had been a failure, in the sense of democracy.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Henley Beach or any other honourable member is quite at liberty to distribute my explanation in their electorate. If they think that there is no community support for those principles and actions that I propose in this Bill, and if they give me the opportunity, I am quite happy to distribute it for them.

Mr Klunder interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I ask the member for Todd to repeat that, because I missed the first part of his interjection. If it related to why I sought to get into a House that I believe already has too many members, I can only say that, if this Bill is passed and I have to represent more electors, I will work just as hard as I did last time. I am sure that would apply to every other member in this House and to any other person in the community who believed that they could do the job as well, if not better, than we do. That has nothing to do with how many members are in this House. That is because someone believes that they would like to be here and they see that as a goal to be achieved.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I am quite happy for the sort of snide remarks that are being made to continue, because I think it typifies the attitude of members, in that they are not prepared to look honestly at our situation. In the past, some of their colleagues represented 45 000 electors and still won, and some of their colleagues represented under 5 000 electors and still lost. That gives an indication of what has happened in the past, and I do not support that.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Fisher mentioned Queensland. I am quite keen and would be proud to distribute my explanation in his electorate. He suggests that he does not support this Bill but, because I have some contacts, resources and voluntary manpower in his electorate, I would be interested to distribute my proposition to the people in the electorate of Fisher to see what they think of it. It would be also interesting to see if he is prepared to stand there and tell them I am wrong.

I did not intend to digress from my explanation, but interjections have necessitated that. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them two tables which are of a statistical nature.

Leave granted.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF DISTRICTS SHOWING NUMBER OF HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ELECTORS

	At Time of Redistribution 29 July 1983	At Time of Rolls 14 March 1985	At Time of Election 7 December 1985
Adelaide	19 221	19 376	19 116
Albert Park	19 217	20 254	20 094
Alexandra	17 574	19 338	19 890
Baudin	18 230	19 790	20 066
Bragg	19 786	20 094	19 995
Briggs	17 133	17 973	18 158
Bright	18 438	19 477	19 601
Chaffey	19 065	19 689	19 614
Coles	17 664	18 016	17 859
Custance	17 565	18 293	18 133
Davenport	18 011	18 482	18 730
Elizabeth	17 034	17 744	17 025
Eyre	17 143	17 676	17 676
Fisher	18 463	20 807	21 998
Flinders	18 164	18 906	18 901
Florey	18 593	19 537	19 449
Gilles	18 735	18 668	18 297
Goyder	19 390	20 549	20 923
Hanson	19 160	19 497	19 196
Hartley	19 070	19 787	19 402
Hayward	18 646	18 877	18 652
Henley Beach	19 549	20 124	19 790
Heysen	17 392	18 694	19 089
Kavel	18 306	19 694	20 085
Light	18 906	19 812	19 981
Mawson	18 165	19 703	19 724
Mitcham	19 912	19 925	19 758
Mitchell	18 576	19 055	18 866
Morphett	18 502	18 846	18 683
Mount Gambier	18 192	18 899	18 742
Murray-Mallee	18 868	19 728	19 662
Napier	17 118	18 280	18 156
Newland	18 940	20 009	20 237
Norwood	18 923	18 952	18 826
Peake	19 848	20 093	19 668
Playford	19 207	19 373	19 283
Price	20 193	20 591	19 905
Ramsay	17 844	19 293	19 586
Ross Smith	18 941	19 646	19 177
Semaphore	18 553	18 938	18 934
Spence	19 870	19 840	19 554
Stuart	18 896	19 152	18 880
Todd	18 117	18 861	18 867
Unley	19 902	19 710	19 576
Victoria	19 653	20 354	20 139
Walsh	19 773	19 430	18 998
Whyalla	18 793	18 999	18 566

NUMBER OF ELECTORS IN THE OLD HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS AT 14 MARCH 1985

Spence	15 289
Ross Smith	15 926
Adelaide	16 306
Bragg	16 485
Victoria	16 602
Price	16 642
Eyre	16 700
Mallee	16 733
Peake	16 771
Ascot Park	16 813
Unley	16 832
Mitcham	16 901
Morphett	17 051
Glenelg	17 116
Norwood	17 174
Whyalla	17 224
Torrens	17 255
Gilles	17 479
Flinders	17 550
Florey	17 589
Mitchell	17 646
Stuart	18 224
Hanson	18 237
Rocky River	18 272
Light	18 490
Goyder	18 808
Mount Gambier	19 248
Semaphore	19 296
Davenport	19 481
Hartley	19 787
Brighton	19 924
Napier	19 964
Henley Beach	20 007
Chaffey	20 114
Kavel	20 718
Elizabeth	20 999
Playford	21 016
Coles	21 088
Murray	21 287
Albert Park	21 374
Todd	22 503
Alexandra	23 214
Salisbury	25 360
Newland	26 095

NUMBER OF ELECTORS IN THE OLD HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY DISTRICTS AT 14 MARCH 1985

Baudin	26 336
Fisher	26 541
Mawson	28 465

Mr S.G. EVANS: I seek leave to have the remainder of my second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

The history of this Parliament becoming a 69 member Parliament goes back to the 1968 election, when all the hogwash of debate about so-called solutions to unequal numbers in electorates was being paraded before the people. At that election, the Liberal Party went to the people with a policy of a 45 seat plan and the Labor Party, 56. The vote was even with Liberal and Labor winning 19 seats each—an Independent, as Speaker, gave power to the Liberals. The reason neither Party went for a 39 seat Lower House was Party political. The Labor Party, by going to 56 seats, aimed to keep the electorates small enough to retain their country regional town strongholds—Millicent, Mount Gambier, with a chance in Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend, and, of course the Iron Triangle.

The Liberal Party 45 seat plan was an attempt to keep what was seen as manageable size seats in the sparsely populated areas. The Liberal Party on attaining government, saw an advantage of moving to 47 in lieu of 45, because it gave a chance of creating seats small enough to stop towns like Whyalla dominating a large sparsely populated area. I fully appreciate that in moving for a 39 seat Lower House, if the previous attitudes of the Electoral Commission prevail, some of the country electorates would be even more unfairly treated. But the Electoral Commission can do a lot better with the right will and suport of political Parties.

The first statistical table that I have inserted in *Hansard* relates to the number of electors in the old electorates at the time of changing the rolls at 14 March 1985. It is quite obvious that the 1976 redistribution did little to promote the principle of one vote one value, or equal numbers in electorates. By March 1985, just before the new redistribution, it was obvious to any fair-minded person that the interpretation put on section 83 of the Constitution Act was unjust, and made a farce of the claims by the Labor Party of one vote one value.

The second table displays the unfairness that is already evident as a result of the 1983 redistribution. Section 83 clearly gives the commission the opportunity to take a realistic approach to keep electorates more evenly balanced between redistribution. However, it failed to do so in 1976 and perpetuated similar inequalities in the 1983 redistribution. The commission has continued to place far too much emphasis on existing electorate boundaries, and political Party desires, and has blindly turned its eye on the obvious population changes that are known, or are known will occur.

There was loud applause by the proponents of equal numbers in electorates for the 1976 distribution, with the 10 per cent tolerance being used. Yet, so bad was the judgement on population changes in that redistribution that by March 1985, Spence had 15 289 electors and Mawson 28 465—yes, 13 176 more in one electorate than the other, or 86 per cent. If that does not make a farce of the claim one vote one value under present practice, what will?

This Bill seeks to change the 10 per cent tolerance to 20 per cent because practice has shown that the 10 per cent does not give the commission the latitude it needs to consider huge electorates like Eyre and Murray-Mallee, nor the rapid growth areas of metropolitan Adelaide—even though they could have done a lot better under existing 10 per cent provision. Further proof of the unsatisfactory result of the last redistribution is shown where the country electorates of Victoria, Kavel, Goyder, Alexandra, Murray-Mallee and Chaffey now have more electors than 25 densely populated areas of Adelaide or large regional towns.

The commission's last two unsatisfactory redistributions have shown that even the Labor Party accepts that a tolerance up to 25 per cent is quite acceptable. For example, they have never made a whimper regarding the discrepancies in numbers of electors in present electorates, even though they know that new Fisher will have in excess of 27 000 by the end of this Parliament's four years. Also, by then Elizabeth will probably be under 17 000. The quota by 1990 will be approximately 19 500, making Elizabeth 13 per cent below quota and Fisher 38 per cent over quota—63 per cent more electors than Elizabeth. Where is this so-called democracy of equal numbers in electorates and one vote one value that the herald angels for democracy of the sixties and seventies chanted?

I said in the 1969 redistribution debate that I was reluctant to support the 47 seat plan, but more importantly I saw the injustice to those members representing the large country seats. Likewise, I have, on many occasions, made this House aware of the unfairness of making the electorates in growth areas on or above quota at redistribution, when they should be at the lowest level of tolerance.

I ask members to study the tables that this House has allowed me to insert in *Hansard* and to forget self or Party and to then make an assessment of where the justice is with the last two redistributions. Quite frankly, no person could honestly claim that it is fair for the member for Eyre to have more electors to represent than the member for Elizabeth. Nor is it proper for the member for Fisher to have an electorate of 27 000 plus in a growth area while many other established areas have 10 000 less. Some may claim that section 88 does not allow for a change to the tolerance without a referendum, but that part of section 88 that refers to section 77 only refers to the principle in that section, and the principle is that there be a tolerance. This Parliament has the power to change that tolerance.

With a commission using the powers it has under section 83, but placing more emphasis on likely population changes and with the right to increase the tolerance up to 20 per cent, then this State could have a greater equality of numbers in electorates during the full period of a redistribution. Plus, give whoever has to represent the vast sparsely populated areas of this State, the chance of a manageable electorate. The change to 20 per cent tolerance is fundamental in seeking to achieve a fair go for people living in the growth and remote areas of this State and to reduce the cost to society by having fewer parliamentarians.

I do not believe that this Bill calls for the implementation of the entrenchment clauses. However, if the Government claims it does, and believes the people of South Australia will not accept a 20 per cent tolerance, I challenge the Premier to pass this Bill and then, before it becomes law, put it to a referendum as provided under section 88. Mr Speaker, you know, he knows and I know, that the people would leap at the opportunity to get rid of the excess of

members in this Parliament and allow a 20 per cent tolerance.

I refer to the issue of the actual number of members of Parliament. Referring briefly to 1969, when the number of electorates was increased from 39 to 47, let me point out that I was not an advocate for the increase and, in fact, only reluctantly supported a 45 seat plan. As I was new to Parliament, I was unsure of how far I should go with my objections in an evenly divided House. One had to be aware that the press, as is always the case, does nothing to make it easier to express a view different to that of one's Party, because they like to call it a split—not a healthy sign for democracy. Yes, I must admit it makes good news, but it does not make for the best democracy a society can achieve where Parliament is dominated by Party machines.

We should never have increased the size of this Parliament at that time, and it only came about because of an election promise by both Parties trying to capitalise on the back-lash of the then huge discrepancies in numbers per electorate. The sitting members of that time were looking at what was the best system that would allow them to continue winning as individuals as well as for their Party. It is obvious that we have reached the stage where the people of Australia are tired of seeing Parties and politicians considering their own situation first. I am convinced, by experience, that I could represent 30 000 electors in the more densely populated areas of Adelaide, and so could any other elected members if they made it a full-time venture. At the moment some do not.

As at the last election, Salisbury, Newland, Baudin, Fisher and Mawson all had more than 25 000 electors. These are the most difficult parts of metropolitan Adelaide to represent, being rapidly developing areas, whilst 10 of the old established and fully developed areas had less than 17 000. So, if those five members representing the outer metropolitan area could manage over 25 000 electors, the representatives of the inner metropolitan area could easily represent 28 000 to 30 000 as this Bill would provide for.

At the last election, there were 905 000 electors in the State and, with a 39 seat redistribution, the quota would be approximately 23 500 with a 20 per cent tolerance as provided in this Bill. This would give the opportunity to make Eyre 18 800—which is 1 000 more than at present and it would make the upper limit, as stated earlier, just over 28 000 for the densely populated areas. At the last election, there were 905 000 electors in the State and, with a 39 seat redistribution, the quota would be approximately 23 500 with a 20 per cent tolerance as provided in this Bill. This would give the opportunity to make Eyre 18 800—which is 1 000 more than at present and it would make the upper limit, as stated earlier, just over 28 000 for the densely populated areas. The present Eyre District will gain from Roxby Downs, but it is unlikely it would be by 1 000, but at least Flinders would not need to intrude because it is at 18 900 (which is within the 20 per cent tolerance).

Therefore, this Bill does not bring about an intolerable position for those members who have to travel huge distances and spend much of their time away from their families. It also retains some semblance of a chance for their electors to catch up with them at least on some occasions. While in the metropolitan area, even if there was no fuel available, we could still service our electorates on a push bike. There is no doubt that the vast majority of Australians support the view we are over governed and over regulated. But, if there is a move to remove any regulation that protects an individual or a group. They become agitated, and the same applies to those who apply to have new regulations introduced to give them an advantage or to protect an advantage that they already hold.

Likewise, a person cannot be in Parliament for as long as I have without realising that the change I seek to achieve by this Bill will annoy some sitting members and those vultures sitting in the wings of the political organisation. Yes, they are waiting like vultures for any sacrificial lamb so that they can grab a seat. However, I ask members not to see this proposed change as an attack on them or their ability. In fact, it is fair to say that, in proposing a smaller Parliament, I have faith in the ability of members, because I know that any one of us could manage any two of the present metropolitan electorates. For us to argue that we could not would be admitting that fellow members, for example, in New South Wales, are far more capable than we. At the last New South Wales election, the electorate with the least number of electors was Broken Hill, with 28 935, whilst the most was in Campbelltown, with 41,160, which is double the number in 42 of our 47 seats.

In Victoria their members, although apparently not quite as capable as those in New South Wales, do well, for as at the election on 2 March 1985 the seat with the lowest number was in Broadmeadows with 27 859, the highest being 32 137 in Footscray. Of course, our Federal colleagues also represent people, and they average over 65,000 electors in their electorates. So, there is no argument regarding the capacity that a person with even moderate ability could quite comfortably represent 30 000 electors and the other residents in an inner city seat.

I am not forgetting committee work that some members of Parliament carry out, or the responsibilities that we have in this House, but we only sit on average a little more than one working day per week—and in fact this year it will only be about half a day a week. Were the politicians of the sixties more capable than the present members? If not, how did they achieve what they did? For example, the State was not plunged into a huge debt like we have now, so they must have been better managers. Yet, some of them represented huge numbers of electors. Not only did they represent such large numbers, but also they did it successfully with the people showing their satisfaction by re-electing most of those with huge numbers in their electorate.

In the 1965 election, Enfield had 39 000 electors, Glenelg 35 000, West Torrens 35 000, Burnside 33 000 and Edwardstown 32 000. In 1968 Burnside had 37 000 electors, Enfield 45 000, Gawler 35 000, Glenelg 37 000 and West Torrens 39 000. Whilst these huge numbers were the upper bracket, others like Frome had fewer than 5 000. That is the type of injustice that people saw as a gerrymander, not, as I propose, a 20 per cent tolerance.

So, it has been proven beyond doubt that we can represent a much greater number of electors than we do now; plus, we also have the following advantages the members prior to the seventies did not have. We have electorate and Parliament house offices with a personal assistant, where previously members had only a Parliament House office and a secretary to five members—similar conditions to what the Upper House members have at the moment. There was no Ombudsman and Government departments and statutory bodies did not have a public relations complaints appointee to deal with the public as most have now. The Education Department, Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Community Welfare, Federal Social Security, Police Department, Housing Trust, Government Insurance and a multitude of other Government bodies were not regionalised to be nearer the people as they are now.

The youth agencies, women's shelters, crisis care of all sorts and local support services were not available. Yet,

most of the complaints handled by these agencies now were handled by the members of Parliament before the seventies. I experienced those times in this Parliament and must admit that it was a little bit surprising to have longer serving colleagues suggest it was better to answer correspondence in long-hand because electors appreciated this more—little did they know how bad my writing is.

Surely, if those members of that era could represent up to 45 000 and continue to win, and the New South Wales and Victorians represent well over 30 000, why cannot we do so? I am not suggesting we should return to the pre-1970 conditions for members of Parliament, and I admit that I was the first to seek to have the Government of the day provide electorate offices and secretaries for members. At that time, the Hon. David Brookman made the point to me that, if electorate offices were provided, members of Parliament would end up being the most highly paid social welfare workers in the State. More recent history has shown that he was in the main right, except that some Community Welfare officers receive a salary that provides much more to spend on their family than that provided to members of State Parliament.

Admittedly, there has been an increase in the number of matters that people come to members' offices with, but most of them can be taken care of by members' capable personal assistants. As much as some of the public may believe the State could get by with a huge decrease in the number of parliamentarians, there is a lower limit required to operate this Parliament. I am not going to try to establish in this debate, for example, how many Ministers there should be or how many of the battalion of their minders should be sent packing.

The lower limit for Parliament to operate is possibly 33, but to achieve that and allow people outside the densely populated area reasonable representation would need a tolerance greater than 20 per cent. That could be justified if there was a provision in the Constitution to allow for a group that polled more than 50 per cent of the State vote to appoint the numbers required to govern. Even this provision would be unlikely to be called into practice very often, but would if used to take the number above 33 for that Parliament. The only other satisfactory method would be to introduce 11 multiple three member electorates for a 33 member House.

These are major changes which are not likely to be achieved for years, but those in this Bill are simple and would save well over $1 million a year, if we consider members' salaries, superannuation, office rentals, plus staff, etc. Also, there would be no more demand for extra office space at Parliament House, which is ever lurking in the corridors. Part of the saving could be spent on the reduced number of Legislative Councillors, because the present conditions under which they operate are ludicrous. Where else in Australia would we find a group of employed people of executive salaries and allowances of over $50 000 and no personal secretary?

In fact, it would be fair to say if the Government made the secretaries' salaries saved by having less House of Assembly members available to Upper House members, we could reduce the size of that House to 16. I challenge members, when talking to secondary school groups, to suggest to them that we have 22 members of Parliament operating under such conditions—note the look of amazement, if not disgust.

Going a little further, many students are learning to use computers and word processors: perhaps we could tell the students that we do not have such essential equipment in our offices, except in those cases where individuals were in a position to purchase their own. They would be further amazed. It is inevitable such facilities will eventually be provided, so why not support this Bill and use some of the money saved to provide modern and efficient equipment? By providing proper modern equipment to fewer members and secretarial staff to the Upper House, we can be more efficient and effective as members, and thereby achieve more with fewer members, and less taxpayers funds.

I point out again that this is not an attack on sitting members: it is what I see as an honest assessment of our operations in doing our best to represent people. When this Bill passes, we will all fight like the devil to represent the greater number of electors provided for. We and many others will not hesitate to pound the decision-makers' doors saying, 'Elect me—I am capable of representing all people in this area with ease.'

What sitting member who intends standing at the next election will announce their retirement after this Bill becomes law? I would say not one of us. There is no need to kid ourselves, as there are plenty out there prepared, willing and capable of doing the job. As is traditional, some will in this debate say we should abolish Upper Houses or State Parliaments, etc., and one argument that will be used will be the need for more efficiencies in the public sector. I agree with that, and a more efficient Parliament is the first step in setting the scene for that goal to be achieved.

I ask members to support this Bill, knowing that it will mean that some of us will go by the board, but does that matter if we are genuinely concerned about our State and its people? It would be sad if any of us felt that if we lost our seat, we could not earn a living. We chose of our own free will to be members of Parliament, and when the proposal in this Bill becomes law none of us need renominate if we believe, for example, that we could not represent 30 000 electors in metropolitan Adelaide. I ask members to recognise the need to reduce the number of members of Parliament and support this important Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the provisions in this Bill to come into operation immediately before writs are issued for the next State election. Clause 3 seeks to delete section 11 of the principal Act and substitute a new section which provides the method of reducing the number of Legislative Councillors from 22 to 18 over two general elections, except if there is dissolution of the Legislative Council under section 41—the reduction would be automatically to 18 at the subsequent election.

Clause 4 amends section 14 to make provision for the number of members to retire and the number of members to be elected at elections to achieve and maintain a Legislative Council of 18 members. Clause 5 clarifies the order of retirement in establishing an 18 member Legislative Council. Clause 6 amends section 16 changing from 10 to 9 the number for a quorum in the Legislative Council.

Clause 7 amends section 27 by reducing the number of the House of Assembly members from 47 to 39. Clause 8 amends section 37 of the principal Act to change from 17 to 14 the quorum for the House of Assembly. Clause 9 amends section 77 by increasing the permissible tolerance to 20 per cent without affecting the principle as enshrined in that section, i.e., a tolerance.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROPERTY VALUES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Lands to initiate an immediate investigation into the reasons why in many instances

land and property values being determined by the Valuer-General do not reflect the true market value.

I move this motion in a constructive manner. Its content is of real concern to every person in South Australia. This motion is not an attack on the Government or the Valuer-General. In a time when the economy of the State is in decline and land and house values are falling, there are real problems with rates and taxes. It is essential that true market or site value is determined so that a fair and equitable rates and taxes system can be applied right across South Australia.

When a valuation determined by the Valuer-General is not absolutely accurate, the rates and taxes paid by a resident—whether council or water rates, which are determined on site or capital values—are in excess of their true share of taxes. This matter has recently been highlighted in the September issue of *Farmer and Stockowner*, the front page of which, under the heading 'Rural fightback over rising rates', states:

South Australian farmers, already plagued by a downturn in the rural economy, are demanding an end to what they claim are iniquities in council rating systems. There is growing unrest over councils imposing increased rates against sharp declines in land values and farm incomes.

Further on, under the heading 'Land prices crashing' the article states:

Land values in areas of Eyre Peninsula have crashed by up to 50 per cent in the past year.

This dramatic situation has been revealed by the South Australian Valuer-General, Mr John Darley.

Other areas of the State had suffered major setbacks because of the rural downturn, with land values in lower parts of Yorke Peninsula falling by 40 per cent in 12 months.

Mr Darley confirmed the issue of rising council rates at a time of crashing land values was 'starting to hurt' farmers.

There had been an increase this year in the number of requests by farmers to have their land revalued after the imposition of new council rates.

'When Australians are pushed into a corner they are likely to resist,' he said. 'The picture is not good.'

Mr Darley said since last year South Australian land was revalued on an annual basis while previously one-fifth of the State was valued each year.

However, few farm sales were occurring because of the rural downturn and valuations had to be largely based on depressed asking prices or last bids at auctions.

'I know of one property on Eyre Peninsula which was worth $1 million a year ago. Today it is worth $500 000,' Mr Darley said.

That indicates clearly the dilemma that the Valuer-General has in accurately determining the site or capital value of properties. In many instances properties have been put up for auction and, in the main, they are not selling.

In the Riverland we find that small parcels of land—three and four acres—with a house on them are selling extremely well. These properties are being taken up by people who do not intend to make a living off the land. Mostly they are public servants and other business people who prefer the rural residential style of living, which is a very desirable way to live. Unfortunately, the money that is being paid per acre for that sort of land is way in excess of what a commercial property is bringing.

Unfortunately, the valuations tend to reflect the value that is being paid for very small parcels of land. Consequently, when that is applied to larger commercial undertakings, such as vineyards or orchards, a massively high valuation is arrived at—in fact, there is no way on earth that these valuations could be realised. In fact, very few commercial horticultural properties are being sold at all. The situation is totally out of balance. As I said, I appreciate the dilemma with which the Valuer-General is faced. However, it is a problem that must be resolved by the Government if we are to be fair and equitable to all concerned in this State.

I now refer briefly to the notional value position that applies in South Australia. Back on 11 February 1981, as Minister of Lands, I introduced the Statutes Amendment (Valuation of Land) Bill to bring in notional values, at which time I said:

This Bill gives effect to the Government's election promise to introduce legislation providing that valuation for rating and taxing purposes is, in certain cases, to be made on the basis of the actual use of the land rather than its potential use, and providing more realistic and understandable bases for valuation.

The crux of that legislation was contained in clause 7, as follows:

The following section is inserted after section 22 of the principal Act:

22a. (1) The owner of land is entitled to the benefit of this section in respect of the valuation of land by a valuing authority if—

(a) the owner—

(i) has an estate of fee simple in the land;

(ii) holds the land by virtue of a Crown lease, or an agreement to purchase from the Crown;
or

(iii) is the occupier of the land by virtue of his shareholding in a body corporate of a kind referred to in paragraph *(b)* (ii).

(b) the conditions laid down in any one of the following subparagraphs are satisfied:

(i) the owner of the land is a natural person, the land constitutes his principal place of residence, and is not used for any commercial or industrial purpose:

(ii) the land is vested in a body corporate and—

(A) the whole of the land vested in the body corporate consists of a group of dwellings and land appurtenant to those dwellings;

(B) all issued shares of the body corporate are owned by shareholders who acquire exclusive rights to occupy land of the body corporate by virtue of their shareholdings;

(C) the land constitutes the principal place of residence of a natural person who is a shareholder in the body corporate;
and

(D) the land is not used for a commercial or industrial purpose;
or

(iii) the land is used for the business of primary production;

The clause goes on, but that is the crux of what it was all about. It was to determine a valuation of the land that I have just specified and that it be based on the purpose for which the land is being used.

Other members on this side will refer to instances within their own electorates, particularly in the metropolitan area, where notional values are not being applied. In instances where the land is for residential use, it is valued on the basis that a potential use could be for a block of flats, and a far greater rate would be applied to the total if a block of flats was constructed on that site. There are significant problems in relation to the valuation of land in this State, particularly for rating and taxing purposes. I urge the Minister to support the motion and carry out an immediate investigation as to how the Valuer-General can more satisfactorily provide equitable valuations across South Australia in the interests of all residents.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I very strongly support this resolution put forward by my colleague the member for Chaffey. The matter of valuations has been a matter of concern with me for a long time. Probably we have had more examples in the last few months of problems in that area than have been experienced previously. The member for Chaffey has referred to some of those concerns and I do not intend today to go over them. I want to have the

opportunity to continue my remarks next week, when I will be able to bring more detail into the House. I want to refer particularly to the matter of notional valuation, again a matter that has been touched on by the member for Chaffey.

I had the opportunity to attend a meeting with the member for Chaffey at Kangarilla very recently. This meeting came about following a very long period of attempting, through the Minister's office and through the office of the Valuer-General, to come to terms with problems being experienced down there by genuine primary producers who find that the value on their land has reached a stage where it is becoming virtually impossible for them to continue in primary production. This has resulted from an increase in development in the area of Kangarilla down towards the Southern Vales becoming a much more sought after area for hobby farms. Much of the area previously held by genuine primary producers is being divided up into smaller allotments and so being used by these hobby farmers.

Over time I have continued to receive correspondence from some of these people being affected asking me what can be done about it. I have continually referred to the changes we made to the Valuation Act when in Government and when the then Minister of Lands, the member for Chaffey, introduced amendments to the Bill, so making it possible for valuations to be carried out on a notional basis. The whole idea of that was to assist people who wanted to continue on as genuine primary producers so that they were not faced with increased valuations and the taxes, rates, etc. that go with that. When I had spoken to the Minister's office I was unable to receive any gains through contact I made or representation I made. I was virtually told that the idea of notional values had been forgotten, that while there might have been changes made to the Act it was found now not to be practical to continue with that process. It was as a result of that and letters written by my constituents that a meeting was called.

The Valuer-General and other valuers were invited and I was asked whether I would bring my colleague the member for Chaffey to that meeting. Some of the things sorted out on that occasion were quite remarkable, indeed, and it concerns me considerably that over an extended period people have been putting up with hardship when in fact it was very easy for us to solve the problems by getting around the table the other night. Letters have been written indicating that notional value was not to be taken into account, yet when specific examples were able to be provided to those at the meeting the other night the required changes appeared to be made. I am not being critical of the Valuer-General, as he has been very fair over this matter. He was very keen the other night to be able to solve some of the problems that are being experienced. I would like to have the opportunity to bring greater detail into this debate on a future occasion.

As a result of constituents making representations to me and an approach being made to the Minister's office to try to have some of the problems referred to followed up, we have been able to obtain some rather significant results. That in itself is good. It is good that if a person complains about the increases in a valuation, comes to me, and I take it up with the Minister, some results are obtained. The fact is that the reductions that have been achieved have been significant indeed. I find it hard to accept that few people have the knowledge and the determination to go to their local member and have the matter taken up through the Minister's office and only then receive assistance and a proper valuation recorded. It seems a pity that only a few people are able to do that or seek to do that. There are obviously many others who are disadvantaged.

I think particularly of an elderly constituent who approached me fairly recently on another matter and it was purely by accident that we were able to talk about her valuation. I suggested that it should be followed up and, as a result, a considerable reduction was obtained. That person had not thought to either appeal or follow it up through her local member's office to see if the valuation could in fact be reduced. However, having done that, she is much better off as a result of the charges, taxes and rates that she will be paying from now on. I have considerably more that I want to raise, but I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House, recognising that for the Parliament to work effectively it is essential that the public be kept informed of matters being dealt with, calls on the Speaker, as the appropriate spokesperson for the House, to take immediate steps to negotiate with either of the two major newspapers to facilitate the printing of a list detailing the business of the House on each day that Parliament is in session.

Many of us speak in this place on various subjects, sometimes because we feel strongly, and sometimes just because the opportunity is provided. I feel particularly strongly about this matter. Over some time, I have sought ways of being able to involve my constituents in the work carried on in this Parliament. I am sure that most of us are here because we feel it is our responsibility and duty to represent the people who elected us as their local member in the House of Assembly. I suggest that, if we genuinely feel that we are reflecting the views of the people who put us here, we are very much mistaken.

I do not know about other members: those who participate in this debate might be able to explain how they keep in touch with their electorate and inform people of the matters that are before this House for resolution. I would be interested to know how other members do that. I certainly make every effort to keep my constituents informed. I send out newsletters outlining some of the matters that are being dealt with, but it is an unfortunate fact of life that, by the time most people receive those newsletters, the matters that they detail have been dealt with. We all know the practice of this House: it is usual that, within a week or so of a Bill's being introduced, the matter has been dealt with by the House and has either gone before the other place or has become law.

It is particularly frustrating when a Bill is passed before I have sought out those who might be interested in it, forwarded the Bill to them for comment and received their reply. We all know the situation: nine times out of 10 it is too late to take into account the views expressed by those people. Even if we can consider their views and even if newsletters are sent out, unless that is done on a weekly or fortnightly basis when the House is sitting, it is impossible to let the majority of people know what is going on. It is easy enough for us to say that most of the people out there do not really want to know, that they are not interested in what happens in this Parliament, but I do not believe that that is a good enough reason for us to just hide our work in a closet and not let people know what issues are before us here. We should be doing everything possible to inform people, to let them know how they can be involved by putting their thoughts before this Parliament in debate. Every member has that opportunity and should be representing the views of their constituents.

If members really feel that we are achieving what I see as one of the main purposes of this place—to represent the

views of the people who put us here—we are failing dismally. I am sure that, if we were honest, we would all recognise that that is the case. We can all determine how best to overcome that problem, and I have thought about it considerably. I have talked to a lot of people. I am sure that all members would have a particular method for trying to obtain opinions and comments from various sections of their electorate.

I do that through what I loosely describe as my grapevine, and that has been the case since I came into the Parliament. Although I have represented virtually three different seats during my time in this place, I have always had access to a few people who I feel are fairly representative: I can go to them for their opinion and discuss issues with them. I am sure that most members in this place work in that way. It seems absolutely crazy to me that in this State 99 per cent of people have no idea what is before the Parliament today. We hope that people might be interested, but if they are not perhaps it is the fault of the members of this place and the way in which Parliament works, because we are not encouraging people to become informed.

I have done research on this subject over a period, and this motion has been before the House on a number of occasions. But for some unknown reason on each occasion it has been turned down, some members deciding that it is not a good idea. My proposal has not attracted the majority. I am not sure how that has come about: I can only assume that most members do not support the idea of keeping the electorate informed.

Mr Tyler: Come on.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The honourable member may say 'Come on,' but I should like to know whether he can suggest a better way of keeping this State informed than by publicising matters dealt with by the House. I certainly cannot see anything wrong with that. Indeed, I can see no disadvantage in making people informed. It may do something to inform the people of South Australia on how this Parliament works and what we are doing. It might, in fact, improve the standing of parliamentarians currently if a few more people knew the complexities and the variety of work that was being done in this place, as well as the many issues debated and the motions brought before the House.

Therefore, it would seem sensible for you, Mr Speaker, in your position in this House to be the one to confer with either of the two major daily newspapers, because I have suggested in my motion that that is the appropriate way to go. Personally, I believe that, if the business of the House on each sitting day was printed in the *Advertiser*, as the morning newspaper, that would be the best way to go about it. I cannot see the *Advertiser* being too upset about it: I cannot see that it would take up much space. Every morning in the *Advertiser* certain subjects are always referred to and, if people knew that on a certain page of the *Advertiser* they could see what business was being debated here, if they felt strongly about it they could find out what was going on, ring their local member, express their viewpoint and, if they had a chance, come into this Chamber to hear the debate.

I believe that the *Advertiser* would be more appropriate than the *News* because it is the morning paper and could refer to that day's sittings rather than those of the following day. It is vitally important that the people of this State know what happens in this place and what matters are being dealt with. Having considered at great length how best that can be achieved, I believe that the best way is for the business of the House to be printed in the newspaper every day on which the House sits. I strongly urge members to support the motion and will be most interested to hear any points that they may wish to put.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I wish to make a couple of points briefly on what I consider is an outstanding move. As the member for Heysen has pointed out, it is indeed a sad reflection on the Parliament that the business of the day in both Chambers is not published somewhere for the general public and that we have taken no trouble to ensure that it is. There is no better way of keeping the public informed on what is happening in Parliament. I have found much misunderstanding (perhaps a more accurate word would be 'ignorance') of how Parliament deals with its business, and to have published the proceedings of the House, at least in the terms of the Notice Paper, over the years would have meant that the level of ignorance was reduced.

I think members in this place would have been better understood than we obviously are at present. I think we have done ourselves a disservice by keeping that information from the public and making no attempt to remedy that situation. I wonder, however, when looking at the specific terminology of this motion, why the member for Heysen has simply taken the minimum position in the proposition by stating:

> . . . to take immediate steps to negotiate with either of the two major newspapers.

Perhaps the honourable member had in mind that the two major newspapers were the *Australian* and one other. In any event, to negotiate with all three newspapers would seem to me a good idea. In the main, my constituents would not receive a daily newspaper. Less than 20 per cent of households in the old electorate of Mallee used to receive a daily newspaper (it was not even delivered but simply collected two or three times and sometimes only once a week from the major country town). So, the information in question would not have reached my constituents anyway. That still holds true for the larger part of the electorate I represent.

Notwithstanding that, I still advocate this move, as it would at least get the information to residents in the nearby towns of Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend and Meningie. It is for that reason that I commend the member for Heysen for putting this motion on the Notice Paper and urging you, Mr Speaker, as our spokesman, to take up this matter. If you need assistance in negotiating with any or all of the editorial interests of those newspapers, you can count on my support. I commend the motion to all members and can see no reason at all for opposing it.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): It is my intention to make a few points on behalf of you, Mr Speaker, because you have been called on to take some action in this area, and I believe that it is not the first time a request has been made of the Speaker. One of our previous Speakers, the Hon. B.C. Eastick (the member for Light), was in the same situation and did, in fact, take some action in the area to which I wish to refer. Members would be aware, of course, that if there were to be a program published it could only be a proposed program, and this presents some difficulty. It is just like a railway timetable: if the timetable is printed and the train does not turn up, the customers get a bit upset.

The printing of a proposed program which does not eventuate could, in itself, cause some problems. Members would know that the parliamentary procedures are in a state of constant change, and matters can be delayed for a variety of reasons. Some items are brought forward, usually by mutual agreement and at short notice, and often at the request of either side of the House. So, the printing of a program has its difficulties. The principles enunciated by the member for Heysen would, of course, be upheld by every member in this House.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am about to, if the honourable members will be patient. I will say what has been done and why there would be difficulties. There are logistic difficulties with the media, particularly with newspaper deadlines, even with modern technology and, in fact, quite often because of modern technology. The previous speaker referred to the possibilities of having notices printed in the *Australian*. I am totally in favour of having the *Australian* printed in Adelaide, and in fact at one stage it was printed in Adelaide. If that occurred, the consequent job creation would be something to be applauded. Unfortunately, the *Australian* is printed in Sydney, and the deadlines for the *Australian* are even earlier than are those for the *Advertiser*. So, the opportunity of getting hold of a notice in the *Australian* is very remote indeed.

Mr Lewis: About two hours.

Mr FERGUSON: No. The honourable member opposite shows his ignorance of the newspaper industry. The first edition of the *Australian* goes out at something like 10.30 p.m. Sydney time. The first pages of that paper are put together at about 5.30 p.m. Only the last pages are kept open before the paper is put to bed. Therefore, we are talking about having to get a notice in even before Parliament starts. The notice for the next day would have to be provided at a time when no-one would have a clue of what the Notice Paper ought to be—that not being known until the previous sitting has finished. So, the honourable member is suggesting that someone would make up a program on the basis of what might happen the next day. It is just not possible. The previous speaker in this debate, the member for Light, negotiated very successfully in 1978 with the *Advertiser* management, who agreed to summarise the proposed weekly parliamentary program on the second to last page of each Tuesday morning's *Advertiser*. I would bet that not too many people in the House knew that.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It was some time after 1978.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, but the negotiations commenced in 1978, I understand. I want to give the member for Light due credit for what occurred during the time when he was Speaker. That brief 'In Parliament' column has appeared from time to time since then, but on many occasions logistic problems have prevented it from being published. It may be significant that its absence has never invoked any unfavourable comment, suggesting that its presence or absence goes equally unnoticed by the citizens of South Australia. No complaints have been made when the column has not been printed.

The main problem with this arrangement stems from the press deadlines, which I have already mentioned. The problems that apply to the *Australian* also apply to the *Advertiser*. The country edition of the *Advertiser* is printed at about 11.30 p.m.—we know that, because we often read the first edition of the *Advertiser* here in the House at midnight. That gives it sufficient time to be printed. Pages 1 and 3 are left open until about 11 p.m., but the earlier pages of the *Advertiser* are printed earlier. In fact, the compositors start to put the paper together in the early afternoon.

Those compositors are very skilful. I am sure that members can appreciate the problems involved in negotiating deadlines. A daily program appearing in the *Advertiser* would create difficulties for the House of Assembly management, because it cannot determine its program for the next day until the House has risen. We often rise late in the evening, well past the *Advertiser*'s deadline. We cannot be sure of what is still left on the agenda.

A suggestion was made previously that a recorded telephone service be installed where interested members of the public could telephone Parliament House to inquire as to the tentative program for the day. Parliament would have difficulty in justifying the expense of about $5 000 in capital costs and $2 000 per annum for operating costs. The breakdown of those costs is as follows: service rental, $1 500 per annum; relay rental, $72 per annum; machine with message which must be purchased by Parliament, $4 500; a private line between Waymouth Street and North Terrace, $130 per annum; connection fee, $440; and tie line cost, $300. Even as late as yesterday I heard members complaining about not having enough money for facilities for their own electorate offices and it seems that this cost would not be justified.

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

LEADERSHIP OF LIBERAL MEMBERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House highly commends all Liberal members of Parliaments in Australia for the outstanding leadership displayed by them in promoting equal opportunities for all people, regardless of sex, race, physical ability, appearance, economic means and family background.

(Continued from 21 August. Page 543.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): This motion seeks to ensure that all members of the House and the general public understand the outstanding role that the Liberal Party has played in the history and development of Australian parliamentary institutions in promoting equal opportunities for all citizens in this country, regardless of their sex, race, physical ability, appearance, economic means and family background. I stand here as an—

Mr Gunn: An outstanding example.

Mr LEWIS: —outstanding example of the Liberal Party's leadership in that respect. With all due modesty (and I know I am no oil painting and the Mona Lisa leaves me so far behind that it would not even be a race between a snail and Ayrton Senna's Formula One, by comparison)—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I have no idea. I dare say that the member for Mawson will be quite happy to show her knowledge of history and the social development of South Australia and its community at large by supporting this motion. The motion does not reflect on any individual or organisation in South Australia; it merely commends the substantial part the Liberal Party has played in promoting such opportunities for anybody and everybody.

It is not only in terms of appearance that I can be regarded as an outstanding example of what the Liberal Party has done in this respect. It endorses people regardless of their appearance. I am fortunate, for if it was to take into account the physical features of the individual I am sure it would have chosen someone other than myself from among the ranks of those who sought endorsement in Coles in 1974 and then again in Mallee in 1979. Looking at economic means or family background, I draw the House's attention to the public misconception—indeed, the furphy—that has been perpetrated over many generations by journalists and others who tend to be leaders in setting public perceptions and opinions about this matter as it relates to the Liberal Party.

It has been thought that the Liberal Party consisted of people who came from backgrounds that were privileged—who were the sons and daughters of the wealthy, who had been given by virtue of birth some greater opportunity, whether in terms of education arising from their economic

means or by the amount of money they have in the bank. That is a furphy.

The Liberal Party ignores any such criteria because they are invalid. It has never been a part of the tenet of the Liberal Party. It, after all, can claim proudly on the world's stage to have been in responsible government during that period of time after the Second World War in which mankind in this nation established the most egalitarian society of any nation on earth at any point in history. In this country under a Liberal right-of-centre administration (in coalition with the Country Party as it was formerly known and the National Party as it is now known) the greatest percentage of the adult population came to own the home in which they lived and raised their family.

We ensured by our tax laws that greater numbers of people were also able to obtain not only more than satisfactory, compared with other countries, secondary standards of education according to their abilities but also tertiary or post-secondary academic qualifications. Indeed, many people came to this country from our neighbouring countries in the near north to study under the aegis of the Colombo Plan developed by that coalition in government. Our qualifications were recognised as second to none anywhere in the world.

Our educational institutions providing those qualifications were seen as equivalent to or better than such institutions anywhere else in the world. As a Party, then, we have made a great contribution to the development of an egalitarian civilised society that is robust and capable of coping with more rapid rates of change than any other society in the history of mankind—or humankind—as I am sure members would want me to describe the species 'Homo sapiens', since some of them have sensitivities about using a connotation which can otherwise have relevance to denoting sexuality.

Let us look at family background. Again, the Liberal Party has shown outstanding leadership by encouraging people, regardless of family background, to seek endorsement. I will use myself as an example of that, although there are other members in this place who have been longstanding members of the Liberal Party and who come from backgrounds where the family has been, in economic terms, less privileged than other families—the norm—in the community or families that were much larger than the norm at the time.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I made no secret of the fact. I tell the member for Stuart that I was a member of a large family. I still am, and proudly so, and they were all single births—10 single barrel shots. My mother knew what she was doing, I suppose, because nine of them were boys and one was a girl. In any case, none of us were neglected. Indeed, for one of us to have been found suitable by the Liberal Party for endorsement as a candidate to contest an election I think bears simple testimony to the fact that family background is not a yardstick that is used by the Liberal Party to decide whether or not it should endorse a citizen to contest an election. That has always been decided on merit, as judged by one's peers in the Party in the electorate for which one seeks endorsement.

Let us now look at the question of race. I refer to the post-war period after which one can say the ethnic origins of the majority of Australians had become more than a generation distant from the people who were in the main the incumbent young adults of the time. We had established something of an identity, of a national race where there had been an integration of people from Ireland, Germany, Scotland, Wales, England and even from Italy, Denmark and Sweden. Those people all settled here, established themselves and intermarried, as it were, regardless of ethnic origin, during the preceding 150 years. Then came a wave of migration. Senator Lajovic was the first person elected post-Second World War to have been born overseas and to adopt Australia as his home. Of course, he was European by birth, and he was a Liberal. He was elected to the Upper House from New South Wales. If we look, too, at the first person from those Australians living here prior to European settlement elected to the national Parliament, we find that Senator Bonner was the first person in that category. Senator Bonner from Queensland is of Aboriginal descent.

The Liberal Party has always ignored things like sex, race, physical ability, appearance, economic means and family background in determining whether or not the candidates whom it endorses—and whom finally the community at large elects to Parliament—are suitable. The Liberal Party has always stood for merit; it has always fostered the individual; and it has always encouraged excellence wherever it can be found in any of the fields of human endeavour. The Liberal Party has done that regardless of the criteria to which I have referred.

Elsewhere in *Hansard* in earlier debates I have referred to the huge majority of members of Parliament in the States of this nation and in the Commonwealth Parliament itself who, in the main, at the time of their election were Liberal Party members or members of the Parties which were predecessors of the Liberal Party. Furthermore, I have referred to the fact that the Liberal Party showed the way in the establishment of, as it were, equal opportunity legislation in this nation. Indeed, it was done in this State, in this Parliament and in this very House. In 1975 David Tonkin successfully had passage of the Sex Discrimination Act to establish for all time the fact that there shall be no basis in law for discriminating against one individual and for another individual on the basis of sexuality.

It is for those reasons that I stand here in this place proudly as a member of a great political Party which has done an enormous amount in the development of a pluralistic egalitarian society of people who are energetic and whose prosperity we recognise depends upon the society's ability, the society's commitment to recognise the individual's ability, the individual's merit and the individual's excellence in promoting such people on nothing other, nothing less and nothing more than merit.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

WASTE MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. H. Allison:

That the regulations under the South Australian Waste Management Commission Act 1979 relating to licence fees and wastes, made on 15 May and laid on the table of this House on 31 July 1986, be disallowed.

(Continued from 25 September. Page 1219.)

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I oppose the motion. On 25 September a notice of disallowance was moved by the member for Mount Gambier. Reference was made in nine or 10 separate points about the process that had been followed by the Waste Management Commission and the Government in introducing a revised set of regulations, in particular, a revised schedule of fees under the Waste Management Commission Act. Those nine or 10 points I think can be said to have encompassed three assertions, namely, that there was no advice, no consultation and no service provided by the Waste Management Commission to country councils. I wish to reject each of those three assertions, but before so doing

would like to correct some of the inaccuracies contained in the motion of disallowance moved on 25 September.

The first is that the reason for the introduction of the new scale of fees is that the Waste Management Commission was facing a deficit and that the principal reason the fees were being introduced was to ensure that the commission would not be in that deficit position. The commission does not have a carry forward cash deficit and is aiming for a balanced budget for 1986-87. The proposal to increase the fees is not designed to balance the books, as it were, for the Waste Management Commission. A number of documents have been distributed to individual councils and groups of councils to allay the fears that they have that it was simply a revenue raising exercise. I will refer to those again in a moment.

Another general matter that I would like to lay to rest is the role of the commission. The licensing provisions of the Act and the regulations have applied to all local government districts since they became effective on 1 July 1980. I will simply refer to two parts of the Act that was passed by this House in 1980. The first part deals with the general objects of the Act. The purpose of the Waste Management Commission was: to promote effective, efficient, safe and appropriate waste management policies and practices; to conserve resources by means of the recycling and reuse of waste and resource recovery; to prevent or minimise impairment to the environment occurring through the management of waste; to encourage the participation of local authorities and private enterprise in overcoming problems of waste management; and, finally, and most important of all, to provide an equitable basis for defraying the costs of waste management.

Further on in that principal Act, in part IV, clause 36 lists the financial provisions of the Waste Management Commission Act. Subsection (1) states:

> The occupier of a depot shall pay to the commission in respect of waste received at that depot such contributions as may be prescribed.

Other sections of part IV include the particular contributions for the operation of a depot, the operation of a transfer station and the operation of vehicles carrying waste from one place to another. When it was proclaimed in 1980, the Act applied to all local government authorities throughout South Australia; there was to be no exception. Although the original contribution payment provisions of those sections applied to all depot occupiers within local government districts, as a result of a Government decision, all but metropolitan depot occupiers were exempted by a proclamation made on 25 September 1980 from having to pay the contributions.

The proclamation which was made on 15 May 1986 and which we are now debating in fact revoked that exemption as from 1 July 1986. What we have is an Act which sets down a prescribed set of fees which determined that all councils would pay the fee. It provided that all operators of depots would pay the fees, but an executive decision in 1980 exempted some operators, some depots and some councils from the financial obligations of that Act. Now we are faced with the prospect of including back into the general provisions of the Act all of the local authorities to ensure that they are meeting the objects of section 4 *(f)* of the Act, namely, to provide an equitable basis for defraying the costs of waste management throughout South Australia.

Mr Lewis: Whether or not you have any waste?

Mr DUIGAN: No, that is not the case. They are based on the operation of licensed depots. The charges are per tonne of waste delivered to the depot, and the fees payable by a licensed depot to the commission are based on the tonnage over the weighbridge. I have been concerned that some people were contemplating urging a number of local councils and waste depots not to pay these properly imposed statutory charges. There have been debates in local government circles for some time about whether or not it was appropriate to, as it were, lodge a protest.

Some people have urged that a protest be lodged in terms of non-payment of fees. Whether we like it or not, statutory charges are imposed by legislation, first, through the principal Act and, secondly, through regulations approved by the Houses of Parliament. Those statutory charges are usually in return for certain services, or they are administrative charges or some form of tax impost—but that is not an extensive characterisation.

Legislation or regulations that prescribe statutory fees also prescribe penalties for non-payment. If someone does not pay, not only do they attract a penalty for non-payment but also the obligation to pay the duly imposed statutory charge still applies and the Waste Management Commission can recover that sum from the organisation, whether it is a private waste operation or a council operated waste depot. Both the Justices Act and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act prescribe further offences for people who counsel the commission of misdemeanors or offences. Those people are liable to the same penalties as the person who did not accept the original responsibility under those Acts.

So the principle that applies is that the person who knows the essential facts that constitute an offence and who counsels the commission of an offence can be liable to prosecution and may be convicted of either a simple offence or a misdemeanour under the appropriate Act. Once a statutory charge is imposed, whether people like it or not (and I am not addressing the question whether we like it or not, because that becomes a policy issue, which can be debated when a principal Act is before this House), that charge must be met. While non-payment may be seen as a protest, it is also an offence.

I said that I would address my remarks to the lack of advice and consultation and the lack of service, and a number of members opposite have asked me to indicate the nature of the service provided by the Waste Management Commission to country councils. I hope that I will have the opportunity to talk about that. This motion for disallowance was moved by the member for Mount Gambier one day before the time for disallowance expired. The Subordinate Legislation Committee had been considering the regulations under the Waste Management Commission Act since the middle of May and I believe that on four or five consecutive occasions it had delayed making a decision about the regulations to extend the scope of the fees under the Act to country councils because it was aware of the discussions that were taking place in the country. It was aware of the negotiations taking place with the Local Government Association and that a number of negotiations and discussions were taking place between staff and officers of the Waste Management Commission and representatives of various local government associations.

So, the committee delayed making a decision in order to allow representatives of individual councils, of country council associations or of depots to appear before it. Only when we got to the Wednesday before the final decision had to be made did a motion go through the Subordinate Legislation Committee that no action be taken because we had not received any submissions from anyone. Had we done so, there would have been available and open to them—as there is in the normal case of all regulations coming before that committee—the opportunity for people to appear to argue their case and for the Parliamentary

committee to have brought down to Parliament the various officers from the Waste Management Commission.

That did not happen. Nothing had come forward either from those groups or from any member of Parliament, despite the fact that on page 1219 of *Hansard* of 25 September the member for Mount Gambier indicated that, despite that absence of presentation of arguments to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, he was acting, I think he said, on behalf of or at the request of country councils in South Australia.

The Hon. H.A. Allison: A letter of request.

Mr DUIGAN: Yes, the request of country councils in South Australia. That is a perfectly proper thing for him to do. The only point that I am making is that those same councils could have come before the Parliamentary committee that has scrutiny over subordinate legislation and been given an extensive hearing about the way in which the charges were being imposed, had they still had those three concerns, namely, that there was no advice, no consultation and no service.

I now turn to each of those three matters. Members of Parliament—as, indeed, members of local councils—are probably the most avid readers of *Government Gazettes* and the various regulations imposed under various items of principal legislation, so all councils would have had, either in their own right or through their regional association or, perhaps, through the Local Government Association at State level, the principal regulations that were gazetted on 19 June 1980, which applied to every single council and waste depot in South Australia. They would have had those regulations as far back as 1980.

They would also have been aware that the reason why they were excluded from the payments set down in these regulations was simply that an executive decision of Government was made, saying that, in the first instance, the Waste Management Commission would operate in the metropolitan area. So, advice began as long ago as 19 June 1980. Subsequently, the *Government Gazette* of 15 May 1986 carried an alteration to the principal regulations under that Act. Again, *Government Gazettes* and regulations made under an Act, particularly when they refer directly to the operations of local government, are the sorts of things picked up in local council offices. Of course, at regional Local Government Association meetings in the early part of 1986, this matter had been on the agenda. Just in case people had not seen these regulations or read the *Government Gazette* and had not attended any of the regional meetings, the Director of the Waste Management Commission on 16 May—the very next day after they were gazetted—wrote to every single council a two page letter, which would then have been distributed to all of the members of those councils throughout South Australia, in which he set out the details of the variation to those regulations. The letter was dated 16 May and headed 'Variation to the waste management regulations 1980, to increase prescribed contributions and licence fees' and read, in part:

> Prescribed contributions and licence fees were last varied on 5 January 1984 and became effective on 1 March 1984. Furthermore, since 25 September 1980 waste management depots operated outside the Adelaide metropolitan area have been exempted from the payment of contributions in respect of waste received at those depots, but on 15 May—

that is, the day before the letter was written—

> the waste management regulations, 1980, were further varied to increase the prescribed contributions and licence fees, the new rates to be effective as from 1 July 1986. On the same day, the Governor made a proclamation which has the effect of removing the exemption from payment of contributions by council, private enterprise and State Government operators of liquid and solid waste depots in the country.

So, everyone who had been excluded, whether private enterprise, local or State Government, was advised that the exclusion which they had been operating under in country areas was being removed. The final sentence of that paragraph of the letter states:

> The payment of contributions by country depot operators becomes effective on 1 July 1986.

Mr Maddocks, Director of the Waste Management Commission, then set out some further details of how it was to operate. He concluded his letter—some hundreds of which were sent out—as follows:

> The commission's Chairman, Mr Bob Lewis, I, and other staff members will be holding discussions with representatives of all councils, either individually or in groups, during the ensuing two to three months, to clarify matters not adequately covered in this circular and to discuss the role and functions of and the future services to be provided by the commission in country areas. Meanwhile, please contact the commission's staff if earlier clarification is needed regarding any matter raised in this letter.

So, I think that that lays to rest the charge that was made that no advice had been received by country councils about the change in the regulations and the fact that the exemption that they had enjoyed for some five or six years was to be removed. Further, Mr Lewis and Mr Maddocks did in fact go to a meeting of the South-East Regional Local Government Association on, I think, either 23 or 24 June.

Mr D.S. Baker: On the two days.

Mr DUIGAN: I am advised by the member for Victoria that they were there on both days. The matter was discussed there. They went over the details in that letter and, whilst there may have been some differences of opinion as to the appropriateness of the implementation of the policy that was set down in the Act, passed in 1980, nonetheless, there was extensive discussion and consultation about it. After that, what happened? Following those discussions, yet another letter was sent on 7 July, because some of the issues that had been raised at that meeting attached to the earlier matters that I had mentioned, namely, for example, the concern that the whole issue was a revenue raising exercise on behalf of the Waste Management Commission.

So, the Director sent to the Mount Gambier councils a series of information papers which dealt with the budget of revenue and expenditure of the councils, information papers on the roles and functions of the commission, and services that are provided in country areas. Also, he forwarded a list of country depots which were secured, were open for limited periods, were supervised, and for which some charges were being made. Again, an extensive amount of information was provided. I was asked earlier to indicate exactly what services the Waste Management Commission was providing to country councils. I refer simply to a document that I have here, dated 2 July, which the Director of the Waste Management Commission sent to councils in response to their requests for more information. He sets down 15 items of assistance that the commission will be providing. I shall cite four or five of them.

First, there is assistance to councils in seeking new depots in their location, environmental studies, and liaising with other Government departments in the preparation of management plans. Secondly, there is advice and assistance to all potential depot operators, waste transporters and producers. They would provide inspections and monitoring of waste operation to ensure that the operators complied with the conditions of their licence. They would advise councils on improving operating standards and overcoming any operational problems that they had.

They would prepare overall management plans for areas like the South-East, the Riverland and the outer metropolitan area. They would assist in the development of those overall management plans. They would advise councils on

new technologies and developments in waste collection, waste disposal reduction, reuse and recycling. They would help in the detection of unlicensed waste producers, transporters and disposers. They would undertake prosecutions where that was brought to their attention. Commission staff would be actively involved in clean-up and disposal of hazardous wastes. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT REGULATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Blacker:

That the Regulation under the Daylight Saving Act 1971 relating to Extension of Daylight Saving, made on 4 September and laid on the table of this House on 16 September 1986, be disallowed.

(Continued from 25 September. Page 1220.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I do not wish to take too much of the House's time on this issue, but I want to return to some of the points that I made last week and I think events since that time have reinforced the general feeling that the public of South Australia are in favour of daylight saving and of the change to Eastern Standard Time. I do not want to muddy the waters by confusing the two issues, but as everybody realises, they are quite closely related.

The issue of extending daylight saving has involved more public consultation per medium of surveys than any other issue that I can remember. It will probably do credit to Michael Rimmer, from the film *The Rise and Rise of Michael Rimmer*, in which the public was consulted to a point of stupefication and boredom. I think that on this occasion on this issue that has almost happened. The public of South Australia are almost sick of doing surveys to ascertain whether or not they are in favour of daylight saving. The overwhelming conclusion is that the vast majority of people in this State are in favour of daylight saving and, further, to the change to Eastern Standard Time.

The reasons for that public support are basically that it is a magnificent boost to our tourist industry. Events like the Grand Prix are enhanced, made better and more enjoyable and accessible to everybody by an extended daylight saving period. Important tourist regions such as the Southern Wine Coast, the Barossa Valley, or almost any other region in the State gain from daylight saving with tourism which involves driving, eating, drinking, etc. Outdoor sport, bush walking, outdoor recreation of any kind and related pursuits gain considerably from extended daylight saving. Of course, the carryover of that into the economy of this State is quite marked. Nobody would want to see that diminish.

The other point that I raised last week concerned the issue of lifestyles. Quite clearly, a lot is to be gained by Australia as a whole, and South Australia in particular, from looking at the kind of lifestyles that people in the northern hemisphere enjoy from their extended twilight. In a sense, our daylight saving is a form of that. It would enable people to indulge in what the Spanish call the *paseo*. The European *paseo* is obviously a habit that we, by rights, ought to incorporate in our lifestyle.

It enables family units to cement themselves by walking, talking, playing and participating together in a whole range of things. Clearly it behoves none of us to oppose anything that strengthens the family unit. The benefits to be gained from playing outdoor sport and from sports practices are clear. We often hear that farmers work by the sun and seasons and not by the clock. For a farmer's day-to-day work, despite some of the objections from members on the other side, the extension of daylight saving is not a major problem.

Certainly, there are problems with children catching buses in the west of the State, and no-one would deny that kids are getting up earlier. However, at the other end of the day they get home earlier and can be more help to their parents, and they can enjoy more family activities as a result. The other objection frequently raised is that schools refuse to vary their hours. If people in country areas want their children to get up later when it is daylight saving, that can be done. The Education Act enables schools under the present set-up to vary their hours in consultation with the committee. This Government has gone to great pains to extend the power of community school councils and community based organisations to influence what happens in schools.

Clearly, if schools want to shorten their day or vary times, they can do that under the Act. It involves the cooperation of people like bus drivers, and I admit that. School councils have the power to vary their hours in that way, and I do not for a moment accept the criticism that this is forcing children to get up in the dark. I would like to spend some time on the related issue of Eastern Standard Time as I think that that matter warrants further debate in the House, and I am sure that that will occur. Therefore, I will reserve some of my comments on that issue until later. I seek leave, with the concurrence of the mover of the motion, to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

RIGHTS OF WOMEN

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Lenehan:

That this House condemns the Federal Liberal Council's decision to oppose significant provisions of the Federal Sex Discrimination Act and, further, this House believes that this attack against the rights of women in the private and voluntary sectors and in those States which do not have State legislation is grossly discriminatory.—

(Continued from 25 September. Page 1226.)

Mr RANN (Briggs): In July the Liberal Party's Federal Council, which held its conference in Adelaide, passed the following motion:

That this Federal Council hereby calls on a future Liberal/National 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.

The member for Mawson pointed out quite correctly that this motion specifically excludes the States, voluntary organisations and individuals. This decision by the Federal Liberal Council was diametrically in opposition to a unanimous vote of the National Liberal Women's Conference which called on Liberal MHRs and Senators to reaffirm support for the principles of the sex discrimination legislation.

The decision by the male dominated Federal Council shows the contempt of that Party for the contributions of its women members. Apparently, the prevailing view of the Party is that women members should be activists on cake stalls and not in the policy rooms. Of course, this decision was a bitter blow (or should have been) to those in the Liberal ranks—including the Opposition women's affairs spokesperson in another place—who try to peddle propaganda among the women's organisations, the academic fraternity and teachers, attempting to fool people that the Liberal Party really is concerned about women's issues—when it is not. I know that that might upset some members opposite—

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, Standing Orders quite clearly state that members shall not read speeches. The member for Briggs is reading a prepared speech, which is part of a campaign to have this issue placed before the media. Mr Acting Speaker, I ask that you rule him out of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blacker): A point of order has been taken by the member for Eyre. Under Standing Orders, speeches shall not be read. I note that the member for Briggs is using rather copious notes. I ask the honourable member to make his speech in the appropriate form.

Mr RANN: Quite clearly, I am using copious notes. Obviously my remarks have upset members opposite who seem to delight in denying democracy to the member for Mawson on this issue. In using these copious notes, I refer to the speech of the member for Murray-Mallee on 18 September, when, in a bizarre move, he attempted a censure motion against the member for Mawson. Showing a complete misunderstanding of what equal opportunity or sex discrimination is about, the member for Murray-Mallee said:

> . . . 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 is the converse corollary.

Yes, 'Sir Humphrey'. That is the standard of debate (with or without copious notes) of members opposite on important issues. It shows contempt for this Parliament. We have seen the member for Alexandra make a series of attacks on women public servants. Apparently he and his colleagues believe that talented women in the Public Service who fought against the odds to reach positions of responsibility should somehow be dismissed with innuendo and contemptuous remarks. However, I would like to put this matter beyond Party politics.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I draw attention to the fact that you are occupying the Chair while the Deputy Speaker is in the House. That is against the normal practices of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. I was not aware of that fact; it was not drawn to my attention. It will be rectified immediately.

Mr RANN: I would like to put Party politics behind us, because that is not really my way. I believe that our commitment on both sides of the House—including Independent, Labor, National Party and Liberal Party members—should be to equal opportunity, the same as with the issue of racism. It goes beyond Party politics. I ask members opposite to lift their horizons on these issues.

They have to confront their prejudices in so doing. In the areas of equal opportunity for women, of sex discrimination and sexual harassment (another important issue) we will get nowhere at all while so many members opposite adopt a defensive, sneering, schoolboy attitude to women's issues.

Let us look briefly at why this Parliament in the last decade enacted historic sex discrimination legislation which rendered unlawful discrimination on the grounds of sex or marital status in employment, education and the provision of goods and services. That such an Act was necessary was proved, of course, by a select committee of this Parliament comprising members from both sides. It found that women were still, in the mid-1970s, being forced to resign on marriage and often rehired on less than satisfactory terms and denied a range of employee benefits simply because of their maritai status. Such discrimination was not practised against men because of the breadwinner concept of the male wage-earner.

We have great issues before us in equal opportunities. I simply ask members to look at areas of education where women are undertrained and undereducated, where women, despite equal opportunities legislation, sex discrimination legislation and equal pay, are still denied equal opportunities in this country. We have a great deal to do. We must always remember that whilst legislation such as the Sex Discrimination Act is vitally important, it still does not change the many enshrined attitudes and prejudices that must be swept away. I thank members opposite for their attention.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLAIN LANGUAGE LAW

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Ferguson:

That this House supports the encouragement of the use of plain language in legislation, legal documents and Government forms.

(Continued from 28 August. Page 757.)

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I apologise to the House for not being in the Chair at the appropriate time, but I was due to address the House. I perfectly understand the Standing Orders, and the ruling was correct. I have only four minutes to speak on this matter as I promised the Whip that I would speak only for that time. I am keen to get this debate up and running to allow other members of the House (from both sides, I hope) to have the opportunity to speak on the matter. I drew some flak following my previous speech to the House. Since then I have conferred with the Parliamentary Counsel, who took exception to two sentences that I had put to the House. It was about 20 words in all. I accept the criticism put by the Parliamentary Counsel and apologise to them.

It has been put to me that a comparison between South Australian and Victorian legislation will show which legislation will produce the plainer language, and I see that the Victorian legislation is to some extent more difficult to understand. I do not retract from the general proposition that I put in my argument. I believe that the Victorian Government is doing the right thing in establishing in the office of the Parliamentary Counsel a person who is prepared to look at plain English, not only in legislation but with respect to Government departments and the use of standard letters sent out from Government departments.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I wonder whether members of the House would bear with me: I have a very short time left to speak and I am trying to assist the House. I have accepted the time limits that have been put on me—I need not do so. I ask members to assist me in trying to deliver this proposition. I come back to the principle involved. As I have said, I believe—and it is not only my belief but that of people who have read the various reports—that the use of plain language by Government departments certainly needs investigation. The purpose of putting somebody in the Parliamentary Counsel's office is not only to look at legislation—and I am sure that the present holder of the office is well able to do that—but to be in a position to look after and assist Government departments in the production of plain language for their own documents.

In South Australia, the Government departments and statutory authorities are looking at this question on a piecemeal basis. I gave due praise in my last contribution not only to the Motor Vehicles Department but to other Government departments (including the Department for Community Welfare) that are changing their documents to plain

English. I think this is a worthwhile and worthy effort, but I would like to see it tackled on the basis of all Government departments. That is being done in Victoria, and it seems to me appropriate to have somebody in the Parliamentary Counsel's office to whom all Government departments can refer. Time does not permit me to continue. I could quite easily do so, as I have plenty of information, but I want to give other members the opportunity to speak in this debate in due course.

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

EDUCATION FUNDING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. H. Allison:

That this House deplores the threats made by the Government to reduce substantially its funding for education despite election guarantees made by the Premier that there would be no funding cuts to schools.

(Continued from 25 September. Page 1227.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): In speaking to this motion, I wish to pick up a point made by the Hon. Mr Allison in his contribution to this debate. When the motion was initially moved in the House by the member for Mount Gambier on 21 August, he stated that the ratio of spending on education as a proportion of the budget had risen steadily until 1980-81, when it was 26.13 per cent of the budget. In 1981-82 it fell to 23.89 per cent and in 1982-83 it fell again to 21.46 per cent. I would therefore submit that the former Minister of Education is hoist by his own petard on this issue. He has read into the *Hansard* figures which quite clearly demonstrate that, for the three years of Liberal Administration, the actual contribution to education in this State fell, not by a tiny percentage but from 26.13 per cent down to 21.46 per cent, a fall of 4.67 per cent. That is a fairly major fall if one takes that as a percentage of the actual amount invested in education in the last of those three years. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PETITION: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

A petition signed by 31 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices was presented by Mr D.S. Baker.

Petition received.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr KLUNDER brought up the forty-fifth report of the Public Accounts Committee on motor vehicle changeover policy and practices in State Government agencies.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

WINDSOR WATER SUPPLY

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier at the earliest possible opportunity make public all departmental documents which refer to treatment of the water supply to the town of Windsor over the last three years, including details of chlorination levels, any slug dosages of chlorine and flushing of mains, and explain what action the Government has taken to investigate suggestions of a link between the water supply and a high incidence of cancer in the area since this matter was first drawn to its attention seven weeks ago?

The member for Goyder raised this matter by letter with the Minister of Water Resources on 5 September and subsequently by deputation on 18 September. Since the matter first became public this morning, the Opposition has been provided with the following additional information. First, I refer to the experience of one family which has lived in the area for 10½ years. The father, aged 37, was diagnosed in February this year as having stomach cancer. One of his daughters, aged five, was diagnosed in July this year as having a cancerous tumour in her vagina. A second daughter, aged nine, has exhibited similar symptoms to those of her younger sister.

Second, a girl aged 15 years whose family has been living in the area for the past five years has recently undergone surgery at the Adelaide Children's Hospital for removal of lumps under her arms. Local pathologists have been unable to make a specific diagnosis, which is very rare, and material has been sent to the United States for further testing. Malignant cancer is suspected.

In all, the Opposition has been informed of 13 confirmed cases of cancer in the Windsor area, one suspected, and one (the nine year old girl) exhibiting worrying symptoms. Of the confirmed cases, five have now died. The age groups of the victims are: one under 10; three in their 30s; four in their 40s; one in their 50s; and four in their 60s.

In relation to the link with the water supply, the pipe supplying the town is 80 years old, and it is known that the water has been treated with cholorine and possibly other chemicals. The Opposition has also been informed that last Christmas an E&WS Department employee informed a local resident that the water supply would be much better because he had just given it a big boost of chlorine. Our informant particularly remembers this because the water then came through like milk. This milky condition appeared in the water supply again just a few months ago. In view of the matters that I have put before the House, and this morning's media reports, I ask the Premier whether he will provide the information I sought in my question at the earliest opportunity.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer that matter to my colleague the Minister of Water Resources, and ask him to see what information can be provided. Clearly, the more information that can be made available the better, first, to try to undestand the problem that has been raised in this instance and, then, to determine what is its basis and what can be done about it. Since the member for Goyder first raised this issue, which I am advised was originally in a letter dated 13 August 1986, a number of things have occurred, including studies by the Public Health Service.

The honourable member led a deputation that saw the Minister of Water Resources on 18 September, a few weeks after his letter had been received. At that meeting he was advised that the tests on the water system in particular, taking samples from Windsor and adjacent areas, had revealed that the levels found were consistent with those regularly detected in the distribution systems supplied from the Barossa Reservoir through the Barossa water filtration plant. In fact, the trihalomethane levels were generally lower in the Barossa system than in the Happy Valley or Myponga area. So, a specific test was being done on the water at that time, and that was the finding.

That deputation was also advised that an analysis of cancer cases based on a large enough sample to have some statistical validity revealed a lower incidence than the overall expectation. In reading the briefing with which I have been supplied, I see that this was done on a post code area. As I say, this was done for reasons of arriving at a sample that was statistically large enough to be valid. This is a point that I would like to check out for my own satisfaction: I think it ignores the very specific nature of the particular area concerned. I have no information whether or not one can draw conclusions in that very specific and limited area.

Again, that point was raised by the deputation that was led by the member for Goyder. At this stage I have no further information that I can provide the House with. The matter is very complex because, as members would know, there are so many causes for cancer and there is such a wide area between exposure and appearance of symptoms that it makes any general conclusion difficult to draw. Certainly, enough has been said to warrant a much fuller investigation.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: An investigation has been made and was made very rapidly in response to the honourable member's request. Because of the findings of that, the Public Health Commission people advised that all that they needed do at this stage was continue to monitor both the water samples and the statistics. I have just said that my reading of it suggests that a more particular study should be undertaken, and in referring this question to my colleague I will certainly suggest that he might investigate the possibility of this. Clearly, the surveys and tests that have been made so far do not give cause for concern. They suggest that whatever apparent statistical aberration there might be could well be explicable by a whole series of causes of coincidence. However, I do not think that that is a sufficient answer, and I believe further studies should take place. I will suggest to my colleague that they do.

BUSHFIRE WATER SUPPLIES

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy outline to the House what measures are in place or are planned to ensure that when the Electricity Trust of South Australia considers disconnecting power at times of extreme bushfire risk the water supply to bushfire prone areas is not interrupted? The ETSA annual report and other reports on electricity distribution in bushfire prone areas canvass the possibility of deliberate interruption to power supplies on extreme fire risk days.

My Hills constituents in Houghton, Paracombe and Inglewood are reliant on continued power to ensure water for bushfire fighting purposes, and find the proposal of deliberately switching off power disturbing. In June 1985 the General Manager of ETSA advised that the trust would not interrupt electricity supplies until appropriate arrangements have been made to ensure more supplies. My constituents, in what is Bushfire Prevention Week, seek confirmation of that 1985 assurance.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for raising the question in the way that she has raised it, and particularly for the term that she used in relation to the trust 'considering' disconnection as distinct from what is sometimes presented in the press as a *fait accompli*. I also thank her for raising the matter with me informally so that I could get up-to-date information that will be of value to members of the House and to the public at large should the media see fit to publish all or any part of what I will now outline to members.

There are two stages of disconnection that may need to be considered by the trust (I emphasise 'may need to be considered'). Stage 1 disconnections are the type which have been necessary on a number of occasions during the past couple of years. This involves ETSA field staff exercising their judgment to selectively switch out a local section of feeder line where particularly dangerous conditions apply, at a time of high fire risk. As an example, this might apply in an area where ETSA has been unable to gain approval for adequate line clearance from landholders. The second stage involves much wider scale disconnections which might prove to be necessary on days of very extreme fire danger—sometimes referred to as red alert days, in areas of the greatest fire risk. The honourable member is aware that, in considering larger scale disconnections, the trust was very conscious that arrangements would need to be made to maintain electricity supplies to most E&WS Department water pumping installations, both for normal water supply and to avoid the depletion of stored water needed for fire-fighting purposes.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: One finds in this area that there are about 4 000 instant experts who, with hindsight, can tell everyone what to do. The difficulty faced by ETSA is that at the time of greatest risk, under extreme conditions, it is required to exercise judgment, unlike our position, where we sit in Parliament saying what it ought or ought not to do. Both the trust and the E&WS Department have been working for more than a year to ensure that power supply can be maintained to pump feeders when disconnections are necessary. The following are the arrangements now in place. In the case of stage 1 disconnections, none of the E&WS Department pumps in high and medium fire risk areas are on feeders listed for stage 1 switching—that is, those to be made on the judgment of ETSA field staff. It should be noted however, that some of these feeders are subject to one-shot-to-lockout controls to provide feeder protection. That is the automatic switching that takes place for what one might term electrical reasons. In the case of stage 2 disconnections—that is, those on a larger scale which would require senior management approval—all pumping stations in the high and medium fire risk areas are expected to be either excluded from disconnection or subject to rapid reinstatement. Given that storage capacity within the water supply system is usually sufficient to maintain water supply for a time, there should be few problems with those few feeders which may need to be switched out temporarily, before re-energising the sections serving E&WS Department pumps.

LEUKAEMIA DEATHS

Mr MEIER: In view of the revelations today about the level of cancer cases in the Windsor area, and its apparent link to the water supply, will the Premier immediately order a new investigation into the high incidence of leukaemia deaths in the Yorke Peninsula town of Minlaton? In April last year, it was revealed that this town was suffering an abnormally high incidence of leukaemia, with three children living in the same street being diagnosed as suffering that disease.

An investigation by the Public Health Service, the results of which were released in May this year, suggested an infectious agent, no such agent however having been identified to that date. The report stated that no herbicides or pesticides were found in collected rainwater samples, and that it was not recommended that any further monitoring be undertaken. That report did rule out any link between the

leukaemia outbreak and crop spraying, but a Minlaton resident was reported as saying that the only tests on water were on samples collected from rainwater tanks.

In October 1983, I brought to the attention of the Minister of Water Resources concerns expressed by a resident of Minlaton about the mains water supply and, in particular, the injection of chlorine boosts to the water supply. I informed the Minister that the water supply was causing considerable damage to pipes and fittings, and was affecting the growth of some plants and vegetables. The Minister responded some months later and admitted in his letter that 'the chlorine residual at Minlaton is frequently higher than is actually required for the local supply'.

In view of the alarming statistics in both Minlaton and now Windsor, will the Premier immediately order a new investigation of the water supply to the township of Minlaton, the frequency and levels of chlorine boosts to that supply, and provide any further information on the incidence of leukemia or other cancer cases in that area?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Rather than respond off the cuff by calling for an immediate investigation, the most appropriate course of action would be to ask my colleague for a report on this matter and to indicate whether or not such an investigation is warranted on the basis of that report. I think we need to be careful about reacting to a particular set of statistics in a very limited area because, as I have said already, there could be all sorts of reasons for it and they are hard to statistically validate. As far as the water supply is concerned, one of the benefits that filtration of water brings—even though it is enormously expensive—is that the amount of chlorine can be reduced and the impact can be monitored more closely. Certainly, I believe that these cases need to be investigated very thoroughly indeed, and I will certainly refer this question to my colleague and ask that he report urgently on it.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr ROBERTSON: Has the Minister of Education seen a report in which the shadow Minister alleges that $146 million in this year's budget was cut from education funding? I refer, of course, to an article in the *News* of 5 September in which the shadow Minister parades under the banner headline 'Education cuts hit $146 million' and accuses the Government of such things as 'warped priorities', and making 'cuts in . . . essential education services', and so on. Has any investigation been carried out into these allegations?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I have seen the report to which the honourable member refers. Unfortunately for the education system in South Australia, such statements are being made, and this is one of the more outlandish and destructive statements that has emanated from that source in recent months. Headline grabbing, I would suggest, in this area is very destructive of our State education system and of the army of dedicated teachers, parents and students involved in the magnificent education system that we enjoy in South Australia. The recent statement in the Adelaide *News* claimed that there was a cut in the education budget not only this year ($146 million) but, indeed, in the last four budgets in this State.

That is, a total of $584 million is diminished from that sphere of Government activity. Then, as the honourable member said, parents, students and teachers would be more interested in seeing their money spent on vital teaching services. The truth is that the total education budget in 1981-82, when this Party came into government, was less than this amount (it was $493 million), and to reduce the budget by $146 million in that year would have meant a reduction of 30 per cent in the education budget. In fact, there was an actual increase of $45 million in the following year in the education budget, and in each following year of this Government there have been substantial increases.

The figures used by the Opposition are simply nonsense and stretch the truth to its absolute limits. To raise fear in schools and in the community by extrapolating percentages of the total budget, one must take into account the changes in the way in which the State budget has been compiled in recent years. It now includes a number of substantial areas of funding not previously included in the budget. Exactly the same argument could be advanced in other spheres of government such as health, welfare, and agriculture, but it has not been simply because the shadow spokesmen in those areas have had a little more respect for their own credibility.

This is not the only instance of fallacious attacks on the State education system by the shadow spokesman for education. A little while ago it was claimed that half the schools in South Australia would be closed. Then, we heard of an $8 million budget blow-out. Both these statements, as I have explained to the House, are fallacious nonsense. It was destructive and irresponsible to make those statements in the way in which they were made and then more recently to gather together much more information and to say that the Education Department was selling properties to shore up its budget. This, too, was fallacious nonsense and irresponsible, and it is time that the South Australian public, especially those involved in the education community, had a better deal from the Opposition.

WINDSOR WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the concerns expressed by residents of the town of Windsor about their local water supply, will the Premier say whether the Government will order the immediate replacement of the pipe supplying the town? Clearly, the Premier has been poorly briefed on this matter, judging from his earlier reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition is aware that he is not allowed to comment but only to explain the background of his question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As the Minister suggests, I almost did. The problem at Windsor is due to the condition of the pipe. I do not know whether the Premier is aware of that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Premier does not know that, he does not know much. An extra dose of chlorine—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will withdraw leave for an explanation to the question if the honourable Deputy Leader cannot conduct himself in accordance with Standing Orders and the traditions of the House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am trying hard, Mr Speaker. I will try a little harder. Filtration of the northern towns' water supply is needed because of the condition of the pipe and the need to introduce extra chlorine to kill bacteriological growth—in other words, to kill the germs developing in the pipe. Likewise, the condition of the pipe to Windsor is the reason for the extra slugs of chlorine and the dosage that has been introduced into the water supply. I know that, because the Engineering and Water Supply Department has said so, and we can take that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As the Deputy Leader is trying to adhere to Standing Orders, it would help if Government members did not interject to distract him.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. One local resident has said rather colourfully during the last day or two that the water has difficulty in trying to crawl out of the pipe. In these circumstances, will the Premier review the priority for the replacement of the pipe? The current priority of the E&WS Department's maintenance schedule indicates that this work will be undertaken in about five years.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know of the precise circumstances, because this is not my area of responsibility and the matter was raised publicly only in the past day or so. I am sure that if my colleague was here he could supply the answer. I am advised that it is proposed to construct a new water main to connect Dublin and Windsor in the 1987-88 financial year, at a cost of about $250 000: that is in the forward budget of the E&WS Department. If circumstances suggest that this project should be brought forward, no doubt it can be and will be. That will mean displacing some other project somewhere else in the scheme, unfortunately. That is a difficult judgment that the E&WS Department and the Minister will have to make if it is justified.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Obviously, if it can be established—and that is where I disagreed with the Deputy Leader. It may well be that extra chlorine has had to be put into the pipe on some occasions because of the state of the pipe. There is no definite connection between that extra chlorine and the possible health problems that have been identified. That is the only point I make, and I think that we ought to try to make it clear. If there is a call to give this project higher priority than the 1987-88 year, that will have to be looked at and we will have to consider what other projects would have to be terminated or deferred to allow it in. That is a judgment that the Minister will have to make after he has received a full report. I will refer the question to him, and no doubt he will obtain such a report.

TREE PLANTING

Mr DUIGAN: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Water Resources advise the House or obtain information on whether any opportunity exists to review the existing E&WS regulations and guidelines about the public planting of major species of trees on nature strips and on road verges? Recently the Design 2000 competition organised by the Australian Institute of Architects was released for public exposure and examination by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide. The competition was characterised by the redesign of Victoria Square, the enhancement of major boulevards and the creation of major gateways to the city. All these require the planting of very tall and imposing species of trees, some of which cannot be planted now because of E&WS Department regulations.

Already the City of Adelaide has begun the process of removing one of the major impediments to tall trees, namely, overhead electricity wires, which are now being progressively undergrounded. One of the most attractive boulevards in Adelaide is Frome Road, and some of the current regulations would prohibit development of Frome Road. Only by a revision of the current regulations can the north-south and east-west axes of the city be enhanced and reinforced and King William Street and Currie and Grenfell Streets be turned into major boulevards with the imposing impact of Frome Road. Is there any possibility of reviewing the existing regulations both in view of the community concern about the environmental quality of our city and also new materials that are being used in deep stormwater drainage and sewage disposal?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am sure that all members will agree that this is a very important matter. I believe that there is always the opportunity to review regulations and certain guidelines. However, whether my colleague believes that a review is necessary is for him to decide. I understand that there has been discussion with the Adelaide City Council and other local government authorities. I will be happy to refer the matter to my colleague to investigate and bring back a report.

WINDSOR WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Premier obtain information on how much time is spent by officers of the E&WS Department in callouts to the Windsor area for the purpose of reviewing blockages in water meters in that township? I have been informed today that E&WS officers from Gawler have been making regular visits to the area over several years to clear blockages caused by heavy build-ups of organisms in the water meters. These calls usually involve two officers and apparently arise as often as four times a week.

I have been informed that these officers have indicated that the pipe in question should have been replaced before now. Residents at Windsor brought this matter to the attention of an officer of the E&WS Department at Elizabeth some 18 months ago but no action was taken, and these frequent calls for meters to be unblocked have continued. As this must have been a heavy drain on the resources and manpower of the E&WS Department, will the Premier investigate the number of calls made to the Windsor area and advise the House what total cost was involved?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer that question to the Minister of Water Resources and see whether the information can be obtained. I do not know whether the matters as put before the House are correct or not. That should be checked out. If the Minister feels it is appropriate he will make a report.

EMBASSIES

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Minister of Labour enter into discussions with the relevant Ministers in the Commonwealth Government in an endeavour to bring an end to the situation where consulates and embassies of foreign Governments are able to hire Australian or local staff without any regard to normal award rates of payment? My attention has recently been drawn to an incident involving the Adelaide Consulate of the Malaysian Government in which a constituent of mine was not employed in accordance with the normal requirements of the relevant award. Repeated efforts by my constituent to obtain the full benefits of the award have been ignored by the consulate, which is protected by international conventions.

While my constituent acknowledges the legal immunity of the relevant consular officers, it is not unreasonable in his view that when such treaties are again subject to review the Commonwealth should take into account such breaches of local law and custom. My constituent has also put to me the need for more publicity to be given by the State Department of Labour about the award-free nature of employment with any foreign Government at one of its diplomatic missions in Australia.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will certainly do that. I will contact the appropriate Minister in Canberra. It is an area, as stated by the member for Elizabeth, that is award free. I am sure that there were very good reasons for that when initially these agreements were drawn up. However, whether the circumstances at that time are still relevant is another question. If the situation cannot be changed, and if complete diplomatic immunity is maintained, probably the most effective action that can be taken has been taken today by the member for Elizabeth, whom I commend.

I hope that the media will follow up such stories when Australians are working in embassies and not being paid anywhere near what would be an appropriate rate. However, I will certainly suggest to the appropriate Federal Minister that when these conventions are being renegotiated this question be raised, if it is appropriate that it be raised at that time.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier be asking Government departments to review their spending programs in view of today's CPI figures, which show that Adelaide's cost of living is rising at a faster rate than the national average and that the contribution of Government charges to our CPI was higher than in any other capital for the September quarter? The State budget for this financial year is based on a CPI of 8 per cent, whereas if the September quarterly movement is maintained it will average out at about 10.5 per cent. Such a result would lead to a very large blow-out in Government spending. At this early stage does the Premier believe that any action is necessary to prevent this occurring?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let us get a bit of perspective on this. The quarterly figures reflect the particular change that has taken place in that quarter. The honourable member could well have risen to his feet at the release of the last figures and pointed to the fact that our selected State and local government charges sector showed nil effect in the last quarter.

If one looks over the past 12 months one will see that the contribution of that sector added 0.54 percentage points to the whole CPI rise as opposed to 0.62 per cent for Australia as a whole—the eight capitals average. So, we came in well below on that basis. I suggest that an examination of our policies has shown the very tight rein that we have held in this area. I do not have to advise departments in the way that the honourable member suggests. Departments are already aware of that and taking such action.

COMPANY PROFITS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Labour say whether he is aware of the spectacular increase in company profits announced in the recent weeks following the results of annual company reports and whether he has given any consideration to the need for all sections of the Australian community to provide an equal sacrifice in the light of Australia's economic problems? I know that this will upset the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order.

Mr FERGUSON: Members opposite have to defend these people as they put them in power. In recent weeks we have heard calls from Liberal spokespersons and of the group known as the New Right, asking for ever more sacrifices from the trade union movement. Both Liberal Party members and the New Right have called for the abolition of annual leave loading, increase in work hours, the abolition of penalty rates, the elimination of all negotiated work breaks, wage pause and similar demands. We even heard it from the member for Mitcham yesterday.

Mr Maximilian Walsh recently reported in the *Advertiser* that a summary of company results, following the publication of 30-odd company reports, had established an increase in gross profits from $1 055 million to $1 800 million—an increase of 74 per cent. Furthermore, Mr Maximilian Walsh reported on the very favourable terms that these companies were receiving so far as taxation was concerned. I quote from his article in the *Advertiser*, as follows:

> From the preliminary figures, tax provisions have increased by 41.4 per cent compared with a profit increase of 74 per cent. If we take out the results of Mount Isa Mines, which moved from a negative tax figure of $32.2 million to a positive figure of $27.3 million, the trend of tax provisions is up by a measly 24 per cent. The capacity of the corporate sector to shelter its profits from tax can be better gauged from the fact that last year this group of companies provided for tax at the average rate of 36c in the dollar. This year it is down to 29c. Bond Corporation lifted its gross profit in the past financial year by 375 per cent—from $94.1 million to $349.2 million.
>
> The company's tax provision actually rose by 543 per cent, but that figure is very deceptive. The amount set aside for tax this year is only $16.3 million. On a profit of more than $300 million. Bond Corporation is paying tax at the rate of 4.7c in the dollar. At least that is up on last year, when it was paying only 3.2c in the dollar. This is almost extravagantly high compared with the Ariadne Corporation. On gross profits of $50 million it claimed a tax credit of $4.8 million. The corporate tax area is something of a jungle and subject to a great deal of argument between the corporate sector and the tax man. Larry Adler's FAI has provided $30.7 million for tax on profits of $103.2 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his diligence in going through company reports and extrapolating those figures. I also read the article by Maximillian Walsh, who has a very high reputation and is a very well regarded commentator, and I have no reason at all to disbelieve the facts that he stated. It is also interesting to note that in these times, when we are all supposed to be pulling in our belts, not only are company profits doing very well indeed but also the remuneration of company executives is very good. While they are out there abusing workers for asking too much, they have done very well indeed with their remuneration packages, far higher than the percentage that has gone to the work force as a whole.

I note that, according to today's paper, there are some adjustments being made to the packages that are given to executives. The fringe benefits tax that has been introduced by the Federal Government is obviously having some effect on those executive packages. I understand that more and more of them are being cashed out and the executives for the first time are paying tax on that proportion of their salary. The policies that have brought about this spectacular increase in company profits are, of course, the policies, in the main, of the Federal Labor Government, the principal policy responsible for that being the prices and incomes accord. From my point of view, and from that of the Government, the prices and incomes accord has been spectacularly successful, if success is measured by a lowering of employees' wages and an increase in company profits. Using that criterion, it has been spectacularly successful.

On the prices side of the accord, I just wonder how successful it has been. It seems to me that in many areas, little or no consideration has been given to the prices side

of the accord at all: a great deal of attention has been given to the income side, but very little to prices. The accord has brought about a spectacular increase in profits, a reduction in real unit labour costs—a very significant reduction—and a very significant reduction in industrial disputes. So, by any measurement, it has been very successful.

The unions—and I want to compliment the trade union movement—have shown commendable restraint over the past few years. When restraint has been asked of them by the Federal Government, that restraint certainly has been shown. Whether companies have demonstrated restraint through profits or whether the setters of prices in the community have shown the same restraint as the unions and the employees, I will leave for the public to judge. However, the evidence would suggest that they have shown little restraint at all. We are entering into a very critical period in the economic history of Australia. On behalf of this Government, I certainly call on all sectors of the community—not just the trade union movement—to show some restraint in what they charge for the product they sell, whether it is labour or a commodity.

Regarding the examples that the honourable member gave of the amount of tax that these companies pay, I do not profess to be an expert in this area, but I remember going to a seminar once that was addressed by Professor Matthews, I think, from the ANU, and he made the point very well that the problem with taxation and the rich is to get the rich to pay any tax at all.

Under our present system, tax is voluntary for the wealthy in our community. So, I certainly again commend the member for Henley Beach for his question. No doubt, significant problems must be addressed by all Australians and all sections of the community, and this Government will play its part, as far as we can, in seeing that restraint will be exercised. I hope that the business community will exercise the same restraint as has been exercised by the Government and the trade union movement.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I seek your ruling on the requirement for a member to inform the House of any pecuniary interest in companies the names of which have been raised by a member in the Parliament. An honourable member has asked a question and cited, I believe, the 30 top companies in the nation. Is he required to declare an interest in any of those companies if he has such an interest?

The SPEAKER: There is no requirement to that effect. The honourable member for Morphett.

IDENTITY CARDS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Government now supports the Federal Government's proposal for the introduction of a national identity card? Legislation to introduce the ID card is now before Federal Parliament. So far, the South Australian Government has not officially announced its attitude to a national identity card even though its successful introduction will require the full cooperation of the States in the provision of births, deaths and marriages records. On 18 September last year, the Premier told the House that the South Australian Government believed the case for introducing such a system 'cannot be fully justified'. Will the Premier now indicate whether the South Australian Government maintains that view and, if it does, whether it still intends to cooperate in the provision of the necessary information for the system?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are two aspects of this question. The first concerns this Government's attitude to the identity card. We expressed reservations on the matter and they were conveyed to the Federal Government. It is up to the Federal Government to determine whether or not it will introduce the card. Secondly, the extent to which the Federal Government should have access to information held by the State in relation to such a system is currently being discussed with the Federal Government. All the States must consider this issue, and discussions are taking place among the States. We would argue that some of the information that we hold is of value and that, if a new system is to be introduced by the Federal Government which has access to that information, we would look for some recompense or financial arrangement to be made in consequence. Those matters are being negotiated at present, but obviously they can be only hypothetical, because the legislation has not been passed and, until it has been, we will not know what form such a card will take, if it is introduced. At that stage we can no doubt finalise such negotiations.

YOUNG DRIVERS' RESPONSIBILITIES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport, in consultation with the Attorney-General, delineate the legal rights and responsibilities of drivers aged between 16 and 18 years? I was recently approached by a constituent whose brother had been seriously injured in a car accident. In fact, the brother may never walk again. My constituent claims that the other driver, who was responsible for the accident, was only 16 years of age and under the influence of alcohol at the time of the accident. My constituent has put to me that the other driver (a minor) cannot be convicted. My constituent believes that, if a person can obtain a licence and is able to drive at 16 years of age, that person should accept the responsibilities and the punishment for any misdemeanours committed while driving.

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I am asking this question because the offender could not be charged, as he was under 18 years of age. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Transport to investigate the situation so that I can clarify the position for my constituent.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. My immediate response is that all citizens of South Australia have ample protection at law against all those who obtain drivers licences but, as the honourable member has pointed out, the problem that her constituents have suffered in trying to obtain appropriate redress within the law suggests to me that I should take up—

An honourable member: Civil action.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member points out that it is not property damage to which she refers. I will take up this matter with the Attorney-General and our officers and bring down a very clear and concise report to the Parliament. It would be inappropriate for me to try to give a legalistic or technical definition of the law when I do not have the full details before me. I would like to do two things: first, I would like the honourable member to provide me with more information about the accident in which her constituents were involved; and, secondly, I would like to obtain advice from Crown Law and my own department.

The question of 16 and 18 year old drivers is of concern to the Government. Those drivers appear in accident statistics much more frequently than I think they should—the level is more than four times higher than the level of drivers who are 25 years or more. The Government is considering

graduated licence schemes and other measures that may reduce the incidence of accidents in that age group. But I understand that that is not the specific point to which the honourable member has directed her question, and I will have the matter that she brought before the House investigated fully and bring down a report.

FOREIGN VESSELS

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the Premier will be taking the salute during tomorrow's naval parade through Adelaide, will he condemn the protests against our visiting naval ships and repudiate this week's statements by the Trades and Labor Council that the American vessels now at Port Adelaide should not be allowed to berth at any Australian port and do not provide a security function for Australia?

The Opposition fully supports the naval celebrations and the visit of warships from the United States, Britain and France. Indeed, it has been a spectacular success. To ensure that our naval visitors are aware that the vast majority of South Australians welcome their presence, and as he will be taking the salute tomorrow, will the Premier join the Opposition in condemning the loutish behaviour of demonstrators against these vessels and, equally importantly, repudiate the Trades and Labor Council's opposition to the visit?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think we have come to a sorry state when even the Opposition, with its conservative views, apparently does not perceive that there is a right of protest and demonstration in this country. That is a very precious freedom, and the way in which the Opposition has slipped into the arms of the New Right lately and is adopting these attitudes is quite appalling and alarming.

The honourable member: A new line.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, it is a new line, and it is very disturbing indeed. I refer the honourable member to the comments of some of the naval people who are visiting South Australia: they have reaffirmed their belief in the right to protest. Indeed, the Navy theme about preserving the peace involves preserving those very freedoms and rights in our community. I believe that there is a right of protest and demonstration. Obviously, I condemn, and I imagine that all citizens would condemn, protests and demonstrations where violence and other untoward occurrences of that kind take place, but often there is more than one side to that story, too.

All I will say is that the only demonstration I have seen was when I took part in the historic encounter at Victor Harbor last weekend involving the French, the British and the Australian navies: there were a number of protesters who had placades and posters and who got their message across, but there were no incidents of any kind. Indeed, I am sure that those who took part felt that that was reasonable in those circumstances. If that is the spirit in which these demonstrations take place, I am appalled that members opposite want to suppress them to the extent where there is no freedom of speech in this country. What on earth did we fight for in the 1939 to 1945 war? Why do we have a navy today? We do not have a navy today in this country to suppress the rights of individuals in our society but rather to protect the free society that allows such rights to be exercised.

WIND POWER

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate how the cost and effectiveness of electricity generation through wind power compare with the more traditional methods currently employed?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for this question, and I draw attention to the fact that, presumably following a model set by you, Sir, in this very House, he has used a pun by asking me about an electrical matter that 'currently' applies.

It is not a question that one can answer simply. The honourable member has asked how the cost of energy from wind power compares with the cost of traditional methods of electricity generation. The South Australian Government has approached this whole area in the following way.

An honourable member: Wind power.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member's continual interjections are a powerful demonstration of wind power! I do not wish to be diverted from this question, because it is important. It would be fair to say that the gap between the traditional cost per kilowatt hour of electricity generation and the cost for energy that can be generated by wind power has reduced over the years. On the South Australian scene, 29 wind recording instruments have already been installed at different sites, and over quite a long period and at most sites over 12 months we collect data on the frequency and velocity of the winds as well as their direction to determine whether the Government, in conjunction with ETSA, might install wind machines on the basis that they would be useful providers of electrical power in those areas.

I said that this is not necessarily a straightforward and simple matter. It could well be that the provision of wind powered electrical generation in the areas of the State where we already have a grid might be an economic proposition in the not too distant future. The data which we have already collected in this area and which will now be matched in the computer with the technological information that we have also been collecting world wide as to the capacities, the abilities and economies involved in existing wind generation machines could and should lead to the Government's installing a trial operation in conjunction with ETSA.

I am sure that in that case we would be in a position to learn more accurately some of the information sought by the honourable member. I know that people sometimes visit overseas and say that there are many wind generating machines in the United States, for example, and ask why we do not have some in South Australia. The situation is not quite as easy as that, because one needs to look at how the machines in the United States, for example, got there. Many members would realise that they got there on the basis of a Federal Government requirement in the United States and assistance in installing the machines on a tax basis.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: As the member for Chaffey points out, and I agree with him, they have not been all that successful. However, presently there are important advances in technology associated with the machines and it may well be that vertical access machines are the machines of the future.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, the Darrieus is one principle involved. I thank the honourable member for his question and apologise, in essence, that I am not able to give him a more definitive answer. However, I think he would agree that what we are trying to do in South Australia to determine accurately for our needs the very questions he has put to me is to follow the direct course. We believe that what the Government is doing in South Australia is the right way to go in this matter.

COUNTRY MATERNITY SERVICES

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health, seek from his colleague an assurance that obstetric and gynaecological services will be maintained at all hospitals on Eyre Peninsula? Earlier this year the Government initiated a report on obstetric services in the Lyell McEwin and Modbury Hospitals. Of the 95 recommendations, 94 related quite specifically to those two hospitals. However, recommendation 95 made a sweeping statement calling for the review of all maternity and obstetric services throughout the State, in particular those hospitals having fewer than 20 deliveries per year.

At that time there was considerable concern about publicity which indicated the possible closure of some country hospital maternity services. Recently there has been renewed concern expressed by members of the CWA about closures. I seek an assurance from the Government that, providing suitably qualified medical practitioners are in attendance, no maternity services in hospitals on the Eyre Peninsula will be closed. I point out that if any maternity service is closed it would ultimately mean that the hospital would close and that some constituents would have more than 100 kilometres to travel to the nearest hospital.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will be pleased to refer that question to my colleague in another place for an early response. The honourable member should appreciate that this Government's intention is to provide the best possible health care services to all South Australians and that has been, and will be, the direction in which the Health Commission and the Minister are moving.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DTX AUSTRALIA LIMITED

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Further to my statement in the House on 28 August 1986 and in reply to a question yesterday regarding DTX Australia Ltd, I have received additional information on this matter from the Director of the Department of State Development.

The Corporate Affairs Commission of Western Australia advised the Department of State Development that the Taxation Department was petitioning to wind up DTX for arrears in group tax amounting to over $500 000. The group tax matter was heard by the Western Australian Supreme Court on 4 September 1986 and DTX was given until 17 September 1986 to comply with repayment terms set by the court. DTX was unable to perform by the required deadline.

At the request of DTX the court adjourned its hearing to 15 October 1986 on advice from the company that it needed more time to negotiate a loan of $2.5 million from an Eastern States financier, the loan to be used to pay all existing creditors of DTX. The commission also recommended its investigation of Dr R. Blom's status as an undischarged bankrupt in relation to his recent reappointment as a director of DTX.

With regard to Government assistance to DTX, the incentive package was offered to the company on a strict performance basis only, as I indicated in answer to a question yesterday, in accordance with the published formula under the Industry Development Payment Program. The payment of the incentive would only be made on a basis of 50 per cent of the entitlement being made available 12 months after establishment, and the balance of the entitlement two years after establishment, subject at all times to the company maintaining a minimum of 160 new jobs. As I indicated yesterday, no payments have yet been made to DTX. In addition, as in normal practice, payment would be subject to a review of the company's position at the time. On this basis, the department considers that there is no reason to review the original assistance package offered to DTX.

The Department of State Development understands that no change has occurred with the arrangement entered separately by DTX to purchase land from the Department of Marine and Harbors. The company has about eight months to make payment to Marine and Harbors to consummate the contract. The Corporate Affairs Commission of Western Australia has advised the department that on 15 October 1986, last week again, DTX Australia Ltd was able to secure the necessary capital to satisfy its financial commitments to the Taxation Department and other creditors who were petitioning for the winding up of the company. Accordingly, the Western Australian Supreme Court has dismissed the winding up petitions.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill introduces a number of amendments to the Controlled Substances Act, taking account of the first year's operation of the Act. It introduces controls over drug analogues (or so-called 'designer drugs'); it substantially increases penalties for trading in drugs of dependence or prohibited substances and cannabis; it revises penalties for simple possession of cannabis by proposing a method of expiation of simple cannabis offences; it extends the prohibition on prescribing for the purposes of addiction; and it provides a more flexible method of appointment of drug assessment and aid panels.

To turn to the specific provisions of the Bill, I emphasise at the outset that cannabis remains a prohibited drug. The Government remains trenchantly opposed to trading or trafficking in cannabis or hard drugs. Our penalties have been, and will remain, amongst the most stringent in the country. Where an amount of 100 kilograms of cannabis is involved in the commission of an offence, a person is liable to an increased penalty of up to $500 000 and imprisonment for 25 years. Courts can order forfeiture of property of persons convicted of offences, or of related persons; they can prevent dissipation of such property where a person has been charged with an offence under the Act and they can charge financiers of drug trafficking schemes as principal offenders. Whether it involves cannabis or heroin, drug trafficking is one of the most reprehensible crimes against humanity. The Government believes that those who derive profit from the

destruction of the lives of others should be pursued and punished with the full rigour and vigour of the law.

The Government believes that the monetary penalty for selling or trading in cannabis is too low. Under the existing legislation, a person possessing more than 100 grams of cannabis may be deemed to possess it for the purpose of sale, and be liable to a $4 000 fine or 10 years imprisonment. The Government proposes that the monetary penalty be increased more than ten-fold, to $50 000. Other penalties have been increased.

For small traders, manufacturers, suppliers or producers in drugs of dependence or prohibited substances the fine is increased from $100 000 to $200 000. The penalty for larger scale traffickers, manufacturers, suppliers or producers has been increased from $250 000 and imprisonment for a period not exceeding 25 years to a $500 000 fine and imprisonment for life or such lesser period as the court thinks fit. The Bill introduces a new system of expiation of simple cannabis offences.

By introducing such a system, the Government is not in any way condoning the use of this psycho-active drug. It is seeking to put the matter into contemporary perspective. As long ago as 1977 the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, under the chairmanship of Senator Peter Baume, was telling us that 'changes in the laws on cannabis are needed to relate social intervention . . . to current social realities regarding its use'. The changes proposed in this Bill seek to do just that. The court's time has been taken up with a parade of cannabis users appearing before it. Penalties imposed are well below the maximum provided in the Act. It is wasteful of resources and out of proportion to the seriousness of the offence to continue to tie up the court system in this manner. It is unnecessarily draconian for a person, particularly a young adult, to be plagued by the stigma, and often the restriction of employment opportunities, of a conviction that will stay with them for the rest of their lives.

We need to be channelling more of our time, energy and resources into the pursuit of the traders and traffickers. We must, of course, recognise that the legislative approach alone is insufficient to deal with the very complex set of social problems involved in drug abuse. We need, and indeed have developed, a comprehensive strategy for tackling the drug problem. Prevention, early intervention, treatment and rehabilitation are important components of that strategy. With the boost in funding of almost 50 per cent through the National Campaign Against Drug Abuse, we are well down the track of reorganising and upgrading our treatment, rehabilitation and educational programs and facilities.

Turning to the provisions of the Bill, clause 8 of the Bill inserts a new section 45a, which introduces the system of expiation of simple cannabis offences.

The new provision will apply to some offences involving cannabis that currently attract a $500 maximum fine under the Act, that is, of some offences of personal possession or use. However, the Bill specifically excludes from these offences the smoking or consumption of cannabis or cannabis resin in a public or prescribed place. Such offences still render the offender liable to conviction and a maximum fine of $500. The commercial type of offence which attracts a maximum prison term of 25 years will also not in any way be affected by this proposal.

Subject to the exclusion of certain offences already mentioned, the expiation fees will apply to the possession and use of small amounts of cannabis and cannabis resin, the cultivation of cannabis for non-commercial purposes and the possession of implements which are connected with the use of cannabis, or cannabis resin.

Where the police believe that the offence is one of personal use only and that no commercial dealing is involved, the offence will be expiable provided that, in the case of cannabis, the amount in the person's possession is less than 100 grams and in the case of cannabis resin, 20 grams. If the amount is greater than this, but the police are satisfied that there is no suggestion of trading, the matter will be proceeded with summarily and the current maximum penalty of $500 will apply.

On the other hand, if there is any suggestion of trading, however small the quantity involved, the person will be liable for the increased penalties for trading. Persons who wish to plead not guilty to charges of possession will, of course, still be able to be dealt with by the court.

The provisions for the operation of expiation fees are established by subsections (2), (3) and (4) of this new section. While the fine detail of administrative arrangements is to be the subject of further consideration and consultation between the Police Department, technical and scientific personnel and the Health Commission (and the Act will not be brought into force until that has occurred), it is envisaged that where the seizure is cannabis or cannabis resin, the police officer will take the offender's name and address, and arrange for the drug to be identified and weighed if the identification and assessed amount are contested at the time of apprehension. An expiation notice will be sent to the offender, or delivered personally, stating the amount of the fee. Failure to pay within 60 days from the date on the notice will render the person liable to prosecution and a maximum fine of $500.

Expiation fees are to be fixed by regulation. In drawing up the regulations, the Government will have regard to the penalties being handed down by the courts. Current thinking is that they will range between $50 and $150.

The payment of an expiation fee will not constitute an admission of guilt and will not amount to a criminal conviction or record. Thus, although offenders will encounter a monetary penalty, they will not have the long-term stigma of a criminal record.

I draw members' attention particularly to the exclusion of children from the expiation scheme. Children will continue to be dealt with in terms of the children's aid panel system of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act.

The Government is adamant that this is the appropriate manner of dealing with children in this area. We need to look beyond the offence to some of the underlying causes for drug-related behaviour amongst our young people. Today's young people live in a world marked by stress and uncertainty. The economic and social dislocation that has occurred in recent times has lead to the sad situation where children are becoming an increasingly important target for welfare agencies.

In June 1985, 19.8 per cent of all children in Australia were in families receiving income-tested Social Security payments. Traditional values and extended family support systems have been shaken by the modern world. There are pressures at school; our young people cannot be sure that they can get the job of their choice, or find any kind of employment, when they leave school. There is a very genuine fear of nuclear war. Life's opportunities are uncertain: they are bombarded by media images of success, style and material wealth. Peer group pressure, probably stronger now than in previous generations, is a very powerful, real, and often coercive force.

The Government is most concerned about drug use by young people. The Commonwealth Government identified youth as one of the special needs groups to be addressed as

part of the National Campaign Against Drug Abuse. Similarly, the Ministerial Task Force which reviewed and prepared a three-year plan for future directions in alcohol and drug services in South Australia also identified children and adolescents as a special needs group when it reported in February 1985.

Education is one of the cornerstones of both the State and Commonwealth strategies. A program called 'Free to Choose' has been introduced into secondary schools. This is a package which includes a resource manual for teachers, designed to assist in developing skills in young people on how to retain independence and resist peer group pressure in a variety of situations. For example, there are sections on the influence of images on promoting socially accepted drugs; alcohol in the context of a teenage party; the abuse of amphetamines in the context of particular youth cultures; solvent misuse.

A similar program, targeted at primary schoolchildren, is currently being developed by the Drug and Alcohol Services Council and the Education Department.

Another initiative which will be available to primary schools before the end of the year is the 'Learning for Life' project. This project has been developed by the Adelaide Central Mission in partnership with the Drug and Alcohol Services Council. The program will offer drug education within health education programs. A range of education sessions will be conducted in a mobile classroom, with resources being available for pre and post-activities. The program basically aims to educate children on how the human body works and the effects that various substances have on the working of the body. It is designed to equip children with the skills necessary to overcome pressures to abuse their bodies.

We are also anxious to learn more about the nature of substance use and abuse amongst schoolchildren. Drug and Alcohol Services Council has been funded to conduct a survey to seek specific information on the use of alcohol, tobacco, prescription and illegal drugs by schoolchildren. The survey will extend over a five-year period and will cover 3 000 students from grades 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 from urban, rural, public and private schools. The survey should provide valuable information for planning of future drug education programs.

I turn now to clause 3 of the Bill and the definition of 'analogue' which is inserted. The Controlled Substances Advisory Council and the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy have expressed concern about the lack of control over 'drug analogues' (or so-called 'designer drugs'). These are substances which have substantially similar chemical structures to narcotic and psycho-active drugs and are designed to mimic the effects of those drugs. They currently escape legislative controls. Unsually made in 'backyard' operations, they are the new phenomenon on the drug scene. Fortunately, they are not yet widespread in Australia. However, the Government believes it is desirable to pre-empt their appearance and move to bring them under control. South Australia took the lead at the last Ministerial Council meeting and convened a national working group to devise controls. Under the amendment an analogue becomes a prohibited substance and is brought within the scheme of controls for such substances.

An amendment is also proposed to section 33 of the principal Act. The prohibition on prescribing or supplying for the purposes of addiction (unless authorised by the Health Commission for therapeutic purposes) currently applies only to a medical practitioner. Given that dentists can now prescribe drugs of dependence, it is considered that they should be brought within the controls of section 33.

The Bill provides a more flexible method for the appointment of drug assessment and aid panels. Members will recall that the Controlled Substances Act introduced the panel system as a more appropriate, humane way of dealing with the victims of drug abuse. It provided a mechanism for diverting people out of the criminal justice system and into treatment and rehabilitation programs. It provided the means of addressing the causes of the problem rather than reacting to the legal consequences. Indications, following just over a year's operation of the panels, are that the system is having a substantial impact: 254 referrals (50 per cent of whom were single and unemployed) were made during the first year of operation. The amendment retains the present combination of skills of panel members, but provides the added flexibility of members being able to be drawn from panels appointed by the Minister, instead of specific groups of three having to be appointed by the Minister.

A new power is included to enable a drug assessment panel to prepare, or assist in the preparation of pre-sentence reports. This will enable courts to seek the panel's advice in dealing with offences that are drug related.

These are the main provisions of the Bill. There are several other amendments included in the Bill (e.g. expansion of regulation-making power, breaches of conditions of licence) which are dealt with in the clause explanation and can no doubt be canvassed in more detail in the Committee stages. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides firstly for an amendment to the definition of 'nurse' consequent upon the repeal of the Nurses Registration Act 1920, and the Nurses Act 1984; secondly an additional subsection is added to the present contents of the section (subsection (2)). The subsection provides that a substance is an analogue of another if both have substantially similar chemical structures or if both have substantially similar pharmacological effects. It also provides that where a substance is an analogue of a drug of dependence or a prohibited substance, then that substance is a prohibited substance under the principal Act.

Clause 4 amends section 31 by inserting 'or consumption' in paragraph *(a)* of subsection (2) to allow for an offence not only of possession of equipment for use in connection with the smoking of cannabis or cannabis resin but also with the consumption of those substances.

Clause 5 provides for the upgrading of fines and a penalty for offences contained in section 32 of the principal Act.

Clause 6 provides for the addition of subsection (1a) which restricts the prescription of, or supply by, a dentist of a drug of dependence in certain circumstances. The first circumstance where the restriction applies is to a person for a continuous period of more than 2 months or a period which to the dentist's knowledge would result in the supply or prescription of the drug to the person by the dentist and either another dentist or a medical practitioner for a continuous period of more than 2 months.

The other circumstance is the supply or prescription to a person whom the dentist has reasonable cause to believe or knows is dependent on drugs. A penalty of $4 000 or imprisonment for 4 years is provided for breach of the subsection under the above circumstances, unless the dentist has prescribed or supplied the drug in accordance with regulations or an authority of the Health Commission. Other consequential amendments are provided by the clause.

Clause 7 provides for the repeal of section 34 and the substitution of a new section. The new section establishes drug assessment and aid panels provided from panels (established by the Minister under subsection (2)) and selected by the Health Commission.

Clause 8 inserts a new section 45a, providing for the expiation of simple cannabis offences. Firstly, subsection (1) provides that only a member of the Police Force or a person authorised in writing by the Attorney-General can commence a prosecution for a simple cannabis offence.

Subsection (2) obliges a police officer to give an expiation notice to an alleged offender before a prosecution for a simple cannabis offence is commenced.

Subsection (3) provides firstly that an expiation notice must be in the prescribed form and secondly that it may be given to the offender personally or by post.

Subsection (4) provides that where an offence is expiated, the offender shall not be prosecuted for the offence.

Subsection (5) provides that the payment of an expiation fee is not an admission of guilt but that any substance, equipment or object seized that would have been liable to forfeiture shall, on payment of the fee, be forfeited to the Crown.

Subsection (6) provides for the fixing of a fee for a simple possession offence and that the fee may be varied according to the nature of the offence or other factors.

Subsection (7) provides that a prosecution for an offence is not invalidated by non-compliance with subsection (2).

Subsection (8) firstly defines 'child'. The subsection also defines a simple possession offence. The offences (all related to use of cannabis or cannabis resin) are listed in paragraphs *(a)* to *(d)* of the subsection and are an offence of possession of not being an amount in excess of a prescribed amount, an offence of smoking or consumption (except where the offence is alleged to have been commited in a public or prescribed place), an offence of possession of equipment for preparation, or smoking or consumption (not being an offence involving possession of such equipment for commercial purposes) and an offence of cultivation (not being cultivation for commercial purposes).

Clause 9 provides firstly for the insertion of section 2a of section 55 of the principal Act creating an offence for a contravention or failure to comply with a condition of licence, authority or permit issued by the Health Commission by the holder of that licence, authority or permit. Secondly, it provides for the revocation of a licence, authority or permit by the Health Commission in circumstances outlined in paragraphs *(a)*, *(b)* and *(c)* of a new subsection (4). Such revocation is subject to appeal to the Supreme Court which may quash or confirm the revocation.

Clause 10 provides for the additional criteria 'of instruction or training' to be inserted in section 56 for the issuing of a research permit.

Clause 11 strikes out subsections (1) and (2) of section 57 of the principal Act and provides that in circumstances outlined in paragraphs *(a)*, *(b)* and *(c)* of the new subsection (1) the Health Commission may by order prohibit manufacturing, producing, packaging, selling, supplying, prescribing, administering, using or having possession of any substance or device specified in the order and may under subsection (2) revoke the order. Other consequential amendments are provided.

Clause 12 provides for the insertion of a new section 61a which provides that a drug assessment panel may prepare, or assist in the preparation of, a pre-sentence report.

Clause 13 provides for the expansion of the regulation making power under the Act and another consequential amendment.

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

HAWKERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Hawkers Act 1934 was enacted for the purpose of regulating and controlling the activities of hawkers and visiting or itinerant traders by requiring persons who wished to engage in such activities to obtain a licence from the Commissioner of Police.

The object of the legislation was to provide a degree of protection to consumers against unscrupulous or 'fly-by-night' traders.

In 1983 a working party was appointed to review the Act, due to concerns that the Act had outlived its usefulness and that it had been superseded by more relevant provisions contained in the Door to Door Sales Act 1971 and the Local Government Act 1934.

The working party found that, with one exception, section 20 of the Act, which gives councils the power to make by-laws, to licence visiting traders and to charge them a licence fee of $2 per day, all of the remaining provisions of the Act were more adequately dealt with in other legislation.

A survey conducted by the Local Government Association in 1984 revealed that the Act was a non-issue with councils, although 23 councils did express some interest in having the ability to impose controls on visiting traders.

The working party considered the relative merits of recommending that a similar provision to section 20 of the Act be inserted into the Local Government Act. However, the working party decided against making such a recommendation for the following reasons:

(a) The existing power enables the making of by-laws to licence visiting traders and to charge a licence fee of $2 per day. These by-laws have not provided any useful form of control over the activities of visiting traders for some time and the present licence fee is insignificant as a revenue source for councils.

(b) Visiting traders usually operate from either halls and buildings leased from councils, which provides councils with adequate powers to control their activities, or, from other leased premises, where councils have certain powers under the Planning Act 1982.

(c) The Crown Solicitor has expressed the view that the power to licence visiting traders may be a contravention of the Trade Practices Act 1974 of the Commonwealth.

The working party has, therefore, concluded that the Hawkers Act 1934 has outlived its useful life and could safely be repealed. I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Hawkers Act 1934.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.C. Bannon:

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

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1391.)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend to detain the House very long on this matter in reply. The Bill, as it came from Committee, and the subsequent debate on it did not shed very much further light on matters which had already been fully canvassed in the budget debate itself. There was a lot of repetition and on the part of a number of members opposite it was clear that they did not listen very closely to the replies that were given to them during the Estimates Committees and, even if they did listen, they certainly were not going to record that. They simply recycled much of the material they had put forward during the second reading debate.

As an exercise in obtaining further information I think it is fair to say that the Estimates Committees did not seem to be very successful. Perhaps that gives weight to those critics of the procedure, like the member for Alexandra, who say that it was the biggest mistake that the Tonkin Government had made and that the whole deal should be scrapped. The member for Flinders also criticised it but he, at least, had the grace to acknowledge that he had not really thought of a system that would be better.

I agree. I do not think the system is perfect, but it provides certain benefits that we did not have under the old system, which was enormously inefficient and never covered the whole of the estimates, and which simply had debate taking place at a purely political and rhetorical level. I was surprised to find some members criticising the presence of public servants at the Estimates Committees, yet there were many occasions on which their presence and the detailed knowledge that they could provide proved very useful indeed.

Mr Lewis: Who was being critical?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would invite the honourable member to examine the record. That is an important feature of the Estimates Committees procedure and certainly helps to make it worthwhile. There could also have been criticism in the past of the enormous body of information that was provided, much of which could not properly be reconciled between the line estimates and the program books. We have continually refined and improved that system. This year the fact that we have scaled it down to one volume meant much greater attention to program details in all areas, which helped quite considerably. I believe that next year we can probably improve and refine it even more.

At this stage I do not believe that we should alter the system that we have for Estimates Committees. If members such as the member for Flinders who believe that it is unsatisfactory and that we ought to have a better system can come up with it, obviously we will have to look at it. It provides a means by which members of Parliament, whether on a committee or simply participating from the back bench of the committee, can get direct access to information. What they then do with that information and how it is translated into parliamentary debates is another matter. I certainly do not intend to recanvass all those matters in this context. I simply move that the House accept the motion.

Motion carried.

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

That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 September. Page 1240.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): There is no doubt that payroll tax is the most undesirable tax levied by the State Government. This is particularly so when South Australia has the highest unemployment of all the States, when one in four of our teenagers cannot get a job, and when our growth in unemployment over the last 12 months has been well above the national average. Payroll tax increases the cost of labour relative to other production inputs. This distorts the production process and discourages employment.

Payroll tax discriminates against labour intensive industries and appears to be regressive in its incidence because labour intensive goods produced by large firms make up relatively more items in the budgets of lower income families. For these reasons, at the last election the liberal Party put forward proposals for a planned program of payroll tax relief. It was carefully and accurately costed. It was one element of the most comprehensive package of tax reform ever proposed at the State level. It showed not only which taxes we would cut but also how spending could be reduced to make room for lower revenue collections.

From the beginning of this financial year, under our proposals the general exemption level would have been increased form $250 000 to $300 000. This would have provided relief to all firms with annnual payrolls up to $1.5 million. The proposal now before the House increases the general exemption level to $270 000 so that only those firms with annual payrolls up to $1.35 million will receive some relief. While this amounts to an adjustment for inflation, it is little more. It means that over the course of the current financial year the base exemption level in South Australia will be above that in Victoria and Western Australia but well below the other States, which have base exemption levels of at least $300 000.

At the last election, the Liberal Party not only indicated what it would do this financial year but also gave a commitment to progressively lift the general exemption level by $50 000 annually so that, at the beginning of the 1988-89 financial year, the general exemption level would be $400 000. These long-term commitments are important for business planning purposes. They are the sort of commitment that the Government ought to be prepared to give now, particularly in the present difficult economic climate. They are commitments which deserve a higher priority than yet more real increases in Government spending.

Much has been said about the need to eliminate payroll tax, but little of substance has been done. The Premier has talked about it often. The Premier's announcement that he will be putting it on the agenda for the Premier's Conference has become what one could only describe as a tired ritual.

While over the last four years moves by this Government to raise the threshold have been welcome and supported by the Liberal Party, it still needs to be recognised that during this period total payroll tax collections have increased by almost 40 per cent. This financial year the Government expects to collect $283 million from this tax on jobs. That is the equivalent cost of 13 900 jobs at the average wage. It will take total collections since 1982 to more that $1 billion—the equivalent of more than 49 000 jobs.

Over the last 10 years, payroll tax collections have gone up in South Australia by more than 150 per cent. While over this period, payroll tax as a proportion of total tax collections has dropped, it still accounts for about a third

of all taxes that the State collects. Realistically, therefore, no State could afford to eliminate one-third of its revenue base in the short-term and still maintain even basic essential services in areas like education, health and law and order without some other revenue to meet the shortfall.

The relatively narrow revenue base of the States is another problem. The Federal Constitution prevents the States from spreading the tax burden beyond payroll tax, stamp duties, property taxes, motor taxes, gambling taxes, business franchise fees and the financial institutions duty. The Commonwealth in that respect holds most of the purse strings. If we are to eliminate payroll tax, the States must seek the cooperation of the Commonwealth—cooperation aimed at seeking to have the Commonwealth return or transfer to the States a broad-based source of tax revenue that could replace payroll tax.

I make clear that this would only be sought in the context of a fundamental and overriding objective to reduce the community's total burden from Federal and State taxation. The Liberal Party remains committed to reductions in overall levels of taxation so this is a proposal not for more taxation or double taxation but for more equitable taxation. Under this proposal, the Commonwealth would have to agree to raise less tax and therefore spend less money.

Payroll tax collections by the States run at less than 2 per cent of the Commonwealth's total outlays. Therefore, the cost involved to the Commonwealth in transferring to the States a revenue raising capacity of this magnitude would be relatively minor, expecially when it is recognised that this move would put into practice the high principle of federalism. Federalism underlines the whole basis of our three-tier structure of government.

In theory, federalism requires each sphere of government to have access to adequate financial resources with which to discharge its respective responsibilities and each to be financially responsible and accountable to its electorate for the money that it raises and spends. But, in Australia, Federal Governments have acquired too much power. Part of the reason is that the Commonwealth has established huge departments duplicating what the States have been doing for years in areas like education and health. Tackling the payroll tax question would be one means of coming to grips with this situation—one means of a more rational approach to power sharing and more effective, efficient government administration at all levels.

With these observations, the Liberal Party will support this revenue measure. We also express no objection to the exemption of university colleges from payment of payroll tax. Additionally, we believe that the proposed amendment to section 36 of the Act regarding public disclosure of decisions made by the Payroll Tax Appeal Tribunal will be of assistance to those parties contemplating appeal actions.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I would like to mention one of the problems concerning my electorate that arose during the Estimates Committees. I had the task of chairing one of the Estimates Committees, and this was an exercise that I found very interesting and very informative. Most of the time I was able to listen to the answers given by the Ministers and to absorb a great deal of information.

Two of the pieces of information on which I will reflect concerning my electorate related to the committees of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Children's Services. I was a little disappointed that the committee dealing with the Minister of Education's lines devoted only a very short time to the children's services area which, I believed, deserved more time spent on it by that committee. To deal with a budget of $35 464 000 in 15 minutes was asking a great deal, and only a very cursory examination of that area of the portfolio was given.

Members are no doubt aware that from time to time I have pointed out the need for child-care services within my electorate. I was very interested to hear the history of the provisions of Federal money for child-care from the days of Sir Phillip Lynch in 1972 right through to the present time. I was also interested to hear about the change of direction that has taken place during that time. The Minister announced that the Commonwealth had approved an additional 245 places in South Australia for occasional care. Although this number is being negotiated, it does point to a change in direction of the thinking of the Federal Government on this matter.

I have from time to time pointed out to the House the difficulties in achieving child-care places where the formula for doing so mitigates against occasional care. It is very interesting and very satisfying to see that the Federal Government is now changing its stance to a limited degree on the provision of occasional child-care services. For the Government to turn in this direction means that it is now looking at the provision of some child-care for those mothers who do not work. All emphasis to this point in time, indeed back to 1972, has been in the area of providing child-care for the children of working mothers. Now, at last, the Commonwealth Government has accepted the logic of the point of view that has been raised in this Parliament, both by myself and by other members of the House, regarding the necessity to provide spaces for occasional child-care. I will give the member for Mawson a mention for her diligence in this area.

As with all guidelines, this matter presents some problems, and one of the problems associated with the provision of these occasional child-care places is that the Commonwealth Government is keen to provide some of these places in shopping centres. That is very good for those areas where shopping centres have recently been established or are about to be established. Provision can be made for the introduction of spaces for occasional child-care. However, in those areas where shopping centres have already been established (and this relates particularly to my electorate in the western suburbs), I can see that there will be difficulty in providing occasional care. I have no doubt that I do not need to remind the Parliament that within the electorate of Henley Beach, and indeed in most nearby suburbs, there is no provision for child-care at all.

The earlier speeches that I have made on this subject have referred to surveys taken in my electorate by local government authorities (particularly the council of Henley and Grange), the Grange Primary School, the Henley Community Centre and others. All these surveys have pointed to the need to provide for occasional child-care. I certainly hope that, when consideration is given to the placement of the 250-odd additional places that will be available in South Australia, due consideration is given to my area.

Indications from research done in the Parliamentary Library are that potentially 2 500 children would have used a child-care centre if it had been established within my electorate. So, the need is great, and I hope that when the child-care centre placements are discussed my area will be

considered. I would like to thank the member for Price for his question to the Minister within the committee seeking information about when a child-care centre would be established in Henley Beach. The Chairman of that committee at the time remarked that it was an extremely good question. The Minister was rather circumspect in his reply, stating that all areas in the State were under consideration in accordance with the criteria established between the Commonwealth and the State.

From time to time I have made certain criticisms of those criteria, and it is very difficult to be able to discover exactly what are the criteria. I hope that the Minister will recognise the need of the children in the 0 to 4 years age bracket in that section of the western area, where there are no child-care facilities. The Minister did say that an ongoing program was being established and that, in time, it would cover a very substantial part of the State. This is very encouraging news, because the western area, where there are no child-care facilities, is a very substantial part of the State.

The other encouraging news in the budget committee was that very positive steps are being taken by the Minister of Health to reduce the size of the waiting lists of people seeking surgery, especially in my area. As the local member of Parliament, from time to time I have been approached by constituents who have been putting up with a certain amount of pain and discomfort, having been unable to receive the surgery that they required because of the length of the waiting list.

The recommissioning of a seven bed ward at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and an increase in the number of operating sessions at that hospital by two is encouraging news indeed. I understand from the budget discussions that $458 000 has been allocated to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for this task. The other part of the announcement was that the Western Community Hospital would be used for the treatment of patients, and this is a good move. The Western Community Hospital has a high reputation and at present it has capacity for extra surgery. Indeed, I understand that at least two surgeons have indicated their willingness to use the operating theatre at that hospital. I hope that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will now be able to divert some people from its waiting list to the Western Community Hospital as soon as practicable.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The first matter which I wish to draw to the attention of the House is one that was raised by the member for Henley Beach during Question Time today. The honourable member implied that company profits had risen to an enormous point where they were unjustifiably high. The regrettable aspect of the honourable member's implied position was that he gave no account whatever of percentage yield on the value of the capital assets deployed in the business. Let me explain the position simply for the benefit of the members for Todd and Newland and others. Regrettably, the member for Henley Beach knows that what I am about to say is true so, in his embarrassment, he has left the Chamber.

Let me take a situation where a business has invested $100 and during one year of trading makes a gross profit (to use the term used by the member for Henley Beach) of $2, which is a yield of 2 per cent on its capital. What member opposite would consider that trustees of a superannuation fund were in any way responsible if they could get only a 2 per cent yield on the capital that they had invested? None, I hope! What members opposite would deposit their savings in a bank that paid only 2 per cent interest? None, I hope! Yet the honourable member has the gall to stand up here and say that, if profits increase by 75 per cent (that is, an increase from 2 per cent to 3½ per cent), there is something wrong. He draws to our attention that fact as if it were an indication that the private sector profitability in this country had reached the point where it was immoral.

Ms Lenehan: The member for Henley Beach is back.

Mr LEWIS: Then I can ask him, if profits in business are so high as his question and explanation would imply, why is he not encouraging others to invest in companies in competition with those businesses that enjoy such high profits, because then, through competition, those inordinately high profits which he implies exist, but which in fact do not, would come down. The companies would be anxious to sell their products or services in competition with the existing businesses, and prices would fall to get the business available, thereby regulating the price. However, the Minister implied in his answer to the honourable member's question that we should tell companies what to charge, in other words, to fix prices by regulation. That is a stupid furphy.

We need competition, not a Government instrumentality trying to determine what is a fair profit and consequently a fair price. We should encourage investment, and the only way to do that is to ensure that businesses are profitable; and, every time anyone goes into business in this State or nation and makes a profit, the member for Unley and every other member in this place, including the member for Henley Beach, should applaud loudly and say, 'Good on you for, by making profits, you are creating employment for your fellow Australians and you are paying taxes, thus spreading the burden of taxation around and increasing the velocity of the circulation of money in the economy, thereby reducing the level of tax that must be imposed every time that money changes hands.'

Members opposite should think about that concept. One determinant of revenue raised by the Government is the rate of velocity of the circulation of money. If there is profitability in the economy and money changes hands quickly in transactions, the rate of collection of taxes is increased, the tax on each transaction can be reduced, and the same total revenue can be raised at the end of the day for the Government to provide the goods and services that it believes it is responsible to provide.

After helping members opposite understand the stupidity of the proposition put by the member for Henley Beach, I now turn to the Government's sudden decision to close Schubert's Farm at Murray Bridge. After deciding not to proceed with the open range zoo which the Government promised earlier in its term of office, its action in closing down the only other drawcard for tourism in the Murray Bridge area was grossly unfair, unreasonable and unnecessary. There has been a tremendous increase in the number of patrons visiting the farm in recent times, even though the Government has not allowed the managers or anyone else to publicise its existence.

Notwithstanding this lack of publicity, there has been an enormous increase in the number of visitors since the farm was established a few short years ago. The Government should have offered that farm, if to no-one else, then to the people working there to run it as a cooperative employment opportunity for themselves. Those people would pay tax on it, anyway, and they would be happy to do so. They could promote the farm and further increase the benefits for the local community by making more people aware of its existence, thereby making it profitable.

A more appalling aspect of its closure is that at the same time as it was deciding to close the farm the Government supported an application to establish a similar farm at Clayton, not 40 kilometres away. Why close the farm at Murray Bridge and open another at Clayton? I do not understand the mentality of a Government that behaves like that. The Government cannot unload the responsibility for the closure on to the History Trust, because the farm was closed at the direction of the department and the Minister.

I now refer to the regrettable ineptitude of the Department of Technical and Further Education and of the Minister responsible for that department in failing to identify the many export industries that could be developed in the South Australian economy. Recently, we have seen the devaluation of our currency as a result of the fiscal policies implemented by the Federal Treasurer. To use his own appellation, he was the greatest Treasurer on earth, but he is now anything but that. The Federal Treasurer believed that his economic J curve would work, but for it to work we must recognise that by devaluing our dollar we expand our export opportunities and make possible the running of profitable export businesses that could not have existed before the devaluation.

The two I wish to focus on specifically are saddlery and lapidary. Saddlery is the making of horse saddles, and we could sell 10 000 units a year in the United States at values of $400 plus. Even the member for Henley Beach knows that that represents a substantial income for people making saddles in and around communities like Murray Bridge. Yet there are no courses available to the people from that locality who have aptitude and skills in using their hands and would like to train in the art of making saddles and other leather goods: they cannot get that training because the course is not available. They do not know how to go about having a course made available, so it is not fair to say that because TAFE has received no formal applications from those people it ought not to offer a range of courses which would make the J curve a reality. That is the extent to which planning in Government has been inept. As members know, lapidary is polishing gemstones and selling them overseas. That has been carried on in recent times by the people who own Cowell jade. This activity ought to be extended to—

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

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I take this opportunity to pick up an issue that was raised in the public forum early this year, namely the EPAC report into higher education. I refer particularly to the *Advertiser* report of Monday 17 February this year. It is quite apparent from the figures cited in that report that in the past Australia has had quite an abysmal record in further education, that is, the education of youths who are 16 years and over. By comparison, I will consider the 16 to 24 years age group and the percentage of people involved in higher education, comparing Australia with a number of other OECD countries. In Australia in 1981, 36 per cent of our 16 to 24-year-olds were involved in higher education: in Germany, it was 45 per cent; in Japan, 54 per cent; and in the United States, 73 per cent.

Regarding the proportion of people in the labour force who had a degree from a tertiary institution in 1981 (and I apologise that the figures are somewhat out of date), I cite the EPAC report: Australia, 8 per cent; West Germany, 8 per cent; Japan, 13 per cent (I hazard a guess that that figure would be almost 10 per cent higher now); and the United States, 19 per cent. Quite clearly since that time the Japanese have picked up and taken further the United States trend. Regarding the number of engineers per 10 000 people (which is an index of technological advancement, in a sense), in Australia in 1981, there were three engineers per 10 000 of population; West Germany, 3.7; Japan, 7.8.; and the United States, 7.8. Five years ago, quite clearly, Australia was well behind the eight ball in all those parameters.

The report stated that poor school retention rates, inadequate school curricula, inadequate post-school education (particularly in technology and business courses), continued use of outmoded management and work practices and a failure by industry to adopt new technology all contributed to that unfortunate state of affairs. I refer briefly to what the report said about tertiary fees. In the light of what happened under the last Federal budget, it is interesting to note the comments in the report, which stated:

> . . . the report does not advocate scrapping free tertiary education or introducing tertiary fees.

It is quite clear from that (and I would certainly uphold the conclusions of that report) that we ought not be in the business of charging people to go to tertiary institutions of any kind, whether TAFE, universities, colleges or anything else. In fact, those facilities should be free and available to everyone. I do not believe that the ills of that sector of education can be improved by charging fees. It is quite clear, if we compare the state of Australian technological education in 1981 with what is happening in 1986, that things have happened. I refer particularly to the Hawke Government's increased commitment to TAFE over the past two years and the increased allocation of Federal funds for retraining and training for new jobs.

In South Australia, of course, we have taken steps to take TAFE out of the education area and add it to the responsibilities of the Minister of State Development and Technology, the Minister of Employment and Further Education. That says something about this Government's commitment to post-secondary education, the education of young people, and the desire to fit those people for a job in an increasingly technological age. Even in the new sunrise industries and high tech, quite clearly there is an increasing relationship between education and people's ability to pick up jobs. In fact, technology, further education, employment and State development, the portfolios currently held by one Minister, are inseparable, and it is quite appropriate that one Minister be responsible for those areas.

I refer again to the EPAC study. That study stated that narrow occupational classifications should be changed so that workers could perform a number of different tasks. For example, a tradesman could be qualified in several areas (plumbing, electrical and welding) while professional workers could get a broader education in related areas. The report recommended that we move towards more flexibility in our educational institutions, job specifications and, for that matter, employer/employee relationships. This applies also to the relationship between management and unions. 'Flexibility' is the key word: we must be flexible in both education and the application of skills to industry.

I guess that it goes hand in hand, and it is apparent, to me at least, that the accord must continue to ensure that some of the benefits of increased productivity flow through to the workers. It appears to me that we must look more closely at industry based unions and amalgamations which would, in fact, add to the abilities of people in various areas of the work force to negotiate appropriate conditions for their members.

I also wish to take up the issue of migration, which was not touched on in great depth in the EPAC report. Of

course, it is acknowledged that for many years Australia had a free ride on the back of European migration, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s. At one point in the 1970s, I understand, we were taking up to 70 000 migrants a year from Turkey alone. Many of those people settled and subsequently became major contributors to the work force in the Sydney area in particular.

We can no longer ride on the back of migration. We can no longer get our workers fully trained, fully skilled and ready to start in the work force. We can no longer save, as we have in the past, on child-care, education, training and the various other areas in which we gained by taking in migrants who were already trained. Of course, in a way (and this has become clear in retrospect), Australia rode on the backs of countries like Italy, Turkey, Greece and Britain in taking in migrants in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s in that way. Their loss was Australia's gain.

I refer now to what I believe is a missed opportunity to develop our resources onshore as opposed to exporting. Our major exports of iron ore, coal, wheat and wool—and, of course, to that we can now add diamonds, live sheep, and alumina/bauxite—are all processed offshore. It never fails to amaze me that Australian industrial development has allowed that to happen. The Australian economy derives no benefits, apart from the opportunity cost of finding the resource. Our workers do not gain jobs and Australian companies do not derive profits other than the profit from putting something on a train and shipping it out. It has struck me over the past 20 years that one of the great quandaries for Australia in post-war development is why we have not cashed in on these resources. I have never been able to work it out. We must gear our economy towards processing those resources onshore.

The economic enhancement from the discovery, cutting, processing and selling of diamonds, is up to 1 000 per cent. What do we do? Do we allow the Ashton diamond venture to go 95 per cent to De Beers in South Africa, for God's sake, because they have a complete stranglehold on the world diamond markets? All we have in the way of equity is 5 per cent for an Australian company.

Ninety-five per cent goes offshore and the 1 000 per cent enhancement takes place in South Africa or South-East Asia, but not in Australia. We need to look at the education of our work force in a whole range of areas to allow us to process those materials onshore and to allow us to enhance our resources. We need to look at areas of management, computer literacy, technical skills, and again we need an emphasis on flexibility. We need education which is free and available to everyone, and which is flexible enough to allow for changes of direction or retraining. We need education that is available at any time of life so people can opt in and out of jobs and retrain as and when they see fit.

Education needs to be available with appropriate financial support so that young people are no longer disadvantaged by the discrepancy between unemployment benefits and the various forms of retraining allowances. It is pleasing to note that, as a result of the last Federal budget, the introduction of the Austudy program should at least allow young people the flexibility of taking the option of training, retraining, working or, if they need to take unemployment, taking that without disadvantage to their future careers and prospects in an increasingly technological Australia.

Motion carried.

At 3.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 28 October at 2 p.m.