

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 February 1987

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

PETITION: POWER BOATS

A petition signed by 736 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to limit the use of power boats on the Murray River was presented by Mr Lewis.
Petition received.

PETITION: POLICEMAN'S POINT TAVERN BAR

A petition signed by 207 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow the establishment of a tavern bar at Policeman's Point was presented by Mr Lewis.
Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 246, 267, 268, 270, 286, and 294; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

TOBACCO ADVERTISING

In reply to Mr OSWALD (5 November).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Section 7 of the Tobacco Products Control Act states that all tobacco advertisements must carry a health warning published in the prescribed manner and form; and that the Governor may, by regulation, exclude a class of advertisements from operation of this section. The Act also states that this provision is suspended until such time as at least three other States decide to introduce the same provision.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

South Australian Superannuation Board and South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust—Reports, 1985-86.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood):

Planning Act 1982: Crown Development Report by South Australian Planning Commission proposed extension to Sludge Lagoons at Onkaparinga Estuary.
South Australian Planning Commission—Report on Administration of the Planning Act 1985-1986.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon Lynn Arnold):

Flinders University of South Australia—By-law No. 28—Penalty.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):

Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Regulations—Contract for Sale of Second-hand Vehicles.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins):
Rule of Court—Industrial Court.
Workers Compensation Act 1971—Practitioners Fees and Costs.

By the Minister of Labour, on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes):
Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—Gulf St Vincent/Investigator Strait Prawn Fisheries—Amalgamation.

ASSEMBLY OF MEMBERS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the minutes of proceedings of the assembly of members of the two Houses for the election of a member of the Legislative Council to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of the Hon. B.A. Chatterton.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: I advise that questions that would otherwise be directed to the Minister of Recreation and Sport will be taken by the Minister of Labour.

FEDERAL MINI BUDGET

Mr OLSEN: In view of this afternoon's announcement of a Federal mini budget in May, what implications does this have for the 1987-88 State budget and, in particular, is the Premier able to give a guarantee that South Australians will not be hit by another round of State tax increases next financial year? In his announcement of a Federal mini budget made just over an hour ago, the Prime Minister also said that the Premiers Conference would be brought forward to 25 May and he warned the States that they should not go on increasing taxes and charges to raise additional revenue. The Prime Minister's warning that the States have to accept more responsibility for restraint has serious implications for the South Australian budget, already geared to a high level of spending. Over the past four years, State spending has increased by 77.5 per cent—well over twice the rate of inflation.

Other factors putting pressure on the State's budget position include the higher than anticipated CPI and the likelihood that interest rates will remain high and may even increase yet again during 1987 as a result of the disastrous current account deficit. In addition, the lagging State economy will affect revenue in major areas like stamp duties, payroll taxes and motor vehicle registration fees. This overall picture, and the many spending promises the Premier made at the last election which remain unfulfilled, suggests that South Australia may also need a mini budget to implement some—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has been in this place long enough to know how to frame a question without entering into debate. I withdraw leave for him to continue his explanation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I welcome the announcement by the Federal Government, because I think the earlier we hear the news (and I do not think it will be good news) the better: it will give us more time to make the necessary adjustments and to plan for our 1987-88 budget. There is no question that there are severe implications in Federal decisions being made this year. Over the past two or three years we have been able, with some difficulty, to ensure that we have maintained a level of services despite the reduction in Commonwealth support which has taken place.

However, it must be recalled that in terms of the State receipts over 40 per cent derive from Commonwealth sources. Therefore, we can see the major impact that any changes in Commonwealth support, both to our recurrent expenditure and to our capital works, will bring.

We have had clear signals from the Federal Government that it will be harsh on the States. All I can say is that the States have played their part—South Australia in particular—in an attempt to ensure that national economic objectives are reached. If there is to be an equality of burden and if we are all going to share in that burden, then I will not have too many objections, but if the Commonwealth is going to seek to solve its deficit problems at the expense of the States, without attention comprehensively to its own outlays, then I will resist that very strongly indeed.

In that context, it is worth mentioning that, if one looks at State outlays (both South Australian and the average of the States) compared with Commonwealth outlays over the past few years, Commonwealth outlays have consistently increased at a higher level than have those of the States. That gives the lie to comments made by the Federal Treasury about the States' profligate expenditure. It is simply not true, and in terms of our capital works program in South Australia we still have the lowest per capita public sector debt in Australia. We certainly have had to increase our own borrowings very substantially in this year's budget, but we did it off the base of the lowest program in the States.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: So, we have played our part, but there is a limit, and as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned I would suggest to him that a contribution that the Leader of the Opposition could make could be to curb all those of his shadow Ministers and others who constantly ask for increased Government expenditure. No matter in what sector economies, efficiencies or cuts are proposed, you can bet your life that one of the Leader's colleagues will leap to his feet and attack the Government, saying that it is outrageous and cannot be done. There is a complete hypocrisy, a real phoniness, of members of the Opposition in relation to their attitude in this area. I can understand that they have a lot of trouble getting their own act together against all the pressures of their national policy making. It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition asked about revenue raising—I have yet to hear whether he still supports the broad based consumption tax of which he was a strong advocate so long ago.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: But, Mr Speaker, we were told that the Liberal Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He doesn't like this. He asked me a question about tax, so let me respond to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will have to resume his seat for a moment while the Chair draws the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the fact that his interjections are completely out of order and are not contributing to the general decorum of the Chamber. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Liberal Leader, John Olsen, said that he strongly supported the introduction of a broadly based consumption tax. The argument, the debate, is raging in the coalition Parties, but there has been a completely deafening silence in relation to the Leader's attitude to a number of issues, a number of questions, that have been put to him. It is about time we heard. Instead, we have had

this flimsy and extraordinary diversion of an attempt to say, 'We've got so many problems; we will legally challenge the results of the last State election.' What a fraudulent piece of nonsense! They got a nice little headline out of it. Perhaps the Leader could begin by reading the Electoral Act, which stipulates that the results of an election cannot be challenged unless within 40 days of the election. However, we still have this nonsensical thing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I don't know. Is this an untruth: 'Liberals may legally challenge South Australian poll result'? Is that an untruth?

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am happy to read the article.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I simply make the point that, before he indulges in these cheap little diversions, these attempts to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, I admire the loyalty of the honourable member; perhaps he is one of those who is trying to get his Federal colleague, Mr Andrew (or is it Mr Porter?) to stand down, to let Mr McLachlan take his place—although I know Mr McLachlan has not said which Party he wants to join. He may indeed be a candidate for Labor. Who knows? I admire the honourable member's loyalty.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport has a point of order.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 125, which states:

In answering any such question a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

The Premier is a member. Also, I believe that Erskine May refers to the fact that some leniency may be given to Ministers but that they shall not debate matters that do not relate to the question or have extensive debate in answering the question. I ask you, Sir, to rule on this point of order, since you pulled up the Leader under the Standing Order, and to apply the same sort of criteria to the Premier.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is not unmindful that there was a certain amount of what normally passes for the cut and thrust of Question Time, including some colourful contributions from the Premier, which the Leader of the Opposition might have considered to be provocative. However, the Leader of the Opposition's responses by way of interjection were out of all proportion to any provocation that may or may not have occurred by way of comment from the Premier, and he was duly admonished.

Now, returning to the first of the two points of order raised by the member for Davenport, it is correct that Standing Orders define a Minister as a member and, therefore, with some latitude, subject to the basic requirements of relevance and not debating the matter in reply. However, I would once again draw members' attention to the statement that I made on this matter on 7 August last year and, bearing that in mind, I would ask the Premier to shortly wind up his contribution.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am happy to do so, but I think the important point I was attempting to make was that if the Leader of the Opposition has a right to ask me and the Government about our attitudes to these issues—and we are perfectly willing and I think it is responsible for us to respond—it is equally so that we ought to know where he stands. I think that, instead of trying to grab a headline

and run, without even reading the Act that is the subject of his talk, he ought to answer a few of those hard questions instead of this phoney attempt to try to cast a cloud over it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price.

SINGLE HOUSING ACCOMMODATION

Mr De LAINE: Could the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House whether the Government is aware of the large numbers of low income single men needing housing in the Port Adelaide area and, if so, what programs it may have planned to help resolve this need? The Port comprises a major part of my electorate of Price, and I have had a growing number of inquiries for low rental accommodation from single men in the area. These men usually have never been married, or, in some cases, are separated, and previously have found boarding house-type accommodation for various periods as required. Now, however, as their numbers apparently are increasing, such accommodation is harder to get and rents are rising. It seems to me that the Port is an area that highlights the need for Government at all levels, together with community groups, to promote and develop various types of housing to meet the different housing demands in the community. I understand that the State Government is working with the Port Housing Association in this regard.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I congratulate the member for Price for asking this question, because it is not only appropriate in the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless but also an indication of the role and responsibilities of both the community and the Government, in this case my own department and the South Australian Housing Trust. I am happy to say that here in South Australia we have already begun that process. On the issue outlined by the honourable member I can report some good progress that he can convey to his constituents.

I should say first of all that the Government is aware of the need for affordable and suitable housing for single people at the Port. We have, in fact, worked closely with the Port Housing Association on this issue. The association is one of 30-odd cooperatives that have been fostered by the Government to help provide low rental housing for particular groups in the community. The association proposed to the Government a project that I found to be a most suitable contribution towards the issue of housing for single men. The association is buying and renovating a property in the area that will house single people in a 'family environment style' home. This will be different from boarding or lodging house accommodation and will also offer long-term secure tenure at a low rent.

The association recently received a grant of \$109 000 for this project from the Local Government and Community Housing Program. It will raise the remaining necessary amounts from private sources as loans guaranteed and subsidised by the Government under its Housing Cooperatives Program. The Port Housing Association already has nine households established, and I am sure this imaginative project will prove just as successful.

Also relevant to the honourable member's question is the Government's intention to investigate the supply and demand of boarding house-type accommodation as one of its contributions to the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless. The results of this investigation will be important in determining what other action the Government may need to take in helping individual groups in the community, such

as low income single people, to find suitable housing in locations where they currently reside.

HOME LOAN INTEREST RATES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether the Government has had discussions with the State Bank about the growing home loan interest rate crisis which is crippling the living standards of many South Australians, and what guarantee can he give home owners that they will not be hit with even higher repayments in the near future? Figures released at the weekend by the Real Estate Institute show that monthly loan repayments in South Australia are rising faster than anywhere else in the nation. In fact, in terms of percentage of weekly income which goes in home loan repayments, we are second only to New South Wales and are catching it fast.

Savings bank home loan interest rates are now at 17.5 per cent compared with 11.5 per cent at the time that the present Federal and State Governments were elected, so more and more South Australians are going under. Figures for bankruptcies about to be released by the Official Trustee in Bankruptcy will show that in the last six months of 1986 there were no fewer than 646 bankruptcies in South Australia, 32 more than in Victoria and 217 more than in Western Australia, both of which States are more populous than South Australia: in other words, South Australia currently accounts for 18 per cent of the total number of bankruptcies nationally, which is well over twice the rate if we are compared on a population basis.

The number of individuals and businesses that are going bankrupt in this State is even higher than it was during the Great Depression of 50 years ago. At the time of the last election the Premier promised that Labor would keep the lid on interest rates. Thousands of home buyers, including those looking to buy their first home, are now wondering how to manage in view of forecasts that rates are soon to go even higher. In 1985, before the most recent surge in rates, the Premier forecast that those rates would go down. I therefore ask what is his latest forecast and whether he can give an indication of current State Bank thinking.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier to reply, I remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition of an admonition made from the Chair two or three times last week that, if a member has to repeat a question at the end of an explanation, it implies that the explanation was unduly long.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This question of interest rates is certainly one of the most problematical areas facing us at the moment: it definitely threatens the living standards of people and their disposable income. The current climate is certainly putting a great deal of pressure on people, particularly when one remembers that so many people went into housing for the first time in the past few years. We had, in fact, one of the greatest housing booms since the Great Depression, indeed post-war, and a lot of people have gone into houses confident that they will be able to service their loan repayments. These people will be placed in severe jeopardy if there is any large hike in interest rates.

I think that this is the issue which ought to be addressed as a matter of economic urgency. As members opposite know, part of the problem is the balance of payments and the rate of the dollar, which at the moment is serving to keep interest rates at a high level. I hope that we see some relief in this area as a matter of urgency. The State Bank keeps the Government informed of its house finance lending policies. It has remained active in the market through both good and bad periods and has been very careful to protect its customers' interests and its large borrowing base.

I cannot provide the House with any short-term forecasts on this matter: nor, I think, can any financial analyst do so. The State Bank issues a quarterly report on economic conditions, the next issue of which is due shortly. I commend its contents to members, as they can get from it some idea of the State Bank's thinking. I agree with the honourable member that the issue is a vital one that is at the moment actively threatening the living standards of South Australians. I suggest that, to the limited extent that we can, we should try to keep a hold on those interest rates, but obviously we cannot, as a State Government (nor can the State Bank), work against national and international economic forces.

LAND AUCTION

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Lands investigate the circumstances surrounding the auction of surplus Education Department land at lot 5 Melsetter Road, Hackham West? I have been approached by a constituent who expressed concern about a number of matters surrounding this auction. In a statutory declaration which I will present to the Minister the constituent alleges:

The overall bidding reached \$102 000 at \$250 intervals, whereupon I overtly and explicitly indicated a further bid by raising a fully outstretched arm; the auctioneer, however, then finalised the auction by the fall of the hammer on the \$102 000 bid without formally acknowledging our higher bid, notwithstanding that he was aware of my further bid. Immediately after the close of the auction I queried the auctioneer on his non-acceptance of our higher bid, to which he replied that 'You had plenty of time.'

My constituent also alleges that witnesses are available who can also support the facts in this declaration, and that his company had intended to pay a minimum of \$120 000 for the property, which had a reserve valuation of \$70 000.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am aware that the land referred to by the honourable member was auctioned. However, I am not aware of any discrepancy that may or may not have occurred during the conduct of that auction. If the honourable member provides me with the details to which she has referred, I am happy to have it investigated and I will bring down a report for her.

TRANSPORT STRIKE

Mr INGERSON: I ask the Minister of Transport whether the Government is prepared to draw up contingency plans to help commuters inconvenienced by this week's threatened bus and tram strike and whether the Government will tell the union that Supreme Court action will be pursued in the event of any further strikes over its pay claim. Yesterday's *News* carried a front page story indicating that the Government was drawing up secret contingency plans to minimise the impact of this week's threatened strikes, including extra trains and the use of private buses. However, in this morning's *Advertiser*, the Minister denied the existence of any such plans. This morning, the Opposition undertook a survey of major private bus operators, and it showed that about 200 buses would be available between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. and from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Further, private operators would make these buses available if the Minister was prepared to give his approval for them to travel on prescribed STA routes to collect fares and to coordinate arrangements to publicise their running times and departure points. The use of private buses, particularly in the northern suburbs, and extra trains in the southern areas would go a long way to minimising any disruption to commuters through a strike for which, the Minister has

already admitted, the union has absolutely no justification. In addition, to ensure that the union is aware that no further strike action will be tolerated, the Minister could put it on notice that he will initiate action in the Industrial Commission to have the dispute referred to the Supreme Court so that any further strikes can be outlawed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member strayed into debate at the conclusion of his comment. He was just at the point where I was about to withdraw leave.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: My immediate response to the honourable member's statements about the contingency plans is that the Minister did not tell one newspaper yesterday that there were contingency plans; nor did I speak to the other newspaper which said that there were no contingency plans. What the member for Bragg has suggested when there is no industrial dispute (a threatened industrial dispute, yes, but no industrial dispute) is a recipe for industrial disaster. One wonders whether that is what the Opposition would like to happen, because everyone knows that Oppositions stand to gain a little, if not a lot, from transport disputes, and I am not sure whether this is what the Opposition has in mind. To suggest that we take a union to the Supreme Court when Industrial Courts have been appropriately set up to deal with industrial matters, and to threaten the union, when there is no strike, that the Government will bring in a whole lot of private buses, is frankly irresponsible. This is the reason why the South Australian Government has the best record in industrial relations in Australia: we abide by the appropriate industrial procedures and we talk—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will get to the question referred to by the honourable member in a moment. We have an open door policy in dealing with the people who are involved in disputation. That has always worked in the past and it will work in the future. What is the current position? It is that the ATMEOA has been threatening for some time to strike. However, there has not been a strike. I have said repeatedly that there is no warrant for a strike and that, if the drivers go on strike, they will not obtain any of the gains that they seek because such gains are outside the national wage case guidelines.

However, the fact of life is that, since the middle of last year until now, only three hours have been lost in the Bus Division of the STA; that has occurred in a period of about eight months. Yet, the honourable member asks whether the Government will stop any further industrial action, when the only time lost over the past eight months has been lost because of a stop-work meeting to report to union members on the Broomhill report, which, unfortunately, they rejected. Although it would have been a wiser course for them to accept the report, that is another matter. My position is (and always will be) not to inflame industrial disputes by threatening the parties involved. I will try to get conciliation whereby people sit down—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There will be no giving in to them, and the honourable member should know that by now. There is an appropriate way of dealing with industrial disputes and there is a political way that the Opposition would like to see the Government pursue. That is what the Opposition is on about: it would like to see a big strike because the greater the dislocation the better it would suit them, but we will not fall for that. I have been around long enough not to take the honourable member's bait. If he were in my position he just might give a similar answer to the one that I am giving.

The ATMOEA is clearly outside the guidelines and there is clearly no basis for negotiation outside those guidelines. I would encourage the union to look once again at the Broomhill report, in which it participated, which it recommended to the Minister and which the Government has accepted. I have told the ATMOEA that and I tell it again: I will not threaten the union with penal provisions or anything else, and I will consider the situation daily as events occur.

ELECTRICITY GRID

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy provide members with a progress report on the project to interconnect the South Australian electricity grid with those of Victoria and New South Wales?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, I can, and I have less than copious notes on the subject. Members will be pleased to know that the interconnection project is continuing on schedule for a 1990 commencement. The supplement to the draft environmental impact statement on the Portland to Mount Gambier line was released for public comment in January. This document was jointly prepared by the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the State Electricity Commission of Victoria to assist the South Australian Department of Environment and Planning and the Victorian Ministry for Planning and Environment with the coordinated assessment of the proposal.

Perhaps of greater interest to members is the fact that about two weeks ago the ETSA board selected a tender for the construction of the transmission line between Tailem Bend and the Victorian border. The contract has been awarded to Transfield and is worth more than \$20 million. Fabrication of the transmission towers will be undertaken at Transfield's Adelaide plant, and the galvanising will also be done locally. In addition, local labour and contractors will undertake the bulk of erection work on site. The supplement to the draft EIS for the Tungkillo-Cherry Gardens line was released a few weeks ago. When the environmental approval process has been finalised, tenders will be called for the construction of the Tailem Bend to Adelaide section of the line.

ARMSTRONG'S TAVERN

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Minister of State Development and Technology say what financial involvement the Liquor Trades Union will have with the hotel the Government has purchased to train hospitality and catering students and whether the Government obtained an independent valuation before deciding to pay \$700 000 for the property and, if so, what was that valuation? At yesterday's launch of the tourism plan the Minister of Tourism gave the audience the clear impression that the Australian Hotels Association and the Liquor Trades Union would have a financial interest in this hotel. Afterwards, both Government and private sector representatives at the ceremony expressed concern at the impression the Minister had given. As the information the Opposition has obtained shows that the Government paid the full purchase price, does the Minister's statement mean that the union will share in any profit the hotel makes? I also seek information on how the Government determined the sale price of \$700 000, given that the hotel ceased trading some time ago as an unprofitable venture and that it last changed hands for only \$615 000 less than two years ago.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Prior to the Government entering into this arrangement, two studies had been done by private valuers who are specialists in the field of hotel valuation, and both those figures were available to the Government when this matter was considered. When Cabinet finally made a decision upon my recommendation that discussions in relation to the purchase should be entered into, the Cabinet decision was that the purchase of the property should be handled by the Valuer-General, the person in the Government expert in the matter of determining whether or not a value placed on a property is in fact the correct value for that property.

There are two aspects with regard to the investment in the property: first, the purchase price itself; and, secondly, the need for some modifications to be made to the site to make it suitable for the purpose for which it has been purchased. I may say that, as regards purchasing the property and the licence, that matter is in the ownership of the Government through the Minister of Employment and Further Education, and that is the ownership title to the building.

Both the Australian Hotels Association and the Liquor Trades Union have indicated they will be making funding available to the project, which includes not just the purchase of the building but also refurbishing the building to suit our needs. The building will be designed to operate as a commercial entity returning a profit that will not only fund the recurrent costs of running the hotel but also contribute towards the education programs that will be conducted there. Those funds being returned will in fact exceed the cost of servicing the money that the Government is putting up for the purchase of that hotel.

There are significant course needs to be addressed in the hospitality and tourism industries. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was quite ready to go on air and criticise the decision and indicate that apparently there was already lots of space available in existing training facilities in TAFE, and he mentioned the Regency Park College of TAFE. Both the Regency Park College of TAFE and the Adelaide College are major providers of courses in the tourism and hospitality areas, and those courses are full at the moment.

The estimated demand likely to come on stream for graduates or trainees out of these areas will increase later this year and in 1988 and beyond, and there was a need for more courses to be offered in the areas of operator entry training, food and bar service training and food preparation courses, as well as the provision of work experience opportunities and training facilities for traineeships. It was in that context that the purchase of the hotel was considered and approved by the Government. One other matter needs to be addressed. The Adelaide College of TAFE, planned as it was under the former Government, has had no provision available for child care facilities.

The view of this Government has been that child-care facilities should be offered to all our TAFE colleges, and we have put State money behind that commitment. But with regard to the Adelaide College, because previous planning had precluded its being included in the existing new building, other arrangements have had to be entered into. Various propositions put to the Government were all much more expensive than the total purchase price of Armstrong's Tavern. One of the reasons for purchasing the tavern is that it is believed that, in addition to providing training facilities for the courses that I have already mentioned, it will also provide space for child-care facilities on the first floor that can be linked in with the college.

The member for Coles apparently takes some issue with that. Does that mean that, if in fact, the child-care facility

was placed in the existing Adelaide College, on one side of the brick wall, from a bar on the other side, that would be an illogical place to put the child-care facilities? The child-care facility will in fact be isolated from the commercial operations of the hotel, and it will be just as if it was in the Adelaide College itself. It will not have a doorway into the front bar; it will not be connected to the bottle shop; and it will not be connected to the commercial activities of the hotel. It is quite ludicrous of the honourable member to take umbrage at that point.

The matter being questioned by the honourable member is whether or not the union will draw dividends from its investment in this project. The answer to that is, 'No'. Neither the union nor the Australian Hotels Association will draw dividends from their support for this project. Indeed, when the Government indicated that it wished to proceed with the proposal, I specifically said that we would not proceed if we did not have the support of both the Australian Hotels Association and the Liquor Trades Union, as the key players in areas of training needs in this particular industry. The answer from both of them has been that not only are they prepared to support the project but they have contributed, or will contribute, money to the project.

GOLDEN GROVE ROAD DRAIN

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport, as a matter of urgency, take up with the City of Tea Tree Gully the immediate installation of a drainage pipe adjacent to Golden Grove Road, Modbury? On 6 December 1985 heavy rain caused flooding across Golden Grove Road and into three adjacent properties. Residents in this area were concerned about this, as it is a newly constructed road. Subsequent investigations showed that, when preparing the drainage plan for the development of the new road, inadequate provision was made for storm water drainage. A 300 mm pipe had been installed instead of a one metre diameter drainage pipe. It has since been agreed that a one metre pipe should have been installed. Last Thursday there was again heavy rain and again stormwater flooded across Golden Grove Road and onto the properties of the three constituents to whom I have referred. These constituents claim that on this occasion the water flow was greater than it was in 1985—and the precipitation at the time was not at the level of a 100 year flood. I would appreciate it if the Minister would take urgent action, as these constituents are very concerned that very heavy rainfall in future could cause flooding of their homes.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will be pleased to have the Highways Department contact immediately the Tea Tree Gully council to see what urgent action needs to be taken to overcome the flooding problem to which he has referred. If the situation is as pointed out, that is, that the original provision for flood control was to have been a 300 mm pipe instead of one metre, it is quite obvious that there would be a problem, and I would want to know why such inadequate provisions were put there in the first place. I will have the matter looked at urgently and provide the honourable member with a report.

TOBACCO TAX

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Did the Premier order yesterday's seizure of \$40 000 worth of cigarettes from the Clearview premises of Mr Brian Stokes, and what charges are to

be laid as a result? Yesterday's seizure was the latest in a series of incidents that have resulted in national ridicule being heaped on South Australia through the media—and I refer to programs such as *Willesee*, and other venues. Other incidents have included a Government request for Holden Hill police to provide police to guard the inspectors; subsequent withdrawal of the police on the grounds that the Police Department is already under pressure from budgetary restrictions in providing the services which are normally required in the community; the stationing of three tax inspectors at a time out in front of the shop—with the maximum score being 17 different inspectors in one day. There are cases of people buying cigarettes being advised of the circumstances—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Could I have your protection, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The member for Light seemed to be coping, but I can give him my assurance that he has my protection, if required.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There have been cases of people buying cigarettes being advised outside the shop by the inspectors of the circumstances relating to the sale; being advised to go back into the shop and seek a receipt for the cigarettes, and coming out of the shop and still being provided with a \$200 on the spot fine. Most of the people who have suffered that indignity have been old people. In this morning's *Advertiser* the Commissioner for State Taxation (Mr Cornish), refused to speculate on what legal action would now be taken against Mr Stokes following yesterday's seizure.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not issued any instructions in the matter: the matter is being handled by the appropriate authorities in the normal way. The inspections have taken place and certain charges are being laid. I find the tone of the questioning very strange indeed. The honourable member certainly has a pretty short memory. Was it not the member for Light who on 6 August in this place asked me the question:

Will the Premier give an assurance that the State tobacco tax will not be increased in the budget, as such a move would give even more impetus to the bootlegging of cigarettes in South Australia?

Was it not the same honourable member who said:

There is now a major concern among South Australian wholesalers and retailers about this possible increase in tax which would further encourage bootlegging and cost the Government even more in lost revenue—

was that not the member for Light? I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. Was it not the honourable member who wrote to me about this, urging that I take action? Perhaps he had better jog the memory of the Leader of the Opposition, who, on 27 August, asked me:

Will the Premier explain what action has been taken to prevent further blatant avoidance of the State tobacco tax by a shopkeeper at Clearview?

What is going on over here? We have taken the action that is required. This individual is able to trade, providing he complies with the law of this State. If at any time he is in breach of the law then, like any other citizen, he will pay the penalty. It is not for me to determine whether he is or is not in breach. It is for the appropriate authorities, and that is what is happening.

Instead of trying to do a complete about-turn on attitudes taken by the Opposition last year, if they have some concern, first, for the operations of all those tobacco retailers who have been complying with the established system, and

if they also have some concern with the revenue of this State they would not be so damned irresponsible.

EPAC

Mr FERGUSON: Have the Minister of State Development and Technology and his department had time to consider the criticisms of tertiary education and training institutes made by the Economic Planning Advisory Council (EPAC)? The *Financial Review* of Monday 9 February reported criticisms by EPAC of tertiary education and training in Australia. The EPAC criticism has stated that restraints on growth in Australia include a comparative lack of management skills and entrepreneurship brought about by inadequacies in tertiary education and training, the small Australian market, and cultural factors which give a low status to business occupations.

EPAC also criticised the shortage of technical skills, especially in computing, electronics, cost accounting and industrial engineering, and was mindful of the small Australian market and the dominance of foreign owned companies. Another feature of its report was the possible locking out of Australian companies by increasing overseas Government intervention.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. Although this matter is still being considered in a number of areas in tertiary institutions, I can advise of some responses. First, by their very nature, any article in any newspaper must, of course, be a summary and therefore does not fully canvass all the issues raised in a report: that is certainly the case with the EPAC report. In fact, one point which is made in the EPAC report at page 15 and which is not adequately covered in the article is that there have been modest gains made in recent years in improving the availability of suitably qualified managers: in other words, the picture is not bleak but one of improvement, but, as EPAC says, with a need for more improvement.

The EPAC report has focused entirely on higher education and ignored that other very significant sector of tertiary education, namely, technical and further education. In any mix of education of professionals and para-professionals—and this applies in the management arena as much as in any other arena—the number of people needed in the para-professional and technician areas exceeds the number needed at the degree level of graduate; in fact, the ratio of five to one has often been suggested in relation to the level of technicians and middle managers *vis-a-vis* the number of professionals needed in an area. I can identify that the TAFE sector, particularly in South Australia, has been very active indeed, and very reactive to these needs.

If one picks out one area of concern in the EPAC report—and the report identifies the need for innovative activity and high technology areas in association with business and industry (and CAD/CAM is singled out in that regard)—TAFE in South Australia is a national leader—so much so that it is being viewed overseas for the work that has been done in promotion of CAD/CAM technologies, particularly a view to its application to industry. South Australia can be very proud of what has gone on at Regency Park College and at the Elizabeth College of TAFE. I can also identify the fact that State Government money has gone into the Institute of Technology to support the CAD/CAM facility in that particular institution.

Another major development noteworthy and of particular relevance to the EPAC report is the establishment in 1984 under this Government of the School of Computing and

Small Business at the Adelaide College of TAFE—a separate school that provided modular programs last year for some 10 000 students. That course offers full certificates in areas such as small business, computing, company law, retail sales and many other areas. In addition, there is a program commencing in March this year in conjunction with the Institute of Directors and the University of New England to provide professional training for Adelaide company directors.

Those are just some examples of what is a very innovative and reactive tertiary education arena of technical and further education in this State. It is picking up the points made in the EPAC report. I can assure members that it will continue to do so. It is a pity that the EPAC report did not address that particular need. With respect to other areas we can identify the Elton Mayo School of Management at the South Australian Institute of Technology, the MBA program at the University of Adelaide, and other programs are also being offered. That does not mean that, if we have achieved something to date, in itself that is sufficient: I agree that it is not—more can be done and should be done. As a State Government we will take our role in this arena very seriously in encouraging other tertiary institutions to follow the lead of the TAFE sector.

TOOLING CENTRE

Mr S.J. BAKER: Can the Minister of State Development and Technology provide details of the concessions, loan guarantees and subsidies being offered to the United States company Autodie to establish a tooling centre at the GMH site at Woodville? Members are aware that the Government has been pursuing the idea of a national tooling centre to be sited at Woodville. In the initial stages local toolmakers were approached in order to ascertain their interest in that venture.

Although at the time no South Australian toolmakers could provide the capital to undertake that venture, more than one indicated a willingness to be part and parcel of a national tooling centre with intentions that obviously would go beyond the borders of this State and this country. Since that time the officers of the Minister's department have spent an enormous amount of time and resources in travelling overseas to woo international capital and investment in this field. However, the local manufacturers have received no response to their inquiries about the status of that project. They have no indication from the Government as to whether they will be able to participate in any investment in that regard in this State. Indeed, they have not even been told whether the Government intends to take away part of their market in order to get this project off the ground. Although one of the officers from the Premier's Department promised it, the people who have said quite openly that they wish to be part of any new venture of this type have not been given the courtesy of an interview with the Minister.

Manufacturers in this State are concerned that, despite promises made by the Government, some nine months down the track they have not been given the courtesy of any briefings on this matter, nor have they received any information from the Government, which told them that it believed that South Australian employment is important.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mitcham has shown himself up again. Last week, after a United Kingdom visitor sat in the gallery and watched the performance of this House, he asked me, 'Who was Jack the lad sitting on the Opposition side?' It was finally determined

that he was referring to the member for Mitcham. Well, Jack the lad has been at it again. He has raised a series of trivial responses to what is a very important development potential for this State, namely, the promotion of a tooling sector in South Australia. I suggest that he really needs to lay on the public record whether this is something that he wishes to encourage. Is this something that he wishes to see happen in South Australia, or does he just want to make some short-term political capital or advantage out of the issue? He can lay on the public record what his real aim is.

I have no intention of going through some of the fine detail of the discussions being undertaken at this stage between the Government, potential investors and the automotive companies involved in this matter, because I am certain that every member of this House would appreciate the commercial and confidential nature of some of those discussions. At the appropriate time full details will be made available to members in this House. I am certain that the member for Mitcham could not quibble with that if he were to realise that, at some point in any set of commercial discussions, considerable damage can be done to the progress of those discussions if they are canvassed in the public arena.

The point of the tooling centre proposal has been canvassed with relevant sections of the industry, not only the automotive industry, including automotive parts manufacturers, but also manufacturing industry in general, including the tooling industry nationwide. There has also been correspondence between toolmakers in various parts of Australia, including South Australia, on this matter. Whereas the honourable member seems to believe that this is a project of nine months duration, work has been going on in this area for considerably longer than that.

At the outset, the honourable member suggested that some earlier responses received from Australian toolmakers indicated that they could not take over the project and participate in it. He indicated that I had received an approach from a toolmaker to meet with them. However, that information has not been made available to me. They have not approached me direct, so I would be interested to hear from the honourable member afterwards which company it is. He will doubtless let me know the name of the company, and we will doubtless make the sort of contact that it wants.

Information has been made available to relevant groupings in South Australia, including the Manufacturing Advisory Council, a tripartite body including the council's automotive panel. For the honourable member at this stage to try to make a cheap political score on this matter and, in so doing, damage this project brings disrepute on himself. It may be all right for him to be Jack the Lad, but it is not all right for South Australia to suffer that kind of knife in the back supposed support.

TRAINEESHIPS

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education outline the Government's position on youth traineeships and say when we may see the South Australian Public Service taking on trainees? I am sure that members noted with interest that the State Bank today became the first bank in Australia to agree to take on trainees. Its decision to take on 15 young people under the Australian Traineeship Scheme follows similar moves by credit unions and building societies, and I am sure that that is applauded by members. The State Government last evening also announced that it would take on trainees within the State Public Service, a move that has already brought a response

from interested youngsters who are seeking more information on the Government's plans.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Today's announcement by the State Bank is certainly very encouraging, and we commend it. To see that the short-term figure of 15 could well grow to 100 is exciting news indeed. Alongside that, State Cabinet yesterday approved the provision of 50 Public Service trainee positions in the general clerical area, the clerical customer relations area, and the clerical finance accounting area. These trainee positions to be offered by the Government will cost \$290 000 in a full year and represent a significant addition to the training opportunities available in South Australia. In fact, they complement the already exciting work in which the South Australian public sector has been involved in terms of training opportunities. That is the school leavers program, which we have had running for three years and which is the most exciting training program initiated by the public sector anywhere in Australia. It is an ongoing program that is now complemented by the 50 positions that are being made available.

The first traineeships offered in the Public Service will be in addition to the planned intake of school leavers in the current financial year, and we anticipate that advertisements will be placed in the near future for these traineeship positions, so that they can be taken up as early as possible. The 50 traineeships will therefore come on stream very quickly and will be in addition to the 800 employment and training opportunities that we already offer to school leavers mostly in the clerical arena and in the apprenticeship categories.

AMERICA'S CUP SYNDICATE LOAN

Mr BECKER: Will the Premier say whether the Government has now decided to convert to a grant the \$1.4 million interest bearing loan that it made to the America's Cup syndicate? An article in yesterday's *Advertiser* reporting the syndicate's financial result (equivalent to a loss of about \$1.8 million if the Government loan and interest are to be repaid) quoted the Chairman of the syndicate (Mr Graham Spurling) as saying that the Government has supported the campaign with a \$1.4 million grant. As previous statements on this matter by the Premier have suggested that a decision on whether or not to convert the loan to a grant would not be made until the syndicate's books had been fully audited, I ask him to clarify the situation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already answered this question and in fact made that announcement, both in this House in response to a question, through which the honourable member was obviously sleeping, and also—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson has a point of order.

Mr BECKER: I object and ask the Premier to withdraw the statement that I was obviously sleeping through any answer that he may have given in this House. That is a practice in which I do not participate. I ask that the statement be withdrawn, as I take exception to the remark.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no need for the member for Hanson to shout. The Chair and his fellow members are quite capable of hearing without the honourable member's voice having to rise to a crescendo. The honourable Premier has been asked to withdraw the imputation that was made regarding the honourable member for Hanson.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I withdraw the imputation that the honourable member was sleeping. All I can say is that he must have been giving less than full attention to

my response, because I am afraid that I cannot lay my hands on *Hansard* to indicate the passage. I pointed out that the Government had made that in principle decision that the actual amount of conversion would depend on the receipt of the final accounts and the audited accounts.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will continue my answer, if the Deputy Leader would also pay a little more attention.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That was canvassed fully in a reply to the member for Bragg. He is within easy distance, and can probably remind the honourable member of that reply.

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to reflect in Government's representation on the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission the appropriate areas of ministerial and departmental responsibility. The Office of Employment and Training was established in March 1986 with the following approved functions:

- To develop and, where appropriate, implement policies and programs that—
 - (a) aim to broaden the employment base in the State, having regard to technological and economic development considerations;
 - (b) maximise employment opportunities, particularly among youth; and
 - (c) provide training opportunities that enhance job prospects and are relevant to the skill needs of the State.
- To provide an effective link with the Commonwealth to make best use of Commonwealth sponsored employment and training programs or funds allocated to the State for these purposes; and
- To maintain an analytical research and advisory capacity to provide up-to-date and relevant advice on the labour market.

At the time of establishing this office, responsibility for the administration of the Industrial and Commercial Training Act was committed to the portfolio of Employment and Further Education. Previously the Act was committed to the responsibility of the Minister of Labour.

Section 9 of the Industrial and Commercial Training Act makes provision for membership of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, which is a tripartite commission appointed by the Governor and the membership of which is:

- (a) a full-time member, appointed to be Chairman of the commission;
 - (b) the Director of the Department of Labour or his nominee;
 - (c) the Director-General of Further Education or his nominee;
 - (d) three persons appointed, after consultation with employer associations, to represent the interests of employers;
- and
- (e) three persons appointed, after consultation with the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, to represent the interest of employees.

Whilst strong links will always remain between vocational training and industrial relations matters it is more appropriate that the chief executive of the agency directly responsible to the Government in respect of employment and training matters be a member of the commission. For the period since the establishment of the Office of Employment and Training its chief executive has been the nominee of the Director of the Department of Labour. The Industrial Relations Advisory Council has supported the proposal. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 reflects the change of membership of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission in that the Director, Office of Employment and Training, or his nominee, will be one of the Government representatives on the commission in lieu of the Director, Department of Labour.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 February. Page 2999.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): As an opportunity for the House to scrutinise the progress of the budget, this debate has become virtually meaningless. Traditionally, under former Governments, this debate was held in late March or April—when the financial year was sufficiently advanced to allow members to make some meaningful assessment of the current year's budget and how it might affect the next, but not under this Government which, for three years now, has brought on this debate unnecessarily early as yet another erosion of Parliament's role.

The Government plans parliamentary sittings until April. There is no reason why this Bill could not have been deferred until then. As it is, we must take at face value what the Premier has told us in his second reading speech about the current state of the Consolidated Account. And South Australians know how dangerous that can be on the subjects of taxes, privatisation, interest rates, the Entertainment Centre, parole reform, and the cost of the ASER project.

They were just some of the issues on which the Premier has misled the public. So, the House is entitled to be sceptical to say the least when the Premier asks us to trust his word that the Budget is on target. Apparently, the deficit will come out about on line with original budget estimates. This is despite the fact that in some areas, receipts are running ahead of expectations.

The House will have to wait until the full budget debate in September to scrutinise the reasons why the Government has been unable to use these extra receipts to reduce the deficit rather than increase spending yet again. Already, this

Government has increased State public sector spending by 77.5 per cent in its first four years in office: that is well over twice the rate of inflation.

The Premier's second reading speech, despite its rhetoric about exercising tight financial control, foreshadows no abatement in the Government's spend, spend, spend policy. The financial policies of this Government and of its friends in Canberra, which the Premier fully supports, offer no incentive, no encouragement and no hope to the risk-taker, the entrepreneur. It is hardly surprising that the latest figures show South Australia's private sector workforce in decline.

The ABS statistics on public and private employment show that between September 1985 and September 1986 private sector employment in South Australia fell by 1.8 per cent. We were the only State to record a decline. We lost more than 3 000 private sector jobs. Nationally, private sector employment rose by 5 per cent. I ask the House to compare that rise of 5 per cent to the decline in South Australia of 1 per cent, and I invite the House to consider other indicators of the current economic and social health of South Australia. Our unemployment rate remains above the national average—above what it was when the Premier came to office. There has been no improvement in teenage unemployment, despite all the schemes wrapped up in glossy brochures.

Throughout 1986, job vacancies in South Australia were consistently the lowest of the mainland States—6.6 per cent of the national total, and well under what should be our share on a per capita basis. The living standards of those lucky enough to be in work are also declining relative to the other States. In 1981, average ordinary time earnings for a man in South Australia amounted to 97.8 per cent of the national average. Since the election of this Government it has eroded to 96.5 per cent. That is an erosion of about \$5.40 a week for a man on the average wage. I take that average wage relating to a man because, as the House would realise, there are separate statistics relating to male, female and youth employment. And, with more and more of the weekly pay packet having to meet higher taxes and higher interest rates, it is little wonder that bankruptcies in South Australia are at a record high, that retail sales are in decline and that activity in key areas like building and car sales is seriously lagging.

South Australia celebrated its Jubilee Year with 1 167 bankruptcies—the highest ever and more than three a day. And, in the second half of 1986, our total bankruptcies were 32 more than Victoria and 217 more than Western Australia, despite our smaller population. Currently, we account for 18 per cent of total Australian bankruptcies, well over twice what should be our per capita share. The fact that more and more South Australians are going under or finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet is showing up in our supermarkets and department stores.

Between November 1985 and November 1986 South Australia was the only State to show a decline in the value of retail sales. I understand also that post-Christmas activity is reason for even further concern. In the building industry, in the December quarter, South Australia had the lowest value of building activity of the mainland States, the lowest number of dwellings approved and commenced. In car sales, registrations in 1986 were the lowest for 25 years, and 1987 has started off even worse with a daily registration rate of only 107—over 50 a day fewer than in 1985. Of course one of the principal reasons for that is the Federal Labor Government's fringe benefits tax, which has a disproportionate effect on South Australia—a tax package, which I remind the House, the Premier has consistently supported.

While our domestic economic performance has been bad, our export performance is absolutely dismal. The value of manufactured goods exported from Australia since 1979 has increased by 38 per cent, but over the same period South Australia's exports have declined in money terms by 19 per cent—in real terms by much more. One should compare the Australian increase of 38 per cent to the South Australian decline of 19 per cent. In 1979, South Australia produced 14.5 per cent of manufactured goods exported from Australia. Now we have only 8.6 per cent, and our share of all exports has declined from 8.5 per cent to 6.1 per cent.

With economic indicators like these, the Premier was fortunate indeed that he had an all-year Jubilee Party in 1986 to distract public attention. They are indicators which are also showing up in a social sense—in the pressures that they are putting on individuals, on families and on personal behaviour. The number of rapes, attempted rapes and serious assaults is up 20 per cent, armed robberies are up 48 per cent, and motor vehicle offences have increased 43 per cent—house breakings increased dramatically also, and I am sure the member for Fisher's area is one where there has been an increase in the crime rate, as there has been right across the metropolitan area and South Australia. All this has been brought about by the serious economic and social decline in our community.

South Australia's divorce rate is the highest in Australia, running at more than 11 per day. Also, aggression on the road increases. Our road death and injury rate per 100 000 people is the highest of all the States. Last month, South Australia had 11.4 per cent of total road deaths in Australia. More and more, people outside the State are looking with concern at our economic and social situation. Our national and international reputation as a civilised, caring community is under threat. We are no longer the most attractive State to new settlers. Our rate of population growth is only half the national average, and our gain in population from interstate and overseas is about one-seventh of the national average.

What this picture adds up to is a serious decline in South Australia's economic and social fabric—an assault on the living standards of average South Australians. Yachts, casinos, entertainment centres and submarines can no longer submerge the true picture. They may be good as part of a bigger picture, but they are only a means to the end of securing higher living standards and more opportunities for all South Australians. Yet the Premier has used them as ends in themselves. His Government has failed to plan for the longer term. It simply adopts the attitude that, if a problem is ignored, it will go away.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Just ask any department head about the Premier's decision making. They will be pleased to give you chapter and verse on it. Any criticism is condemned as carping, when no problem can be tackled, let alone, resolved, unless it is first of all admitted, recognised or acknowledged. The Premier also hates questions about things like the America's Cup yacht, the Jubilee year failures and the entertainment centre. Shamelessly, he used them to chase votes during the election campaign. He craved the kudos then, but he tries to reject the responsibility now that they have not turned out to be everything the Premier promised. He is certainly a good news Premier who cannot cope with the bad.

The Premier has also been lily livered in standing up to be counted in Canberra on the fringe benefits tax, the capital gains tax, the wine tax and the tax on entertainment. They have all hit South Australia more than any other State. Yet what has been the impact of the Premier in Canberra? Zilch!

There have been no changes and full impact. Next, we will see the workers out at Mitsubishi and General-Motor's Holdens really starting to be laid off in large numbers as the result of the lack of action, foresight, willpower and determination of this Premier to stand up for this State's interests in the long term. Yet this Premier has the effrontery to challenge other people on that, when he went to Canberra to fight for the introduction of the fringe benefits tax which is wrecking our car industry. Here in South Australia, he leads a Government more interested in slogans, stunts and symbols than in substance. It is a Government which promised only a year ago not to embark on any form of privatisation of public assets—a good policy being put in place, I might add. However, it is the hypocrisy of the stand that needs to be highlighted to the people of South Australia.

The Premier also promised to keep the ceiling on bank home loan interest rates. It was interesting to see the Premier's response to that question today—one of sympathy and caring, when in 1985, just before the election, he made specific promises to the electorate, knowing full well that those promises were rubbish and would not be kept. It is typical of Labor Governments—they make a promise and, as soon as the election is out of the way, they break that promise. Then they let interest rates rise. The member for Fisher and a few others in marginal seats around Adelaide will well understand the impact of that on the household budget of ordinary South Australians.

This is the Labor Government that promised to keep the ceiling on interest rates! The Premier promised to implement a five year economic plan, with emphasis on overseas trade. He also promised to significantly lower youth unemployment through the YES scheme, and to reduce workers compensation premiums by more than 44 per cent. That promise evaporated fairly quickly. He also promised to immediately take test cases against lenient court sentences. Another promise was to build a world class entertainment centre. It was a package dressed up in taxpayer-funded colour brochures and mischievous and misleading advertising. All these major promises, delivered with lofty sentiment at the election, have failed to materialise.

Let me address the Government's most serious failing—on the State economy. While it has directed attention to the submarine project—and there is nothing wrong with that in itself—the Government has completely failed to put into place an overall, credible economic policy. I know this is an issue concerning senior, conscientious officers in the Department of State Development. Resignations in the department over the last year show that. Remember the glossy publication that the Premier released at the last election promising a five year economic plan? One of its cornerstones was to be the establishment of S.A. International. In his election policy speech, the Premier said that this organisation would:

... bring together private sector expertise and Government backing to promote trade wherever there are opportunities for South Australian business.

This is a task to which the Government should have been giving the highest priority. This is particularly so because of the devaluation in our currency and the opportunities this offers on export markets. Yet this Government appears to think its job is done when it has produced a brochure. S.A. International has failed to materialise. All Labor has done regarding export effort is to hinder it. With its high tax and high interest rate policies pushing up the cost of production, and its rigid labour market policies further eroding our ability to compete on international markets. The need to boost our export performance is the single most important issue affecting South Australia's economic future. But we rarely hear the Premier or his Ministers talk about

it. They do not address the problems. They refuse to acknowledge the difficulties faced by exporters in an increasingly competitive world.

Labor has governed South Australia for 17 of the last 22 years and in that period South Australia's enduring achievements—the Stony Point liquids scheme, Roxby Downs, Technology Park, O-Bahn, the Festival Centre—have all been Liberal initiatives. But, in particular, it has been a period in which our economy should have been adjusting to the opportunities presented by changes in the world economy. The emphasis on developing import-competing industries behind high protective barriers needed to be changed. Yet, if we ask ourselves today whether the State has done all it can to encourage and assist our industry to restructure so that it is better suited to the challenges of today, the answer must be 'No'.

While the domestic market is largely oversupplied and can grow only very slowly, this Government's policies and decision-making are stalled and without purpose. South Australia needs to export much more to grow. Our manufacturing industries need all the help they can get to make them more specialised and efficient. But Labor Government policy means we still lack the outlook to seize the potential or even to compete adequately with imports. Now, on the rare occasions when they do address this question, Government members smugly refer to the State's industrial record as though that should be sufficient to guarantee expansion. And they claim that only under Labor can that record be maintained—the record which consistently sees the number of working days lost through industrial disputes running at levels well below the national average. This, of course, is a myth, and I have referred to it before in this House.

Let me now support my contention with reference to the recent publication *The State as Developer*. It examines in depth South Australia's State industrialisation strategies and on page 67 publishes some very illuminating figures. They show that right through this century South Australia has had the lowest number of working days lost due to industrial disputes. And I hardly need point out to the House that for most of the time non-Labor Governments have been in office.

So, I say again, the constant claim of members opposite that only under Labor can the sort of industrial peace be guaranteed to win us the submarine project and to entice other investment is a complete furphy. On the contrary, this long established record—one in which all South Australians should take pride—is the product of a variety of historical factors, most of which have absolutely nothing to do with Party politics. But, rather than simply crowing about this one point in our favour, I challenge the Government to look at the other factors which inhibit our export performance:

the rigidities in our industrial relations system which force up costs and hold back productivity gains;

the Government taxes and charges which are another cost of production; and

the mass of Government regulations which discourage investment effort and enterprise.

These are the sorts of issues on which we as members of this Parliament should be concentrating. But so much of what passes in this House for debate is sterile irrelevancy. New ideas and long-term thinking have been missing from the agenda for too long.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Far too much of what is done in this place is preoccupied with personal politics—and I instance that interjection from the member for Fisher. There is far too

much preoccupation with personal, parochial and Party politics.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Hasn't the honourable member heard about SA International—that new export drive which the Government promised but about which it has done nothing? The honourable member ought to listen. I know that members opposite do not like the facts but the facts are there and cannot be disputed. We have a Government that is too fond of gimmicks and too frightened to face the real issues.

The Premier shuts his door at the first sign of a problem. Departmental heads complain that they cannot get to see him to get a decision. Take Amdel, for example: the Government has been talking for almost three years but still cannot grasp the nettle. Legislation in that regard still has not been introduced here because the Minister has to front the ALP State Council and explain the position away before the legislation can be introduced. This is despite the fact that Cabinet made the decision well before the election, a matter that was concealed from the public of South Australia. The ship of State cannot be kept afloat by Government policy and decision making which centres on yachts, casinos, entertainment and car races. It is time we dealt in a genuine and constructive way with some of the real issues, namely: how the current spate of company rationalisation will affect our long term economic future; working out precisely what the Government should and should not do with our taxes (and it gets plenty of them); how much tax we should pay, and in what form; better relations between management and the work force; how we make our education system more relevant to tomorrow's challenges and opportunities; the implications for all of us in the ageing of our population; how we can make more areas of our State more productive; how we can ensure that the man on the land retains the incentive to remain one of our key export earners; and how we can improve our communications and reduce our transport costs to boost trade.

Issues like that cannot be resolved with a slogan and a glossy brochure. We all know why such publications were produced just before the election campaign: to create a false perception. Nor can we go on pretending that a car race or a few submarines will give us a comfortable sail into the future. That simply will not occur. There are underlying problems in the economy of South Australia, and it is about time that they were acknowledged. When the problem is acknowledged we will have a Government that is prepared to sit down and start working out some economic directions for South Australia, to take us not only to the end of this decade but to the turn of the century. The long term future of all South Australians will be dependent on that rather than on the Government gearing itself for the next election campaign.

It is all very well for the member for Fisher to laugh. I know that he believes that the fact that the living standards of his constituents have been eroded by \$5.40 a week is a laughing matter. I do not consider it a laughing matter. One of the reasons they have been eroded is the high taxes and charges applied to all South Australians by this Government, and the people who can least afford it are average South Australians who are out there battling to make ends meet, and not only because of the high interest rates—and I note the member for Fisher has gone very quiet now; he has shut up, because he well understands that his interjections are totally irrelevant. He is supposed to be representing an electorate, representing its concerns in this place and he would do well to find out what are the problems of his constituents.

They are battling to make ends meet, battling to meet the high interest rates brought about by Labor Government policies: the highest interest rates in over 50 years, brought about by Labor administration; by the lack of policy direction for Australia. We will have a mini budget in May to try to get us back on course: a last desperate attempt by the Hawke Government to save itself. The House ought to note that the policies of the Hawke Government have been followed through by this Administration in South Australia, supported at EPAC; supported at Premiers Conferences consistently; and if we talk about big borrowing Governments, South Australia's capacity is there. We borrowed \$100 million last year to prop up the capital works program for the short term. That will mean that South Australians, in seven years time, will have to pick up a tab for \$325 million.

Obviously, the Premier is not working on being in Government then, because there will be a massive problem for the Government of the day to work out how it will repay that debt—\$325 million on \$100 million gained this year. That is the impact. That is the mortgaging of the future of South Australians about which I spoke before. That is why for South Australia we need some long-term economic policies and plans which have as their base the future of individuals—choice—so that they can make ends meet and so that they can make their lot and that of their family a better one. That is why this Parliament has to get back to basics.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): In talking about Supply I want to concentrate on Supply to the Children's Services Office and the problems of child-care within my electorate. Since I last mentioned this subject in Parliament there have been two pleasing developments in my electorate. An announcement was made in December by the Department for Community Services that this Federal Government department was prepared to fund an after-school care program in my electorate, centred on the Fulham Gardens Primary School site. This site would service a large area of the Woodville council, and also the Henley and Grange council areas.

There has been and still is a desperate need for all areas of child-care within my district. It is very pleasing to see that, after a four-year campaign by me, we now have the first Government funded child-care program within my electorate. After-school care was started in the area by a group known as the Henley and Grange Action Group, a self-funded program started at the Grange Primary School. A group of mothers from that school, without any Government assistance whatsoever, banded together with the help of administration from the Henley and Grange council to provide for the people in that area an after-school care program which was fully funded by the parents who were prepared to have their children included within this program.

I am a member of this organisation, and it is very pleasing to see that funding has now occurred, so that people in more needy circumstances may be involved in the after-school care program, which is of particular importance in this area. We have many so-called latch key children who are unsupervised between the time they finish primary school and the time their parents come home in the evening. Unsupervised children in that situation from time to time get into trouble, and it is very pleasing to see that at least a start has been made in trying to cover this situation. After-school care has been of particular concern both to me and to the residents of Henley and Grange because of the problems of unsupervised children.

I believe that just one program is insufficient to cover the sort of demand there is now in my electorate. I would

like to give due praise to the Henley and Grange Council—and particularly to its officer Natalie Fuller—for the strenuous help and assistance given to the program. The Henley and Grange Council has been deeply involved in providing delivery of human services to the district, and the time and money it has been prepared to give to allow Ms Natalie Fuller to organise and arrange child-care can only be commended.

I am also pleased to see the announcement by the Minister of Children's Services, Hon. Greg Crafter, in relation to the proposed building of more child-care centres. In the list he provided, the Woodville area was named with a proposed completion date of March 1988. I was very pleased to see this, and my inquiries of the Children's Services Office lead me to believe that a new child-care centre will be erected within my electorate. I will not be satisfied, however, until I see the bricks and mortar of the centre, and I know that negotiations are now under way between the Children's Services Office and the Woodville council in regard to this site. I understand that the Children's Services Office would like to have the new child-care centre erected adjacent to the Barbara Kiker Memorial Kindergarten, requiring the Woodville council's permission, and that matter is under negotiation. I sincerely hope that these negotiations are not protracted and that we will be able to see a new child-care centre rise within the immediate future.

The other problem to which I wish to refer is in relation to the announcement of the new child-care centre. I understand from today's *News* that a mini budget is to be introduced by the Federal Government, and I sincerely hope that the announcements already made in regard to child-care centres will stand, and that we do not see a reduction in the Federal budget in this area.

If decisions have to be made in regard to such a reduction, I hope that due consideration will be given to the absolute lack of any child-care whatsoever in my section, in the Henley and Grange section and in the Woodville section in the western area. That area covers not only the suburbs I have already mentioned but Flinders Park, Lockleys, part of Seaton, Fulham Gardens, Fulham and that whole huge area which to date has no child-care coverage whatsoever.

The two events which led to an increase in the child-care facilities within my electorate are extremely pleasing, and I believe that I have been able to be of some assistance in providing these facilities. One thing I have learned in my career in politics is that it is very rare to achieve anything very quickly.

Whether one is talking of child-care, tourism, creation of employment, or solving any other problem—particularly that of exploitation—the road to success is very slow indeed. It is as a result of constant attention to problems over many years that one sees some success from time to time. I am hopeful that, this time, success will be achieved in the child-care area in my electorate.

I turn now to problems raised with me from time to time by constituents relating to financial advice which was given to them in the past and which in many instances, unfortunately, is still being given to them. One sees from time to time headlines about the number of bank robberies occurring in Adelaide, but the amount of money that bank robbers get away with is nothing compared to the amount of money taken from my constituents because of advice given to them by unscrupulous people.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Mitcham produces another of his inane interjections and makes the stupid suggestion that I support bank robberies. I hope that, when

people read this speech, they will understand that I am doing nothing of the sort.

I have mentioned previously to the Parliament that I believe there is a need for better control of financial advisory services given to the public. I have recently received complaints from constituents about various financial propositions that they have been led to believe would produce quick and spectacular returns on their investment money. I refer particularly to one of my constituents who took advice many years ago about investing in a pine plantation. I am not against investment in pine forests, and I believe that some investments in that sort of activity may be useful, provided the investor is prepared to wait between 15 and 20 years for a return on investment.

In this case my constituent invested in a firm called Pine Forests of Australia Pty Ltd, situated in Orange, New South Wales. I name this company while being fully aware of the criticisms made of members of Parliament from time to time for naming specific companies. I hasten to inform the Parliament that I have been corresponding with this company for more than four years in an attempt to right some of the wrongs that have occurred because of advice tendered to my constituent. I have written, also, to the appropriate department in New South Wales, but they have yet to right the wrong done to this constituent.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: If the member is patient he will hear all the details: I have nine minutes left to finish my speech. My constituent who invested in this organisation in 1966, received correspondence in 1983 informing her that her investment in the pine plantation had been affected by a fire which had occurred in December 1982. The correspondence informed her of the loss and requested her to invest more money, which would provide her with a return on her investment plus a further return on the additional money that she was being requested to invest. As my constituent is a pensioner who is no longer able to invest in any venture, she sought to sell the land purchased from this organisation in order to get a return on her money. I believe that, with similar investments in other forestry companies, provision is made for disasters such as fires by insurance covering the whole number of people investing in the company. Such insurance was not provided by the company to which I refer.

As I have mentioned, I have had continuous correspondence with this organisation for four years: my file on this matter is extremely thick. The latest information from the company—which, incidentally, took months and months to reply—indicates that Pine Forests of Australia Pty Ltd is of the opinion that my constituent should have made arrangements to protect her investment by way of insurance, although such advice was never given to her in the original contract, of which I have a copy. The company cannot sell the land that she has purchased and, because of the fire, there appears to be no hope of a return on the money that she invested in the company.

I believe that this is a poor form of investment and that, before any such investment proposition is made to anyone, the advice tendered should be subject to some form of regulation. The proposition put to my constituent in relation to the return on her money was very rosy indeed, and led her to believe that she need only invest in the purchase of land with this company and it would grow the pine forest and cover any expenses. This has proven to be untrue. At no stage was my constituent advised that she should take out insurance against fire. The impression given to her was that all charges would be taken care of by the company and

that her original investment was all that was necessary to provide her with an eventual return.

I believe that this case, in which Pine Forests of Australia Pty Ltd provided poor investment advice to my constituent, illustrates the need for the Parliament to take a firm view on the regulating of financial advisers. This company has proven to be intractable so far as my correspondence is concerned. It is my desire that the land involved be repurchased by the company. Unfortunately, this is not the only form of investment about which my constituents have sought advice and assistance from me in an attempt to redress some of the wrongs and imperfections of financial advice given to them.

I refer also to macadamia nut plantations and tropical fruit plantations involving companies which I believe have very dubious qualifications but which have promised returns in a few years of 60 per cent to 70 per cent. Many of these companies escape Department of Consumer Affairs legislation because they do not make out an appropriate prospectus. They overcome that requirement by making the investors partners in the company instead of investors. In this way the company involved does not need to provide a prospectus and by using that mechanism it escapes the legislation that this Parliament wants to apply to it. I hope that this Parliament will consider the problems arising because of the tendering of poor financial advice by people concerned only with gaining as much capital as they can: they leave a shell company, or, by spending the capital, allow the company to slide into bankruptcy.

With more and more people obtaining lump sum payments as a result of redundancies, early retirements and ordinary retirements, and with the increasing provision of superannuation that is now the vogue, it is time that various Parliaments throughout Australia thought about regulating the type of people who provide this financial advice.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I support the Bill and commend the Leader of the Opposition for his fine speech, which outlined the enormous deficiencies in the State Government's performance since it came to office on 6 November 1982. I will not repeat the statistics except to say that they are grim and offer little hope for South Australians. Also, they reflect very poorly on the Government's performance over the past four years.

I think it is important to put the Supply Bill in perspective. It is strange that it has come before us so early in the sittings. The Government has not provided any details as to how the budget is running, except that it thinks that there will be a little plus and a little minus here and there and that generally the budget is on target. Underlying the lack of details is the fact that a lot of people are being hurt by State Government taxation, and they will hurt tomorrow and the next day also. Also important is the fact that some of those taxation measures bite into areas which can least afford it.

On 12 March I will move a motion that addresses the question of land tax, which is a serious problem. I do not wish to canvass that debate today, but I believe that, if members talked to their constituents who try to operate small businesses in South Australia, they would realise—and perhaps for the first time Government members would understand—the horrific impact that land tax is having on business prospects in this State. The Leader has already pointed out that bankruptcies are at an all time high in this State—they are at the highest level since the Great Depression. The Government cannot stand on a record which is indifferent, to say the least; it cannot evade questions that are important to the State: and it cannot continually avoid some of the major issues that confront this State.

I will not canvass some of the sketchy details contained in the second reading explanation. However, I note that it contained some inane comment about the delay in the national wage case decision affecting pay-roll tax revenues. One would think that, when the decision is made, there will be some catch-up phase, and members know that budgets do not necessarily run the same amount of revenue per month. That indicates the Treasurer's very poor budgeting ability.

It is important that the Government does all in its power to improve this State's prospects as well as those of the people. We know that a lot of people in the community are being hurt. We know also that there has been a record number of bankruptcies, which involve people who have shown a little endeavour but who have finally been crushed by State of Federal policies. We know that there are enormous problems in relation to crime, partly as a result of changed economic circumstances and partly as a result of the failure of this Government to lay down a clear and unequivocal policy on law and order.

Today the Minister of State Development and Technology relied on bluff and bluster when he answered a question that I asked about the future of the national toolmaking centre that is scheduled for the GMH Woodville site. I raised that question because it is a very important one. It reflects on the siege mentality of the Government when it does not get out and talk to the people of this State. Members of the Opposition have been informed by various people that the ALP is taking a rest this year because Federal politics will overtake State politics and really it does not have to perform. That is not good enough for the State or for its economy.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is common knowledge. To take a simple example, I think the member for Bright represented the Premier at the Oaks Day race meeting.

Ms Gayler: The Premier might have been elsewhere.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Newland said, 'He might have been elsewhere,' and that of course means also that 12 Cabinet members were absent at the time. Nobody would believe that.

Mr Tyler: They all might have had commitments.

Mr S.J. BAKER: 'They all might have had commitments,' said the member for Fisher. If one thinks something is important enough, one makes the time. Obviously, the Government does not make the time. It is a very small example, but it is indicative of the Government's attitude. In relation to the question that I asked the Minister, the fact is that the Minister has not opened his door. I do not know whether that is because his departmental officers have not properly advised him, or whether it is because Mr Guerin from the Premier's Department has not bothered him. However, the fact is that the Minister has not taken the trouble to talk to local industry.

It is very important that local industry receives the support of Government. When we talk about job opportunities, it is very important that that door opens. When the subject of Vision Systems was raised, that door closed very smartly. When that company offered a cheaper and superior surveillance system for the Mobilong gaol, the door closed, and we do not know why that was so. However, we know that some strange things happened. There was a complete lack of support for South Australian industry.

Again, in relation to the tooling centre, there is no rapport with the industry. Many employers now say, 'Look, Mr Bannon was very cooperative. One could always talk to him just before an election. One could always ring one of his

officers and obtain an answer, but today we cannot do that.' Business communities in this State are very frustrated about the lack of performance by this Government.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I certainly do talk to them, and they are quite unhappy with the attitude and slack performance of this Government, which does not seem to care. The Government may well care in two years time when it faces another election, but at the moment it certainly does not care. If it cannot institute policies which demonstrate some vision and which can take the State forward, at least it should spare the time to assist those people who are trying to do the best by the State. At the moment the Government is not doing that; nor does it seem to have any intention of doing so. It is about time that the Government lifted its game.

I am sure that, if any member opposite wanted to canvass industry to ascertain how it is bleeding at the moment and how it can be helped, they would be welcomed at the door; but they will not take the opportunity. We have heard—and we will continue to do so—about the rural crisis. Many of the solutions are beyond the State Government, because overseas markets fluctuate quite violently and are very volatile. They are questions that cannot be answered at State level. However, some things can be done at State level.

I will refer to the extent to which the Premier and the State Government have supported the Hawke Labor Government, which has contributed significantly to the demise of the rural sector. When one looks at the figures (and I ask members opposite to look at the figures relating to the number of people in the labour force and the changes that have taken place in that area over the past year), one sees some surprising results. The results show quite clearly that most of the increases in employment have been in the non-metropolitan area.

They have taken place outside Adelaide. As the rural crisis bites deeper, as farmers walk off the land, and as people cannot support themselves because of the high interest rates that are supported by the Premier here because he supports the Hawke Federal Government, the impact on the State's economy will be severe indeed. If things continue as they are going at present, we will see a severe crisis right across the board in many of our domestic products and service sectors.

In the manufacturing sector, 5 000 jobs were lost last year because of downturns. Anyone going back 15 years in the performance of the manufacturing sector will see that this State has done poorly. It was recognised by one and all that the policies of the Dunstan Government in the 1970s did not help South Australian industry. We had the ability to produce goods at a lower price because we had a cost differential, but that cost differential has been eroded and this Government has done nothing to change that trend.

It is important that the Government understand that we must perform not only for our own regional economy, but also for the national and the international economies. Nothing has been done in this regard, and on every opportunity support has been given to wage claims and to applications for reduced working hours, as well as to the actions of certain elements of the trade union movement that have been condoned by this Government. None of those things has helped the State. This Government could show direction and backbone and indicate that it intends to lead this State in a renewal of some form of prosperity, but it declines to make the hard decisions. It is a Government under siege. It does not know what to do or how to do it. It is useful to look back at the record of the Tonkin Government when it was in office for three difficult years.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: It's a painful record.

Mr S.J. BAKER: No, the Tonkin Government could be proud of its achievements. If the Minister for Environment and Planning would look at the record and see what was put on the ground during that period and what has been put on the ground since then, he would feel a sense of shame if he was capable of feeling shame. The Leader of the Opposition has already outlined certain projects that were up and running during the term of the Tonkin Government or put in train by it. Indeed, it was the most significant developmental surge in this State since the early 1970s, but such projects have since been eroded by the Bannon Government. Somewhere along the line the press will look at the record of the Bannon Government and ask what it has done for South Australia over the past four years.

Behind the rhetoric, the press releases, and the enormous effort that has been made to cultivate the press, someone will ask, 'Mr Bannon, what have you done for South Australia? Why is this Government's performance the worst of any State?' We have the chance in a small regional economy with generally good industrial relations to set out on a new path for this State and to show a little vision. However, the same old policies are trotted out. The Bannon Government supports various elements of the trade union movement but does not support South Australians generally. We have heard of the impact on the retailing sector and the fact that it has had one of the worst trading years on record. It will not stop there. The parts of the private sector that were buoyed up by celebrations such as the Grand Prix will not hold up.

The only people who may have benefited during the past four years must be those in the accounting sector, because people need accountants to sort out the massive problems resulting from changes made by the Federal Government. On all fronts we are doing poorly. Sure, there has been an increase in tourism, but we still have nowhere near our share of tourism in this State. There are ways in which tourism could be boosted so as to attract more tourists to South Australia. We could sell to various countries specific policies that are tailored to their needs, but this Government has done little in that regard. In fact, we have spent more time running around China where, at the most, our chances for trade are limited because this Government simply does not have the wit to understand what trade relations it must have with China in order to get a part of the expanding market there.

We do not know the mechanisms to achieve the expansion of our trade profiles. While I was in Japan earlier this year, the Japanese, who are normally quiet and almost apologetic in the way in which they approach international visitors, clearly said that they did not like Australia because Australia could not perform, could not produce, and could not deliver on time. Yet nothing has been done by this Government to address that question. When the unions stop supplies at the airport or on the wharves, trade is disrupted and the unions are supported by the Bannon Labor Government. That is the way in which this Government produces jobs in this State! The Government could do so much for industry in this State. It could turn around the downturn of industry that took place in the gay Dunstan years, but it has neither the vision nor the capacity to be able to reverse the way in which it approaches these problems.

One of the most disappointing aspects of this State Government's performance must be its support for the policies of the present Federal Government. After all, Mr Bannon was the most ardent admirer of Prime Minister Hawke

when the Prime Minister enunciated his policy on a fringe benefits tax. Perhaps the people out there do not understand that tax. Mr Bannon led the charge that has resulted in the demise of our motor vehicle manufacturing industry. That was his contribution to the economic welfare and wellbeing of this State. And we are paying for those policies because they were ill-considered, ill-founded, and indeed, defied all sense of logic.

Concerning the capital gains tax, the welfare housing bill will soon be increased; otherwise, many people will be sleeping in Light Square or being told to move to other areas as a result of the capital gains tax preventing investment in residential rental properties. In fact, that is happening already today. The list of people lining up for welfare housing is increasing. The budget deficit financing, which has led to the debacle of our increasing international debt—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The honourable member had better get his facts right. I am talking about the Hawke Federal Government. This has led to the demise of the Australian dollar and has seriously impacted on the balance of trade figures. If we could achieve an improvement to the level when he came in, that \$110 billion debt which we have today and on which we are paying prime interest would be decreased to \$70 billion, with consequent lower interest rate repayments on the international market. We are talking about a budget from which about 40 per cent of our earnings will be spent on interest rates overseas. What a great benefit would ensure if the Government could effect such a reversal.

Mr Bannon supported those policies. He supports, by definition, the high interest rates that are being pushed by the Hawke Government to shore up the floundering dollar that was placed at risk originally because of his poor budget management. If the dollar had not gone on its terrific slide, we would not be seeing the present horrific consequences. Mr Bannon supports high unemployment levels because that is what the Hawke Government's policies have brought about. Mr Bannon has continually told Mr Hawke and Mr Keating, 'We support you in everything that you do.' The only time that Mr Bannon has gone to Canberra and timidly told Mr Hawke, 'We are not happy about this' the Hawke Government has said, 'You have supported everything else, so you might as well support this.' Premier Bannon supports the high levels of unemployment in this State.

In relation to the customs changes, putting South Australia at risk, the Federal member for Port Adelaide (Mick Young) did not want to know about this, and people, including trade unionists, who live in Port Adelaide say that they could not get through Mick Young's door for three months, because he was not interested. That is how much support we are getting for South Australia. We continually see this disruption to our export trade through the policies of trade unions. We have international investment in projects such as the ASER development affected, and people will not want to invest here because of the nefarious activities of the BLF, painters and dockers and other unions. These unions operate with absolute impunity because this Government does not have the wit, will or backbone to stand up and take action.

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

Mr RANN (Briggs): In following the member for Mitcham, I want to talk about some of the matters he raised in saying that South Australia's record of financial management is the worst of any State.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr RANN: You did say it—the worst economic performance compared to other States. The honourable member also talked about the Federal Government. Today I want to lend my public support for a group of young people in my electorate who are getting support through this Supply Bill in terms of their role in Community Involvement Through Youth (CITY) in the northern suburbs. Shortly after becoming the member for Briggs, I became interested in the operations of a group of unemployed young people collectively known as Rough Cut.

In 1985 these young people, with the support of the State Government financially, produced, wrote and performed a rock video about life for young people in the northern suburbs. This video, which featured interviews with unemployed young people, the Minister of State Development and Technology, the Minister of Housing and Construction and the member for Elizabeth, concentrated on issues such as unemployment, alcohol and drug abuse, recreation needs, and so on. It was a moving, challenging video that earned national attention and a few months ago won a national filmmakers award.

I stress that it was a professionally produced video produced by enthusiastic young amateurs who shared an enthusiasm for rock music and video production. Some of the tracks written and produced by these young people would stand up alongside the very best offered nationally. That is not surprising, because the northern suburbs have produced the likes of Jimmy Barnes, Glen Shorrock, Little River Band, and so on. Many of the 140 young people involved with Rough Cut, which as I say is being supported by CITY, which the State Government funds, are involved in rock bands that perform at venues throughout the northern suburbs. Others have been involved in the production of other videos, including a video for the State Youth Workers Conference and a video on independent community living for disabled people at the Regency Park centre. In other words, it is getting young unemployed people involved with other people who have problems in our community.

Rough Cut has also produced a video on Shop Front, which is the adolescent health referral service in Salisbury, to promote and provide information on a range of health issues. Rough Cut has organised a concert in Elizabeth and a series of highly successful discos at Elizabeth, Salisbury and Blackwood, again, showing its support for young people in the area. Rough Cut is also involved in other issues of concern to young people. It has conducted training workshops on using video cameras, lighting, editing and music. Rough Cut has also worked with Para Hills High School students, participating in a peer education program focusing on health issues such as drug and alcohol abuse, sexually transmitted diseases, sexual abuse, and so on. I know that Rough Cut is also keen to stage a major rock concert to focus on the talent that is emerging from Adelaide's northern suburbs.

In this debate today I want to record that I have given my total support to its submission to the Federal Minister for Health (Dr Neal Blewett) to establish a local facility or centre for music and video production and training. Rough Cut Incorporated is applying for funds under the Commonwealth's national health promotion program, and that is very appropriate, because much of Rough Cut's work has focused on the problems that young people in the northern suburbs are having with drug and alcohol abuse. Indeed, in its proposal it says that it wants to establish a drug free youth facility as a base for video and music production and training activities. The facility would also be accessible to other young people from the local area, and Rough Cut wants to produce a range of videos on various health issues

affecting young people. As the videos would be produced by young people for other young people in the area, the strength of this strategy lies in the peer group education model, and that is very important in tackling drug and alcohol abuse. It will be aiming at people aged between 15 and 25 years.

I have been most impressed with the maturity and responsibility shown by Rough Cut members in their various endeavours, including their promotion and staging of supervised youth discos. I believe that Rough Cut, in developing the artistic and organisational skills of the young unemployed, has become an active force against drug and alcohol abuse in our area. Rough Cut has briefed me on its plans to establish this youth facility as a base for video and music production and other activities. I am also aware that Rough Cut members are keen to produce a range of videos on various health issues affecting young people. The establishment of such a facility will contribute to the momentum of support Rough Cut is receiving from young people in the northern suburbs, and I have absolutely no hesitation in supporting the application for funds.

Just a few moments ago the member for Mitcham talked about how South Australia's economic performance compares with that of other States and also reflected on our role, in terms of a State, compared with the Federal Government's economic programs. Today I want to talk about how we compare with other States, particularly Queensland. For about the 10 years that I have lived and worked in this State the Liberal Party and its Leaders have used Queensland as their frame of reference. To David Tonkin, to Dean Brown, to the present Leader of the Opposition and much of the Liberal front bench, Queensland has been their shining light on the hill—their inspiration, their Camelot.

For them Queensland has symbolised small government, lower taxation, deregulation, privatisation, union bashing, and incentive for private enterprise. I am afraid that I have to agree with John Howard and Steele Hall—and yesterday Malcolm Fraser—in saying that this is a myth. Any real analysis shows that Sir Joh has successfully fed the chooks on rhetoric, not action. I hope that the member for Mitcham, in making that comparison with other States in terms of this Supply Bill, will have a look at the facts and not just the mythology that is being peddled.

National and Coalition Governments in Queensland have had 26 years to make their policies work but have failed. There can be no alibis—Queensland is in deep trouble. It's economic performance, despite enormous physical resources and natural advantages, is lagging well behind the other States. More and more Queenslanders are concerned about the security of their jobs, their homes and their businesses. Queensland, after all, consistently leads Australia's unemployment stakes.

The latest unemployment figures show that, while the national unemployment rate was running at 8.28 per cent, in Queensland it was the highest at 10.2 per cent. Queensland records the second highest level of youth unemployment—over 30 per cent—just behind the only Liberal State, Tasmania. For those in jobs, the economic pinch is felt hard. Queensland has consistently had the lowest average weekly earnings in Australia. But Queensland's Premier, with new national aspirations, prefers to blame others, to find fault elsewhere. He blames Canberra, as the Leader of the Opposition did today, even though other States have reduced unemployment to well below Queensland levels.

He blames 'migrants' from the southern States for many of Queensland's woes, including rising unemployment. Yet the facts show that far more people are leaving Queensland to find jobs elsewhere. He blames the unions, even though

he brags around Australia that he has cracked down hard and has made Queensland unions toe the line. Queensland industrial relations (as the member for Mitcham, who is also the shadow spokesman on this area would know) are in a shambles, with well over 300 working days lost per thousand employees—three times higher than in this State.

Sir Joh's excuses keep changing, but in Queensland division and confrontation remain the name of the game. The Premier might have a quiescent press, but in Canberra he would find that a Government cannot claim credit for the good times and then pass the buck when the going gets tough. In the context of this Supply debate and in the context of what the member for Mitcham and the Leader of the Opposition said earlier about comparisons with other States, let us look at how Queensland shapes up in terms of its financial, economic and physical performance. It has the highest public sector deficit of any State. Indeed, according to the United States investment banker, Salomon Brothers, Queensland's total debt grew from \$6 billion to \$9.6 billion—

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I would ask you to rule on the relevance of Queensland finances to the Supply Bill presently before us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have now heard four speeches in the debate. The Leader of the Opposition ranged over a whole series of subjects, including Federal issues. The member for Mitcham, in his speech, referred to the Hawke Federal Government, past Bannon decisions, capital gains tax, the Australian dollar, interest rates, and the Federal member for Port Adelaide. This has been a free ranging debate for members on both sides of the House. Nonetheless, I ask the member for Briggs to relate his remarks to the Supply Bill.

Mr RANN: In making these comparisons, I am responding directly to the member for Mitcham, who in the context of his Supply speech raised the matter of comparison with other States. I refer to Queensland's total State Government deficit in comparison with what we are offering in this Supply Bill. Queensland's total State Government deficit rose from \$391 million to \$1 703 million over the past five years. Further, Queensland has experienced the highest increase in public spending of any State. Conservative 'dry' theologians tell us that an expanding public sector equates with private sector stagnation. The Leader of the Opposition said that today. Again, they look to Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen for inspiration. But this is cold comfort. Since the beginning of that Government, the Queensland Public Service has had the highest growth rate in this nation. During this period the number of Commonwealth public servants—to which the Leader referred—increased by less than half that recorded in Queensland. It is a record that makes a mockery of Joh's promise to take a chopper to the Federal bureaucracy.

In the context of this Supply debate, the Leader of the Opposition said that we were a red tape State. That is just not true. It is Queensland that is Australia's red tape State, with more regulation there than anywhere else in Australia. A recent Queensland Government report found that over-regulation was costing local industry more than \$250 million, and that by 1979 it had more than 7 600 regulations. National Party identity Sir Ernest Savage recently reported that Queensland industry was suffering from over-regulation.

Mr OSWALD: I refer to my original point of order, Sir. The member opposite has gone straight back to the subject that he was referring to previously, that is, a resume of the financial situation and management in Queensland. It has no relevance to the Supply Bill before the House. You, Sir, referred to the contributions of other members here this

afternoon, but all of them linked State finances with Federal finances. That is acceptable because of the flow-on arrangements between the Commonwealth and the State, but Queensland finances have nothing to do with this Bill, and I ask you to rule accordingly and to ask the honourable member to keep his remarks relevant to the State Supply Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand the honourable member's point of order. At this stage I will not uphold the point of order. I point out again to the honourable member that so far a great deal of leniency has been extended to speakers on both sides of the House. I believe that the Supply Bill debate—which is very similar to the debate that was held this time last year—allows a certain amount of latitude. Notwithstanding, I ask the member for Briggs to link his remarks to the Supply Bill.

Mr RANN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Indeed, in closing my remarks on this issue, I refer, in the context of the Supply Bill, to a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in this debate this afternoon, whereby he said that South Australia was introducing higher taxes and charges and backdoor taxation. In fact, an article in last week's *Bulletin* (which honourable members would have read) found that Queensland was the State that had made backdoor taxation an art form, with hidden charges and fees, such as higher freight charges, liquor permits and electricity charges. Indeed, tax collections have increased there by 75 per cent over the past five years. I think it was Sir Roderick Proctor who described Queensland as being an extremely highly taxed State—and we will have to take his word for that.

I am quite happy to make available to members opposite my speech in written form so that they can look at the comparisons that they have challenged me to make. I congratulate the Premier on his orderly conduct of State finances. I urge everyone to challenge the myths, to debunk the Queensland myth in particular about its record compared with ours. Instead of knocking this State and pointing to Queensland as being the ideal, I urge people to consider the facts and not the rhetoric. Mind you, from what we heard last week about the media lessons of the Leader of the Opposition, I have no doubt that if he finds that the Queensland Premier is becoming a popular figure around Australia he will be up there practising saying 'Don't you worry about it!'

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I refer to the member for Briggs's comments about the group called Rough Cut and to the Community Employment Program operating mainly in the northern part of Adelaide. I want to ensure that members of this place realise that there are many young people throughout the State, some unemployed and some working, who put on discos, just as successfully as do Rough Cut, without any Government assistance. If such people asked for Government assistance to subsidise music and all sorts of other things, the State debt would be even greater than it is now. It is about time that Parliamentarians started to promote and encourage young people who give so much of their time to society, free of cost, and I refer particularly to young people who perhaps belong to the junior section of St John, sporting and community groups, hospital groups, and others.

I think there is a tendency for some people in this place to presume that the only young people worth mentioning and giving credit to are those who ask the Government for a handout—and tend to get it quite readily. To be fair, we should be saying to all those other great contributors in our society—some young and others not so young—that they should apply to the Government for a handout also. How-

ever, this would increase the burden on the State. This is the approach, though. I can understand the enthusiasm of the member for Briggs, as his Party is in power; he is able to make a submission to a department and say that funds are needed in the northern area as there is a lot of unemployment. He can maintain that there is a group close to him that gives him a fair bit of support at election time and that he needs a bit of help to ensure that the group will continue to support him on future occasions. I can understand this. The situation is different for a member who does not belong to the Government of the day. Notwithstanding, I can honestly say that in my entire parliamentary career I asked for that sort of favour on only one occasion, immediately after the Ash Wednesday fires, for a community group that did a lot of voluntary work. I did make that point at the time, that electorally there was a benefit to me, although I might not have been as successful as I would like to have been. This is the area in which we as Parliamentarians are failing, that is, that whenever we want support in the electorate we buy it—not with our own money but that of the taxpayer. In the case of Rough Cut, I point to one just aspect where I believe they are not acting correctly.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: A couple of discos have been run at Blackwood since the Blue Light discos stopped. However, they have said that they will not stop people smoking inside the disco. This is against the places of public entertainment laws and all the insurance regulations covering pay-outs in the event of a fire. Further, it is against present-day health concepts. Surely it is unreasonable to expect non-smokers to suffer that sort of inconvenience. I do not say that they smoke anything other than cigarettes: I do not know that, because I have not attended, although I have had all sorts of reports. But we as a Parliament need to think of those things when we talk about too much promotion for any group.

In my electorate there would be people who could produce videos, who do it on a voluntary, hobby basis. Given some Government money, they will produce good videos: good productions, top class—but what will we do with it unless we can commercialise it? What is the use of developing the skill unless we can export it? The truth is that our cost structure is so high in this State and the Commonwealth that, in the main, we cannot export it. It is an area we should be able to export. The Fraser Government brought in some direct tax deductions for those who wanted to invest in film production. The present Government set to work to say, 'That is a bit expensive: we will cut that out.' They may be right; I am not saying they were wrong, but at least it was developing an export market.

The Leader spoke of exports, and the trouble we are in as a State. I have had the fortune in recent times to speak to several business groups who export, mainly in the area of manufactured articles. Their one problem, apart from the lack of productivity from the same amount of personnel in this country as in others, is reliability of transport by sea; they cannot give a guaranteed delivery date to their customers.

The Japanese people to whom I spoke said that, although they would be happy to buy more goods from Australia—and South Australia is part of that—they could not lodge an order because they did not know when the articles would arrive in Japan. So, they cannot guarantee to their customers that the goods will turn up in time to be of any economic use to them. That is the position into which we have got ourselves, and that same position applies to many articles.

For example, a farmer can grow hay, mow it, rake it, bale it, and cart it down to Port Adelaide, and from the time it leaves the truck that delivers it until it gets into the hold of the ship it has doubled in price. What sort of country are we running when that sort of abuse is going on? Fair dinkum, a fit person would cart more down a ladder through all the different sections of the ship into the hold one bale at a time than can be done with all the modern technology we have.

We are a country which has become apathetic, in the main lazy and non-productive, and not, in the main, trying to create the expertise to bring out the quality product that other people want. It is a lacklustre sort of environment: whether it is caused by management or employees, the problem is there. South Australia can grow a vast amount of crops of different types, and the country in which South Australia is situated can grow any sort of crop that can be produced in the world, (from semi-arid regions through to tropical zones), yet we import in monetary terms twice the value in fruit and vegetables and their products—whether frozen or canned—of that we export. What a joke! In some States we have a massive supply of water and in others we do not, and we can produce all sorts of food, yet we import twice as much as we export. At the same time, we have thousands of unemployed.

Let us be quite frank: we are living in a fool's paradise and, unfortunately, we cannot blame just each other as individuals. It is true that the human race will never bring out its best until it suffers, whether through famine, disease, fire, flood, war or depression. Those things bring out the best in human beings—when they are threatened as individuals. We as parliamentarians are not threatened. We are fairly secure (although at election times we get jumpy), so we cannot really relate to the problems, for example, of those many thousands of people who are not able to meet interest commitments on their home mortgages. On average, in this State they have to pay on mortgages an extra \$3 000 a year, which is \$60 a week.

Imagine what people could do, as home owners, with \$60 a week. They would not have to worry that the end of February and early March is going to be a bad time, while they are paying for school books, meeting lay-by payments for Christmas presents, and so on. They would have the cash available to them, but if they have other commitments—personal loans or hire purchase agreements—it is very difficult to survive. We may have had some restraint on our wages for three years, with real increases, but we cannot relate to the seriousness of those people's situation.

I challenge Labor members to knock on the doors of those homes and say, 'Look: we know you're paying high interest rates, but bad luck. If you happen to lose your home you can come and see us, and we might find you a Housing Trust home.' I will talk more about the Housing Trust on Thursday. We are in a serious situation, where our society is lost. Where do they turn? Banks say, 'Come and see us and we'll refinance you.' Instead of lending money to people over 30 years, they will lend it over 40 years, and the dream that one day people will own their own home is gone, because the Premier of this State supports the Federal Government in its actions for high interest rates, making it difficult for people to survive. By not attacking the Prime Minister, as Leader of this State, he is really supporting the Prime Minister in the demands he is making on the Australian community.

The Premier, as Leader of this State, is also supporting Mr Keating in his arguments that, suddenly, the economy will turn around and everything will be rosy. We know it will not be. This State now has a debt of \$190 million, and

that is too much. Local government in many cases has borrowed to the hilt with the encouragement of this State Government, particularly of the Ministers who have represented this State Government in recent times.

I ask members to think about that very, very seriously. How can one explain to someone who took out a mortgage of, say, \$40 000 at an interest rate of 12 per cent that suddenly they can pay 14 per cent or 15 per cent for some of it, if not all of it, and bad luck—they have to suffer it. How can one say that that is justice? If it was 11 per cent, and is now 14 per cent, how can we say that is justice? That is not justice. Young people who are saving to buy a home in the future must pay for a block of land, plus Government charges for water and sewerage, rates, plus the Electricity Trust's demand that new home owners put in a type of switchboard which, instead of costing \$200 to install will cost up to \$1 200.

The new switchboard is required because it is easier for the trust to cut off the power if the bill is not paid than it would be if that type of meter were not installed. In other words, trust officers turn the whole meter, which disconnects the power, and turn it back again, with locks in either position. The trust has moved in the direction of forcing people to buy those meter boards. The Housing Trust is doing it because it suits it, if it wants to cut the power off, I believe, but ETSA is now moving into the residential areas and saying to people, 'We want that sort of switchboard.' There is an extra \$1 000, just like that! That cost is coming through this State Government's form of administration.

How do young people save to build a home? How much do they need? More particularly, with the sorts of Government charges that have an effect on the inflation rate, how much must a person of 50 years plan to have at 55 or 60 to retire in some sort of comfort? Are we saying that it does not matter if at 55 or 60 they have nothing left? Are we saying 'We do not mind if inflation goes through the roof. You can then go to the Housing Trust, which might supply you with a home'?

How many people know how much they need? Some people say that they should take what they get when they retire, if they are on superannuation, and invest it. Where would one invest it today to keep up with inflation? Unless one has an accountant—and they charge a high fee to give advice—or a great knowledge of financial institutions, how will one invest that money to ensure the future? While inflation is at 10 per cent or more that is not possible.

That is what the State Government, with its Federal colleagues, is inflicting on the people. The State Government will not attack the Federal Government. It knows that the Federal Government is wrong, but it is prepared to run along with it. I ask members to think about this. We worry about youth and their future, but what about people aged 45 and onwards? What do they see in the future, those who are not in highly paid areas with guaranteed superannuation? Many people do not have that. When we talk about interest rates and the cost of Government charges in this State, what happens to those who cannot make a go of it (we have a high bankruptcy rate) and decide to borrow overseas when the dollar drops? Instead of owing \$50 000 in a small business they owe \$75 000 and are paying the same interest rate. It destroys them! This is happening in the rural sector and in the business community.

The State Government says it will not get quite as much out of land tax as the Premier forecast in his speech. I hope the Government does not want more out of land tax than it is getting. It is already applying this tax to rental accommodation so that the owner of rental accommodation who

last year was paying \$215 land tax and is now paying \$900 has to go to the tenant and say, 'I have to put up the rent because the State Government has ripped me off for this much land tax.' The tenant says, 'Hold on, you can't increase the rent that much—it is unfair.' The landlord says that it is the Bannon Government—the so-called social conscience Party, the Labor Party—that has applied it—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: For social justice, as my colleague says. The tenant asks, 'Why is that?' When the matter is explained in detail the person says, 'That is unreasonable. Why are they asking you for so much land tax?'

How can one justify that sort of land tax on residential accommodation? The owner cannot afford to pay it, because of the cost of maintaining the building and, if he has borrowed money, because of interest rates. If he has not borrowed money, he has to try to keep up with the inflation rate, or the investment will fall behind and he will need a Housing Trust home in a few years because his capital will have run down.

Then there is the small storekeeper who rents business accommodation. I said years ago that if we had a system where land was zoned for particular purposes, with a limited area available for certain purposes such as shops, then the rich would buy the land and exploit the community. The Government exploits the community also, because it says to the landowner, 'You are in a high land tax bracket (24c for every \$10 over \$200 000 land value) and we are going to rip it off you.' The landlord goes to the shopkeeper and says, 'We are going to charge you, because you are renting the premises and it is part of the contract.' The landlord passes it on to the tenant, the shopkeeper, who applies it to the goods he sells to the community, so it adds to the inflationary trend. It is an injustice. It is caused by Government greed and rip off—that is what causes it! In our system land tax is destroying initiative. Land tax is so high now that, if people want to invest in properties, they skip South Australia, and so we have a depressed market.

I could talk about many areas of disappointment in our community. However, home ownership is the one that disappoints me most. I believe that we have allowed quite rich people to exploit the Housing Trust (I will talk about that on Thursday). At present, 39 000 families are waiting for Housing Trust accommodation, while 56 000 people are accommodated; in other words, nearly as many people are waiting as have been accommodated, yet rich and affluent people are living in Housing Trust homes and paying very moderate rents. That is the greatest golden handshake that some people have known. The speed with which some people get Housing Trust houses amazes me. I hope that the home owners of this State realise how much this Government has neglected and ignored them, and said, 'It does not matter if you lose your home. Come and see us, we'll find you a Housing Trust home and you can be on the taxpayers' list of benefits for the rest of your life, because we don't believe in private ownership. We'll attack you, and we will let interest rates stay high.' That is why the Premier will not attack the Prime Minister on high interest rates. He sits back and gloats, and thinks, 'Good old Hawkey, he's one of my colleagues. I will support him to the hilt, regardless of what he does to the people of South Australia.'

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

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I support the Bill. I commend the Treasurer for the result to date, as reported in his second reading explanation of last week. In that speech he indicated

that, as a result of this Government's management of the State's finances, it is unlikely that it will need to present supplementary estimates to this House during the remainder of this financial year. That is an indication of the accuracy with which the estimates were done, both for expenditure and revenue, when the budget was drawn up.

We are informed in the Treasurer's statement that the budgeted deficit for 1986-87 of \$7.3 million is likely to remain and that the estimate given at the beginning of the financial year will be similar to the likely result in June. The Treasurer also indicated in respect of receipts that they are likely to be slightly over the estimate given when the budget was brought down last year. Receipts from payroll tax and stamp duties are likely to be slightly under budget, but estimates of revenue from the casino are likely to be slightly exceeded. In addition, the Treasurer has indicated that, as a result of the upward revision of the CPI outcome, the Commonwealth grants to the State are likely to be \$8 million more than anticipated and budgeted for at the beginning of the financial year. All in all, this means that receipts will be slightly above estimates at the conclusion of the financial year.

Mainly as a result of the matter raised by the member for Davenport in relation to extra high expenditure to provide housing and housing assistance, expenditure will be slightly above estimates for the financial year, but as a result of 'unders and overs' it is likely that the result will not be much different from that estimated at the beginning of the financial year. So we will end up with a budget that is in accord with the estimates given at the beginning of the financial year.

The Bill provides for the expenditure of about \$645 million in order to pay the Public Service of the State until the end of the financial year ending 30 June 1988. In accordance with the conventions of the House, the Supply Bill provides the opportunity for members to address a wide range of issues that are generally covered by the operations of State Government.

I address my remarks to a number of aspects associated with local government and the relationship between State Government and local government. The two major points I raise are, first, the role of the State Government in the distribution of grants from the Commonwealth through the Local Government Grants Commission to local government and changes that are taking place in that system of distribution; and, secondly, the provision of services, in particular, human services, to local communities and the way in which local government and the State Government are working together to better ensure that local communities are well serviced in this community services area.

In 1986 a new Local Government Financial Assistance Act was passed by the Federal Government. Under section 9 of that new Act the Commonwealth distributes money to local government via State Local Government Grants Commissions in order to ensure that, as far as is practicable, local government is able to be compensated for the shortfalls that it might have in revenue and in the provision of services as a result of a comparison between any one local authority and an average of other particular local authorities. This mechanism of distributing grants was originally established in 1974-75, when the Commonwealth first began to make grants available to local government. In that first year of the grants being made available to the States about \$56.3 million was provided by the Commonwealth to all the States, and in that first year South Australia received \$4.8 million.

In that first year of distribution the funds were distributed on the recommendation of the Commonwealth Grants

Commission to regional organisations of local government authorities. However, since then (and in particular as a result of a Bill introduced in this House in 1975) a South Australian Local Government Grants Commission was established, and it has adopted the principles which were part and parcel of the Commonwealth Government's distribution arrangements as the principles under which the money would be distributed in South Australia.

The allocation that has been made available to South Australian local authorities has grown from \$4.8 million in 1974-75 to nearly \$50 million in this current financial year. The general purpose grants that are made available for local government purposes are now distributed through that State Local Government Grants Commission in accordance with some set formulas, which are that not less than 30 per cent of the amount is to be distributed amongst all local government authorities on a population basis. That means that, of the total amount of \$50 million that is available to local authorities in South Australia, 30 per cent is distributed to councils on a per capita basis, the remaining 70 per cent being distributed to councils following an equalisation or assessment of needs procedure which is entered into by the Grants Commission.

Having been involved in this process of providing grants to local government over the past 15 years or so, the Commonwealth Government undertook a review in 1974-75 to look at the effect of the distribution of grants over that period and to determine whether or not more equity and consistency could be introduced into the system in the way that grants were distributed throughout Australia. As a result of that, the new Commonwealth legislation which came into effect last year and to which I have already referred sets down a timetable by which all States must come to an agreement about the principles on which the money is distributed, because up until this point each State has used a different system for the distribution of grants to local authorities.

The general principle of fiscal equalisation is accepted by the Grants Commissions in most of the States. Fiscal equalisation involves the provision of what are called topping up grants to councils which are assessed as having a financial capacity below that of a standard council which has been determined by the Grants Commission. A council's financial capacity is assessed according to its ability to raise revenue from its rates (which in turn is derived from the value of its rate base) and in accordance with its expenditure needs in the provision of services to ratepayers in a particular locality.

The question that arises in terms of the new Commonwealth legislation is the definition of what constitutes a standard council. At the moment, in terms of the operation of the State Grants Commission, a standard council has been assumed to be a level of service (that is, the average of the top 25 per cent of councils in a particular category). Recent discussions that have been conducted between the various State Grants Commissions and the Commonwealth suggest that that has established a standard that is perhaps unachievable and too high; and that the average or standard council should be either an average of the top 50 per cent of councils in a particular category or a standard average of all councils right across the State.

That debate is continuing, and the outcome of that will have an impact on the way in which grants are distributed and, in turn, the impact that that will have on local revenues. Perhaps the key element is something over which, to a large extent, the councils have no control; that is, the value of their rate base as determined by the value of assessments in their areas. In particular, I am concerned

with the value of inner city land and the land in the inner suburban areas which, as a result of no particular action by councils themselves, is becoming increasingly valuable. As that happens it is assumed that the ability of councils to raise revenue is increased, and the extent to which their ability to raise revenue is increased is taken as an indicator of the lower need of the Grants Commission to top up those councils.

That leaves a number of individual ratepayers in inner city and near inner suburban localities in somewhat of a dilemma, as they face both a higher rate bill from their council as well as a smaller grant through the Grants Commission's distribution process for the provision of many of the services. Of course, at the same time the demand for services in those inner city areas and the range of community, social, recreational and, in particular, housing facilities that are beginning to be offered by councils in those areas are straining the resources of councils.

So, while argument about methodology in respect of the Grants Commission and its relationship with the Commonwealth is in itself a somewhat dry topic, it will have an extraordinary impact on the way in which the States Grants Commission will distribute the \$50 million coming into South Australia annually from the Commonwealth Government for local government purposes.

At present, the arguments are being addressed by local councils and the major thrust of much of the debate is now going on the timetable of the implementation of the new principles. There is no argument with the general policy thrust of the Commonwealth Government's approach to fiscal equalisation. Nor is there any argument with it on the part of the State Government, which wishes to ensure that those councils and those individuals in council areas who are least able to afford to pay rates and provide their communities with services are those that attract the greatest level of Government support.

However, there will perhaps be some unintended consequences arising from this policy change, and the principal way in which that is being addressed is perhaps to defer over a five or seven to eight year time frame the phasing in of the new arrangement so that the impact on council finances as well as the effect that changing relationships between State and local government will have on local authorities finances can be phased in.

The South Australian Local Government Grants Commission is taking a leading role in the establishment of common formulae and policy approaches. The South Australian commission is one of the smallest commissions in terms of resources and staff that are allocated to it, yet at the same time it has had the best piece of legislation and the most consistent and equitable set of principles in the distribution of funds of any of the States. Again, in respect of this debate with the other States and the Commonwealth, it is taking very much a leading role.

In the few minutes remaining to me in this debate, I turn to a subject to which I alluded when discussing local government finances. It concerns another part of the relationship between State and local government, especially in the area of human services. The responsibility for human services in South Australia is a shared responsibility. Parts of it are borne by the Federal Government, other parts by the State Government and yet other parts by local government. A bone of contention for many years has been that it has been unclear where one level of government responsibility ceases and another begins. The current initiative of the State Labor Government to try to define those limits of responsibility and exactly what each level of Government should be doing and then, by a process of negotiation and coop-

eration, to contract one with the other for the provision of specific types of service is one of wholehearted support.

At present, local government is very much into the business of providing human services. Indeed, many councils now have a community services department that operates a range of programs including aged care, youth services, children's services, family support programs, community information and housing and community health programs. Yet others are involved in employment, local training and development initiatives, as well as recreation. Others are involved in programs dealing with the disabled, the frail aged, and so on. A whole range of these programs is also the responsibility of State Governments, and therefore it is necessary to delineate clearly the lines of responsibility, the lines of demarcation as regards the provision of staff, and the lines of responsibility in terms of the provision of finance and resources, so that there is no argument about one level of Government trying to cop out of the provision of community services by palming it off onto the next level of service.

Inevitably, some local community services will be better performed by the local council which is more closely in touch with local needs, even if at present such services are provided by the State Government. So, the present process is to define those areas and to enter into contractual arrangements that will define collective areas of responsibility and also those areas which each level of government should undertake separately. I believe that this process of consultation and discussion will improve the professionalism at both levels of government and ensure that the communities that we all serve through State and local government will be far better off in terms of the provision of human services. I support the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I, too, support the Bill. The Supply Bill is a traditional Bill that comes before the House at this time every year to facilitate the business of management of the State. However, on this occasion I wish to say that, when I came into Parliament, we had a Supply Bill for about \$80 million, whereas this Bill is for \$645 million, which is a considerable increase on the original sum the allocation of which we debated just a few years ago.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It is almost more than the total budget in 1970.

Mr BLACKER: Yes. My first recollection is of 1973, when I became a member and when the budget was under \$1 000 million, so we are now talking about a Supply Bill of two-thirds of that budget. I wish to use the time available to me to raise an issue which has become public knowledge only in the past few days and which concerns the dilemma confronting students, teachers and parents at the Streaky Bay Area School. This problem hit the press for the first time over the weekend, when there was an article in Saturday's *Advertiser* and today's *Advertiser*. Indeed, a front page report states that this school has been closed because of contamination resulting from the use of the chemical aldrin. Although my knowledge of this problem is somewhat scanty, I believe that there needs to be placed on the record the limited amount that I know and to be pressed on the Government the seriousness of the situation as I see it and the need to take every conceivable measure to ensure that the safety of the children, staff and parents at the school is regarded as of paramount importance and therefore guaranteed.

As I understand the position, in June last year contracts were let for the treatment of white ants at the Streaky Bay Area School. Infestation by white ants had caused a considerable problem and action was necessary. The school is

relatively new and of basically solid construction with a raft concrete floor and brick walls. However, the woodwork in the building was badly affected by white ants, so contracts were let and, in good faith and within the guidelines that were established at the time, the treatment with aldrin was carried out. At that time concern was expressed by the staff and parents about the safety of the chemical.

In this regard, I wish to make clear that the concern was expressed not just last weekend but seven months ago. That concern was conveyed through the appropriate channels to the Health Commission to ascertain whether, in fact, there was a health risk to students, staff or anyone else. Assurances were given that the practices undertaken were within the acceptable guidelines at that time. To that end, despite the fears and concerns of the community, assurance after assurance was given.

It has now been proven that the chemical aldrin was used in excessive proportions and contaminated a large part of the school. The dilemma now is whether the children and staff have been unduly subjected to that contamination and what action the Government intends to take to rectify the situation and make the school area safe.

The Supply Bill talks about a figure of \$645 million. It may well be that \$1 million or more of that figure will be required for restitution to the Streaky Bay Area School. As all members would know, that school is not being used at present. On Monday, parents (although not all parents could be contacted) were told that the students did not have to go to school and, as a result, most students stayed away from school.

Mr Gunn: Housing and Construction and the Department of Health have a lot to answer for.

Mr BLACKER: That may well be right, because the staff and parents who sought the advice of those authorities at that time have evidently not been given the full facts of the situation. The carpets were saturated by this chemical. There are many other aspects of concern. Although my association with the handling of chemicals is limited to agricultural chemicals, my concern is such that I feel there is a very grave risk. A meeting was held late on Friday night, and after that meeting I undertook to contact the Minister of Education's office first thing Monday morning. I did so, and I asked that the matter be treated with the utmost urgency because we had a problem of a proportion which this State may or may not be able to handle. If the chemical is as damaging as many people believe, it could lead to massive compensation cases. As I have already pointed out, the staff took every action available at that time to seek assurances.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: As the member for Light has pointed out, the problem may not be evident for years. That is the problem for this Government and subsequent Governments. I would like to give a brief precis of some of the steps that have been taken leading up to this point, because I believe we will be seeing and hearing a lot more about this case. I hope that no other schools in the State have been treated in a similar way, because the problem is one of grave magnitude to the Government.

Last year teachers and cleaners observed pools of pesticide on lino floors, with spraying occurring around uncovered food in the canteen during school hours. The contractor was then asked to spray, if it had to be done during school hours, in outside areas. This was after the staff passed a motion asking the headmaster to stop any spraying during school hours. The headmaster was approached with many concerns on numerous occasions. The headmaster says he

was assured that the treatment was safe. However, at that time residue was observed on the floor.

The local hospital administrator was approached by a teacher for information and was referred to a Mr Robert Taylor, the scientific officer of the pest control section of the Health Commission. A conversation was held between the teachers, cleaner and Mr Taylor, who assured them that the treatment was within the regulations and that there was minimal danger when the pesticide was a dry powder. The treatment of the school continued. Several teachers were approached by parents about children with headaches and nausea and about the smell in the primary unit.

This year, after an area of floor had to be replaced in the library due to wetness, parents became even more concerned. The tradesman who pulled back the carpet and replaced the swollen flooring experienced tingling in the fingers and thereafter used gloves. The carpet was then replaced. Parents received information sheets about aldrin from a teacher who obtained them from the local doctor. Concerned parents held a meeting with the headmaster. It was then decided to have the carpet tested. Contact was made with the CSIRO, which told the delegation from Streaky Bay to contact the forensic testing division of the pesticide analysis section, Divett Street, Adelaide. Two samples were sent at \$122 per test. The samples were to be given top priority, as children were involved, and the results were to take one week. The tests were sent by Stateliner on Wednesday 18 February and received by forensic testing on Thursday 19 February.

Parents saw the local doctor about testing the children but he felt he could not test them at that stage. He stated that the chemical should not be used where there is a possibility of contamination. Parents attended a staff meeting and sought written statements on the observations and requested that children be kept off the carpets. Mr Taylor of the Health Commission was contacted again and, after further research, changed his opinion and stated that the dry chemical was also dangerous and recommended that the carpet be replaced.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Is this the same Government that's putting heavy impositions on employers?

Mr BLACKER: I presume we are talking about the Government that has been in power in South Australia over the past seven or eight months.

Members interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: A public meeting was called for Friday 20 February, and the local parks and wildlife ranger gave information from pesticide producers, Shell and the Health Commission. So, the saga goes on. I would like to put on record some information on the nature of the chemical. The insecticide is from the organochlorine insecticide group, which includes derivatives of which DDT is the best known: cyclodienes, including chlordane, aldrin, dieldrin, heptachlor and endrin; and other hydrocarbons, including such hexachlorocyclohexanes as lindane, toxaphene, mirex and chlordecone, are part of the group with which we are dealing.

We all know that DDT was withdrawn from the market a considerable time ago. Both dieldrin and aldrin have been banned in the United States since 1974, and the use of chlordane and heptachlor for agricultural purposes was suspended in 1976. So, we are dealing with a chemical which has been recognised to be dangerous to health and which was evidently used abundantly in the treatment of this school. I understand from discussions I have had with people in the area that the aldrin was pumped under pressure into holes drilled through the concrete floor. No-one knows whether the aldrin has gone below the plastic film

underneath the concrete or whether it is lying between the concrete and the plastic film. It is known that the chemical has been seeping up through some of the holes.

From conversations that I have had with people involved in the use of this chemical, I understand that protective clothing should be used and that no other person should be present. I understand that when this chemical was applied at the school not only were the operators working without protective clothing but also other people, including children, were in the room at the same time. The mind boggles as the story unfolds. I ask the Government to treat this as a matter of urgency. Every possible measure must be taken by the offices of the Minister of Education, Minister of Housing and Construction and the Minister of Health to ensure that every possible avenue is explored in guaranteeing the safety of the school before the children and staff are obliged to return.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The member for Eyre says that we do not want a repeat of this exercise elsewhere: I sincerely hope that this is the only time that this has occurred. If it has happened elsewhere, the problem for the Government will be immense. In particular, the welfare of students and staff of that school must be taken into account. I believe that the parents and the staff have acted most responsibly. They have even gone to the trouble of obtaining independent tests of the chemical. I do not know the results of the tests, although, to use someone else's term, I believe that they were horrific. I am trying to ascertain just what is the acceptable level of aldrin contamination. I have been told that there is no acceptable level, that the acceptable level is nil and that any contamination, of the most minute proportion, is beyond an acceptable level. That being the case, the problem for the Department of Housing and Construction and the Health Commission seems almost insurmountable.

If that information on the acceptable level is correct, I do not believe that it would be possible to make that school safe, considering that the chemical has been pumped into holes drilled in the concrete floors, so that, with the raft foundation and configuration, no-one knows where the chemical has gone. It may have gone between the plastic film and the concrete floor. I presume it was intended to go into the soil beneath the floor. But at this stage we can only assume that the barrier beneath the floor and the carpet is heavily contaminated with this chemical.

The articles published in the paper today are to a fairly large degree accurate. However, I point out that reports are inaccurate in stating that the crisis has only just developed: that is not the case. The matter was brought to the attention of the authorities nearly eight months ago.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: As the member for Eyre says, this is an outrageous position. The assurance given to the staff at that time may well have been given in good faith. I do not suppose the finger can be pointed at anyone if everyone was acting in good faith, but the problem now is to rectify the situation. I apologise to the House, as I gave an undertaking that I would not speak for so long. However, I ask that all due care, caution and commonsense be applied to ensure the safety of the children and staff of the school.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I shall refer later to problems concerning education. It is probably appropriate that I comment on the contribution made by the member who has just resumed his seat. It certainly seems that the procedure pursued by the department in processing the matter pertaining to the Streaky Bay school is pretty appalling, espe-

cially in view of the fact that occupational health, safety and welfare legislation has just passed this House, whereby workers are compelled to wear protective clothing when this sort of spraying is going on: it in fact compels employers to ensure that workers wear safety gear. In the case referred to, it certainly seems very inappropriate that the teachers and students were present. I look forward to a satisfactory resolution of this problem. I believe that the Minister of Housing and Construction has called for a report on the whole affair, and I sincerely hope that that is concluded to the satisfaction of the parents and students at Streaky Bay as well as other schools throughout the State that have been treated in that way.

I want to put on record something that gives perhaps a glimpse or a window into the life of an MP. Having been in this place for a little over a year, I guess I can say that some of the things that have happened have surprised me. Members of the House who believed that the daylight saving debate was dead and gone at the end of last year will be surprised to hear that I received a letter this month from a constituent still complaining about the daylight saving issue. I thought it might be appropriate to put this on record. The letter is unsigned, for reasons that members will understand when I read it. The letter is written in multi colours, with certain words in red, others in blue, and with some really poisonous bits in another colour to emphasise the severity of the problem. It states:

This is just to let you know regarding daylight saving, as it was you the Government who invented daylight saving in mid-October 1986 and in years before, and now daylight saving will last 'til mid-March 1987. It is you the Government who is upsetting all people with daylight saving. You the Government enjoy daylight saving, but through daylight saving you the Government are killing a lot of old and hospital people and tiny babies.

I, for one, did not realise that we were entirely responsible for that. It continues:

You the Government are to blame for all people in the daylight saving time in distant countries.

I presume that means infant mortality in South-East Asia. It further states:

You the Government are inventing daylight saving and by that lots of old people will die—

and this next bit really made me quite anxious—

God invented all the days, times and hours during all the years correctly. By that you the Government will be punished by the end of the world, through Jesus Christ who comes to live on the earth after 2 000 years.

Well, my watch tells me that certainly my time is nearly up—so I will file this away, and if it is any sort of guarantee when the time arrives I will trot it out! Perhaps to let members know that all is not quite as bad as that, I refer to another letter that I received from a constituent, as follows:

Dear Mr Robertson,

We think you are terrific! My children and I wait up night after night hoping to hear your voice on the radio. We scan the papers every day searching for some mention of you. Although you have visited our home on several occasions, we look forward with interest to seeing you again.

The letter is signed by a constituent—who turns out to be my wife!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If I might interrupt the honourable member's very entertaining address to the House: I remind him that we are debating the Supply Bill, and I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to the Bill. Unless he does so, I am afraid that I will have to truncate his speech.

Mr ROBERTSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was about to explain the relevance of that last comment to the debate. I refer now to a matter that was raised in this place on 21 August last year by the member for Mount Gambier. It

pertained directly to education which, in turn, relates directly to the education budget and the Bill under debate. At that time, the member for Mount Gambier tabled a series of figures which purported to show that during the previous Liberal Administration things had in fact gone pretty well for education. On closer analysis, it appears that this set of tables does not really reveal that at all.

Close examination of the figures for total Education Department expenditure (that is, as a percentage of the State budget) indicates that the Education Department's commitment—or share of the State cake, if you like—peaked in the 1980-81 financial year—which indeed was the first year of the member for Mount Gambier's stewardship of that portfolio. It fell, however, the following year from 32 per cent of the State budget to 29.45 per cent. As a proportion of the previous percentage that is actually a drop of 8.5 per cent, and through the rest of that table—which runs from 1976 through to 1986—I do not see a single drop that comes within cooe of that particular fall. So, the former Minister, who claimed rather loudly back in August to have had stewardship of the department during this massive heyday of education in fact also presided over the fastest drop in the share of education as a proportion of Government spending, as far as I can see, in the history of, certainly, the last 10 years of this State.

Not only did it drop in the following year, 1981-82, but it continued to fall—and I must also concede, of course, that as a proportion of State budget it is falling still, but at a very much decreased rate. Of course, that obviously is explained by the fall in enrolments, and the former Minister would be quite right in pointing to the fact that the reason why it fell from 1980-81 is because the funding had not quite kept pace with the turnaround in student numbers. In fact, it reached 32 per cent in 1980-81 because his department was not quite aware of the fact that numbers were falling, so the budget continued to increase after the numbers began to fall. Now, of course, the Treasury has twigged the fact that numbers are falling and so, in fact, the allocation proportionately is also falling.

It is interesting to note that in the figures tabled by the former Minister the massive fall-away in 1981-82 was continued through the years of the Tonkin Government and only flattened out again at the accession of the Bannon Government. It is worth pointing out that that is the record on education; in fact, it is probably a good thing, in some respects.

The Hon. H. Allison: You should go back to school: your maths are wrong.

Mr ROBERTSON: It is your table. If you are prepared to trot out the figures and then misuse them, it is incumbent on me to sort out the record.

I want to turn now to a set of rather more reliable indicators of the commitment of the Government to education in this State. Again, no one would beg the question that the proportionate allocation to education is still falling slightly, but if one looks at it in terms of allocation per student it really presents quite a different picture. From the first year of the Tonkin Government, 1979-80, the first year of its treasuryship, the allocation in constant dollar terms—that is 1985-86 dollar terms—was \$2 480 per student per year. The allocation per student has steadily increased—with the emphasis on the 'steadily', I might say—for the three years of the Tonkin Government, and has increased rather more rapidly so that at this time in 1985-86 dollar terms it is \$3 250 per student per year, which is an increase of 31 per cent since 1979-80—not a bad record under the circumstances, when one considers that we are going through

fairly stringent times and the demands from other sectors of the community, of course, are increasingly strident.

Turning to the issue of teacher numbers, of course, to the beginning of this year 500 contracts have been converted to permanent. I understand that in the 1986-87 financial year the plan is to convert another 100 contract positions to permanent. I do not claim for a moment that that indicates an increase of 600 in the total number of teachers because, quite clearly, it does not; some people who previously had contracts no longer have them.

I want to turn now to a second indicator, and that is the number of students per teacher, which is not a bad sort of index to use for classroom teachers. How the schools allocate their teachers is very much up to the school, the community, and the administration of that school. In fact, class sizes are a pretty reliable indicator of the level of stress of teachers and the level of resources being poured into the department at that time.

We find that from 1977-78, when the number of students per teacher on average in South Australia, right through Education Department schools, was 15.1, it continued to fall until 1979-80—again in the years of the Tonkin Government—when it flattened out at around 14 and a bit, and since that time has continued to fall steadily to this point in the 1986-87 financial year, where we have 12.8 students per teacher, down in the past 10 years from 15.1. That is not bad—a fall of 15 per cent in the student-teacher ratio. I might point out again that in those three dark years from 1979 to 1982 it was flat as a pancake, and only began to drop again after that. If that is any sort of indication of teacher welfare and the level of resources being offered to our kids, it shows they are doing rather better than they used to.

I want to turn to another index, the supply of relief teachers—TRTs (temporary relieving teachers)—which is applied to schools. If we look again at the time frame, this time from 1980-81 through to 1986-87, we find that in the last year of the Tonkin Government the TRT expenditure per student was as low as \$23.5 per year in 1985-86 dollars. It has now risen in this financial year to \$40.5 per student per year—not perhaps a huge amount but, certainly, an increase of 72 per cent in that proportionate allocation. Again, if one takes that as a sort of barometer of teacher comfort and of the amount of resources being placed into schools, the present Government comes out looking pretty good compared to its predecessor, which looked fairly grubby in that area.

I want to stay in the area of education but turn to some of the difficulties confronting this or any other Administration. I have the fortune (or misfortune) to represent an electorate which covers about 14.5 kilometres of coastline, from a very settled ageing area in the north to a very rapidly developing 'young-ing' area in the south. That electorate, I guess, exemplifies the problems confronted by successive administrations and successive departments. We find that in the southern part of my electorate we have done rather well. We have gained a child-care centre, a kindergarten and a school—which is the celebrated Hallett Cove R-10 School—running from reception through to year 10.

We have suffered, though, in the northern part, where the population is ageing and the turnover that normally occurs in older areas has not yet begun to take effect. We have, in fact, lost a kindergarten, which had to be closed down, and that certainly has caused a few problems with children having to be transferred, but it exemplifies the difficulties faced by that department in trying to spend its dollars wisely. It really is extremely difficult. We are confronted in the south-west corner of this city—that is, the

area south of Cross Road and west of Goodwood Road—with a situation where the numbers of secondary school students in the eight State Government high schools are falling from 6 400 in 1984-85 to 3 200 or thereabouts projected by the mid 1990s. So, in the space of 10 years we are losing half the students. We cannot continue to resource those places at the levels at which they were resourced 10 years ago in the face of that sort of fall. Obviously, there will be some pain in that area. Obviously, people will have to confront changes in arrangements, with perhaps children going to different campuses for senior schooling, and so on.

It is a difficult problem. Education is a difficult area, yet we continue to allocate substantial amounts of State money and, as I tried to indicate before, looking at the three indices we have talked about—the TRT index, the index of class sizes and the index of recurrent expenditure per student—on all those indices we have increased expenditure. Certainly there are bumps, and certainly there is the need for reallocation, but I would submit that the first Bannon Government and, certainly, this Government have put many resources into education—and I am sure will continue to do so.

I want to take some of the last few moments to look at another matter that was raised on this occasion by the member for Davenport, who gained some momentary notoriety for three or four seconds earlier in the session by raising a rather ridiculous grandstanding motion calling for prospective MPs to make bids for their seats, to put in bids for their wages. I guess that, logically, any electorate looking to save money would accept the lowest bidder: heaven knows what sort of member they would get as a result of that tactic.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr ROBERTSON: I was not going to say that, but the member for Fisher makes that point reasonably well. I will pick up a few figures that relate indirectly to State Government expenditure, because some of the categories about which I wish to talk relate to State Government employees. The member for Davenport hastened to point out that he earned a salary of \$40 000 a year (and I am sure that he deserved it). He pointed out that professional engineers working for ETSA earn up to \$46 243; that the Executive Director of what he calls the Kindergarten Union (which has been the Children's Services Office for the past couple of years, unbeknown to the member for Davenport) earns up to \$63 000 a year; and that the Deputy Crown Solicitor earns \$64 000 a year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must interrupt the honourable member and remind him that it is inappropriate to canvass speeches that have occurred previously during this debate. What we are dealing with at the moment is Supply, so I request strongly that the member come back to the Supply debate.

Mr ROBERTSON: I wish, if I may, without testing your tolerance too far, Sir, to take the figures that I have indicated and to point again to wage levels in the Government sector that I think do not quite come up to the level of Executive Director of the Kindergarten Union. If you rule, Mr Deputy Speaker, that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is appropriate, but the honourable member must not refer to previous debates during the session: he must stick to Supply. The line that he is taking now is appropriate.

Mr ROBERTSON: Thank you, Sir. I was using this as a launching pad and apologise for being overly enthusiastic about the introduction. The point I was trying to make was that, of course there are highly paid people in the Government sector, as there are in the private sector. A point

which appears to have escaped the notice of the honourable member who raised it is that many many people through the State Government sector, and the private sector, have to put up with appallingly low wages. I wish to put some of those wage levels on the record—applying to the Government as well as to the private sector—by way of comparison with the salaries that the member went to great lengths to put on the record.

An area that directly affects the State Government involves various parts of the vehicle industry. The State Government car pool is covered by this award. People in the area of detailing and car polishing earn a massive salary (a full adult salary) of \$232.80 a week as at 1 July 1986. The honourable member complains of people being overpaid. Quite clearly, if we were paid \$232.80 a week, I do not think either he or I would know how to handle the situation.

Juniors in the same industry, assemblers of car parts aged 16 years and under, earn \$122.40 a week—a massive salary! A terrific salary! That compares pretty well with some of the salaries mentioned! Some storemen, packers and cleaners in that industry earn \$110 a week. The point made by the honourable member is that we are overpaying our State Public Service employees. I submit that a quick glance at that award proves we are not overpaying many of our people but that we need, in the Government and private sectors, to look at some of the people who are lowly paid or who are dragging the chain, and look at allocating more of our resources proportionately to those areas and pulling them up to a reasonable subsistence income, which at this stage I believe they do not receive.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This debate deals with the appropriation of \$645 million of taxpayers' money for the provision of services by the State Government. I share the concern expressed in some detail by the member for Flinders. I represented the school he mentioned for nearly 16 years as a member of this House and had made considerable representations at the time it was built. A number of the students who attend that school live in my electorate. I am most concerned about this matter and sincerely hope that nothing is left undone to ensure that the problems are rectified as soon as possible and that every undertaking is given that we will not have a repeat of this event anywhere else in South Australia.

The health of our young people, who are our greatest asset in this community, is paramount. I was most concerned after reading what appeared in the press and after hearing what people from the area have told me in recent days. It concerns me that this matter has been discussed by departmental officers over a number of months yet only as a result of recent action has it been brought to a head.

As the member with responsibility to speak for the Opposition on agricultural matters in this State, I sincerely hope that some of this \$640 million that we are about to approve for expenditure by the Government will be put towards assisting some of those people who are in very difficult situations in the rural community. I do not know whether the House is aware that currently in South Australia 156 farming families are receiving household support. I estimate that most of those people have a very bleak future in relation to remaining viable on their farms. I understand that a considerable number of people who have been financed by the stock firms are facing grave difficulties. Some of their futures are bleak.

I do not really believe that the House (or the Government) is fully aware of the difficulties that many of these people are facing and the stress that they are experiencing. Last week I raised in this House a number of issues con-

cerning agriculture. I believe that, unless both the State and Federal Governments quickly address these particular issues and reduce interest rates, many more people will be in the same difficult situation.

I do not know whether members are aware of the current debt situation in rural Australia, but I point out that it is estimated that in 1987 the total indebtedness in the rural industry is \$8 250 million. That has occurred since 1970, when the debt was estimated to be \$2 082 million. The real increase has taken place since about 1979, when the amount increased from \$2 960 million to the current rate of \$8 250 million.

If one looks at the number of people who have been assisted by the Rural Adjustment Scheme, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in 1985-86 some 615 people in Australia were on household support. I put to the House that during the next few months that situation will rapidly deteriorate. If we are unfortunate enough in the State to face a lean year—not a drought—then the situation will be even worse. I will briefly give some information. Interest rates averaged 19.4 per cent in 1986, compared with 17 per cent in 1985. The bureau estimated that rates would decline. Unfortunately, in recent days there has been more pressure on interest rates and it appears that they will increase.

Falling incomes in the broadacre cropping sector have had the effect of almost halving machinery sales in a year. The rural sector debt is estimated to have increased by about 11 per cent in 1986 as farmers borrowed to cover shortfalls in revenue. Not only the farming community but also the total rural community is affected. Unfortunately, small businesses in country areas either have to close up or they must drastically restrict their commercial operations. That causes people to lose their jobs in areas such as spare parts, service and office administration.

Yesterday I received in the post some information from a group of people who produce a business letter, and it states:

A current economic forecast says nine out of 10 small businesses won't last 10 years and three out of every 10 businesses started up last year will fail over the next 12 months. In the farming business area another report warns two out of every five farmers will have income levels below zero in 1987 and 55 per cent of all cropping farms are already running at a loss.

The majority of those people are running their businesses at a loss, not as a result of bad management or through any fault of their own but because, unfortunately, Australia is reaping the results of a trade war between the United States and the European Economic Community.

Further, the economic policies of the Commonwealth Government which artificially prop up the dollar cause high interest rates. Over a period of time no-one can continue to pay in excess of 20 per cent interest and hope to survive. I put it to the House that the only way in which we will reduce interest rates is by closely examining Government operations across the board. I firmly believe that the Government will have to allow people in business to get on with the job of making a living and creating employment. Every day I am contacted by constituents and people in South Australia who are affected by bureaucratic red tape, humbug and nonsense. Even when people have experience in the field, they cannot get builders' licences to build their own premises. They have to go through this unnecessary rigmarole and, when they try to argue their case, people say, blindingly and arrogantly, 'You will have to come to Adelaide', as if it were like stepping over to the other side of the street, with no regard for these bureaucratic hold-ups.

The time has come for us to rid the system of this red tape. It does no good when the member for Briggs and the

member for Fisher give notice of motions that they wish to move. When the country is on the verge of bankruptcy it is a sad reflection on this House when we have to sit idly by and listen to members such as that make the most outrageous and ludicrous comments and statements. No wonder the public has a low regard for members of Parliament when they witness such childish and immature behaviour. Heaven help us if that is the best that the Government can offer to the people of this State. Let us hope sincerely that D-day for those people is not far around the corner.

When this country faces a most difficult economic crisis, with people going bankrupt, losing their homes, not able to find jobs and with not a great deal of confidence in the future, along with high unemployment and high crime rates that are directly related to unemployment, it is appalling that we have to listen to this sort of Sunday school picnic and boy scout attitude of some of these people. Obviously, they have never been out in the real world because, if they went into a community and carried on like that at a public meeting, they would be laughed out of it and would be regarded as absolute fools.

It sickens me to think that the debate in this Parliament has been reduced to such a low level. Most of it is designed to attract the attention of the media. The merits of a topic do not matter, because the whole place tends to revolve around gaining the attention of the media. There are better things to do. Commonsense ought to prevail, and this Parliament should begin to debate and address some of the real issues. When people with no experience do not want to learn about the problems facing those involved in the commercial world and they demonstrate such a juvenile attitude, no wonder a considerable number of people in the community treat this place with contempt and have a very low regard for members of Parliament.

Until there is a sound economy the improvements that these people always bleat about and want will not be able to be put into effect. No matter how well meaning and how worthy those propositions are, unless there is a soundly based viable and expanding economy, Governments will not be able to finance those sorts of things. Our system depends on growth and, unless there is growth in the economy, we will stagnate and the Governments will have less money. Governments are spending too much money on the non-productive side of the economy. The Department of Environment and Planning must be trimmed, and planning laws are completely—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I make no apology for what I have to say because, unless people have a bit of courage and political guts, the country can look forward to a rather bleak future.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Where do we start?

Mr GUNN: We have squandered our opportunities. We were the lucky country. In 1900 Melbourne was the wealthiest city in the wealthiest country in the world. What have we done? We have squandered our opportunities, because for far too long we have tried to play Father Christmas and we have conditioned the community to come to the Government to fix everything.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr GUNN: The problems were well in place before Malcolm Fraser became Prime Minister, but too many politicians have raised unnecessarily the expectations of the community. They have raced around the country and told the people what they wanted to hear. They have deliberately raised the public's expectations and have told them that it

is their right, that they should have this and that, and 'We will do this for you.' Unfortunately, the public are gullible and very few of them question how the revenue will be raised.

Of course, the other difficulty is that, as soon as a problem arises, someone wants to pass a new law or introduce a new regulation which in turn creates more red tape and more bureaucracy. Every time a law is passed in this Parliament someone is denied their rights, we add another cost to business and we create more red tape. At the end of the day, what have we really done? I believe that we must scrutinise very carefully the operations of every Government department in this State. One of the problems is that Parliament allows the Government to set up a new statutory authority or department but it does not have the time or does not make the time to check up on the department's activities. I believe that the Public Accounts Committee does a good job, but Parliament itself should scrutinise carefully the administration of these departments and it should have a second look at some of the decisions that were made three, four, five or six years ago. Every Government department should come under close scrutiny, and we cannot continue to allow these massive increases to occur.

As I drive around the north of South Australia I am horrified to see a large number of State Government motor cars. You see one, two or three large Toyota vehicles carrying one driver, and they virtually follow one another. As a member of Parliament, one of the worst examples I witnessed was when the Maralinga parliamentary committee went to have discussions with the Maralinga community. In my view, the committee was a success, but it was told that no State Government Toyota vehicle would be available to meet us. We had to arrange private vehicles but, when the committee arrived, we saw in excess of four State Government vehicles there. The committee did not request to see those people and I did not believe that it would be of any benefit. When that sort of nonsense occurs, no wonder the taxpayers of this State have a problem. The member for Gilles asked, 'Where should we start?' There must be a proper analysis of each Government department and, when we appoint people to administer these departments, we have to ensure that they have experience in financial control.

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

Mr GUNN: Before the dinner adjournment I was discussing the need for a sensible approach in Government concerning Government expenditure and the need to ensure that Government funds are directed to the production side of the economy. The member for Gilles asked me where there should be restraint in Government, but I found that a sad reflection on the honourable member for, although he was a Minister for 3½ years, he does not know where there should be restraint and reallocation of resources. No wonder his department was completely out of control. That department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, has reached the stage where there must be a complete re-examination of its operations, because today it cannot even maintain its massive network, and private contracting is urgently needed to perform some of the department's work.

Regarding other non-essential areas, it is all very well for the Government to spend large sums on building great sporting complexes. The member for Gilles presided over one of the worst debacles in Government mismanagement at the aquatic centre. If that is an example of his style of management, then heaven help the people of South Australia. They are but two examples.

Further concerning the non-productive side of the Government, the Department of Environment and Planning is

a group of people that is preventing employment and development, and the time has come when their coat tails should be trimmed. Millions of dollars should not be tied up merely because of the imagination of irresponsible people who have no idea of practical realities and who have not been out in the real world. The Government has over-regulated and over-controlled and has put the community as a whole in a straitjacket. This Government's only attempt at deregulation, of getting rid of red tape, has been an attack on our system of orderly marketing of primary products. What a ham-fisted, irresponsible, nonsensical course of action that has been. Unfortunately, this Government has so little understanding of the real practical world of economics that that is the only practical attempt that it has made where there is a need to streamline Government operations.

I refer to the over-supply of Government vehicles where vehicles of a type that is not necessary are purchased. In the area of national parks, country fire fighting services have been duplicated, and the equipment now used in national parks should be allocated to the country fire services. The duplication of such equipment is not necessary, and the National Parks and Wildlife Service should be spending its time managing the parks properly. Too much land is being bought for use as national parks, and it cannot be properly managed or administered. We have seen an improper use of Government resources in this regard.

The real functions of the Government should be to guarantee jobs for people and to provide reasonable housing and accommodation for the community. The Playford style of government is required, not all this airy fairy nonsense about subsidising the arts. It is very nice for those who want to enjoy the arts, but it is not right for the people who attend the Festival Theatre to be subsidised at the expense of the economy of the State and of those who make a real productive contribution to its welfare. I do not believe that in these times of economic restraint we should be spending large sums subsidising such operations, and I do not apologise for saying that.

In this speech I have answered some of the questions asked by the member for Gilles. In this Parliament there should be a statutory review committee to examine the regulations made by statutory authorities, boards and committees and to ensure that they are operating effectively and efficiently. I hope that the funds allocated under this Supply Bill will be directed in such a way as to restore efficiency in government.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): At least the speech from the member for Eyre was better presented than those of his colleagues. In fact I nearly choked over comments made by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Mitcham. The Leader seemed to suggest that, because the Supply Bill was being brought in a little earlier than in previous years, there was somehow a motive on the part of the Government to cover up its financial position, whereas nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the Leader's remark shows a lack of appreciation of the way in which Supply and Appropriation Bills interlock and function. The authorisation of Government payments from Consolidated Account comes from the annual Appropriation Bill. Indeed, the limit is referred to in the schedule attached to that Bill. Supply Bills are necessary because the annual Appropriation Bill, which is the parliamentary scrutiny of the Government's budget, is not passed until about November, and Supply Bills are necessary to enable the Government to continue operations beyond 30 June each year until the annual Appropriation Bill is passed and authority is given by Parliament to the Government for payments from the Consolidated Account.

This is the process of parliamentary scrutiny and, because of the nature of the Supply Bill, it is absurd to suggest that simply because this Supply Bill, which is being introduced to enable the Government to function beyond June 30, is being introduced a little earlier than in previous years there is a cover-up. Indeed, toward the end of his explanation of the Supply Bill, the Premier said:

Under the proposed new public finance and audit legislation, the Commonwealth grants previously passed on to recipients in a trust account will now be taken through Consolidated Account and subject to parliamentary scrutiny.

That is an example of open government: that is, of the Government opening the whole of its financial resources and receipts to the scrutiny of Parliament. For the Opposition to suggest that there is some sort of cover-up is absurd in the context that this Bill and a subsequent Bill will open Government finances to better and deeper parliamentary scrutiny.

Further, a press release issued by the Premier's office in mid February showed that the receipts and payments to the end of January are readily available for anyone to see. Those figures cover seven months of this financial year: that is, the greater part of the year. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition must have been speaking tongue in cheek because there is no force in his criticism.

The member for Mitcham said that he was proud of the achievements of the Tonkin Government over the years 1979-82, but I find that statement absurd because, if the honourable member is proud of the achievements of that Government, then presumably in Government he would follow the same sorts of policy as those followed by the Tonkin Government.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member should look at the record book again. The Tonkin Government brought down the greatest depression that we in South Australia have experienced by taking money from capital works. After all, the Government can reduce taxation if it wants South Australian industry to collapse. That can be done today or next week by taking money from capital works. By doing so and by not managing the budget, the Government can get into a position into which the Tonkin Government found itself. How the member for Mitcham can honestly stand in this place and say that he is proud of the achievements of the Tonkin Government I do not know, because the Bannon Labor Government inherited a \$63 million deficit as a result of the way in which the Tonkin Government managed the finances of this State. That must be contrasted with the record of this Government. In fact, in 1986-87 the Bannon Government's projected deficit on recurrent operations is about \$7.3 million.

What a turnabout! When one compares our record since 1982 with that of the Tonkin Government, there has been a remarkable turnabout in the South Australian economy. The Tonkin Government in its August 1981 budget took \$44 million out of capital works; in August 1982 it took another \$42 000 out of capital works, which grew to \$51.9 million. There was also a deficit of \$6.1 million building up in the system, and a blow-out in the deficit occurred as a consequence of those policies amounting to an additional \$57 million, which made the deficit we inherited something like \$63 million. A total of \$100 million was frittered away in capital works.

The manufacturing, housing, retail and motor vehicle industries were all depressed under the Tonkin Government, because you cannot take \$100 million out of capital works and expect the economy to function and then claim you have been reducing taxation. That is absurd economic

management. However, that is the record the member for Mitcham says he is proud of.

By way of contrast, what did this Government do in relation to the \$63 million deficit it inherited? In the 1983-84 budget it had to transfer over capital works moneys, but nothing like that of the Tonkin years: in fact, it was reduced to \$28 million. In 1984-85 the proposed \$25 million was actually not used. Further, there was a surplus of recurrent operations for 1985-86 of some \$11 million. As a consequence of that surplus and of the very neat way the Government managed the finances of this State for 1986-87, with only a \$7.3 million deficit, the deficit of \$63 million inherited from the Tonkin years has been reduced to something like \$40 million. At the same time, notwithstanding the very difficult setting in which the State Government has had to work as a consequence of some Federal cuts in various areas—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr GROOM: There have been Federal cuts, and the State Government has had to cope with them. Had the State Government not imposed measures such as the financial institutions duty, it would never have been able to cope with the types of cuts that have been experienced as a consequence of the Federal Government's actions. The fact of the matter is that the State Government behaved responsibly and did not take capital works money to prop up its taxation needs, unlike the Tonkin Government.

Combined with the fact that there is a projected \$7.3 million deficit for 1986-87, during the 1985-86 year, involving a surplus of \$11 million, the State Government was able to deliver something like \$42 million in taxation cuts. Surely that meets the objection of the member for Coles. You cannot beat \$42 million in taxation cuts during 1985-86, despite the very difficult economic times. So, there has been a remarkable turnaround in the economic performance of South Australia when one compares this Government's record with the Tonkin years. There is nothing of which the member for Mitcham can be proud, but if he is, it simply means that if in Government there would be more of the—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Members of the Tonkin Government had their opportunity between 1979 and 1982, but the fact of the matter is that members opposite just could not manage the affairs of South Australia, and that is why they are out of office. To hear the member for Mitcham lauding the Tonkin years, it is no wonder they continue to stay out of office.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Of course it is a joke, as the member for Gilles says. No responsible South Australian could support the types of policies inflicted on South Australia during 1979-82, and nor will they. The member for Mitcham should go back and study those years and then he will soon come back into this Chamber and change his tune and support the sorts of policies formulated by the Bannon Labor Government.

I know it is painful for members opposite to have to hear of their record when in Government, but it has to be said, when one hears comments such as those made by the member for Mitcham. This Government is maintaining tight control on expenditure. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that expenditure has increased. Of course it has increased—everything goes up—but the function of Government is to ensure that its recurrent operations do not get out of control as a consequence of the need for increased expenditure, and this Government is performing that function.

The Premier said that the projected deficit on recurrent transactions of \$7.3 million for 1986-87 was essentially on target. Notwithstanding the economic difficulties South Australia has faced, that is a truly remarkable result. One of the reasons why tight expenditure controls are necessary is that the interim figures show that the Government may be down on such items as payroll tax, stamp duty and casino revenue but combined with that there is a projected extra \$8 million from the Commonwealth Government as a consequence of CPI increases in Commonwealth Government assistance grants. The net effect of the combination of all that is that expenditure must be watched.

As the Premier says, there is no reason why the projected deficit of \$7.3 million will not be met at the end of this financial year. All that indicates the balance that is needed between looking at revenue and at potential revenue shortfalls and of course activity alters. There is a need to balance expected revenue with expenditure needs. However, the fact is that the Government is doing extremely well in managing the affairs of South Australia. I know it is painful for Opposition members to face that fact, but it is as simple as that.

I have referred to the absurd remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the proposed new public finance and audit legislation. The Premier mentioned that the authority the Supply Bill sought this year is \$645 million.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Don't you worry about that. That \$645 million is well in excess of the \$475 million sought for the first two months of 1986-87. Of course, this is simply because the Commonwealth grants previously passed on via a trust account will now be paid into the consolidated account. The estimate is that some \$120 million will be required to cover these payments in the Supply Bill, leaving \$525 million to meet the cost of Government operations, traditionally handled through the consolidated account. That is just an example of open government and refutes the suggestion of the Opposition Leader. The fact is that, under this Government Parliament will have greater scrutiny of Government finances.

I do not propose to take all of my time but wish to end with two points: the Government is going well; and proposals are in the pipeline for far greater accountability to Parliament in relation to expenditure and receipts.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): It is a delight to be able to stand and congratulate the honourable Leader of the Opposition for the very perceptive way in which—

Mr Groom: Deceptive.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: —perceptive way in which he analysed the situation as it applies to South Australia. I believe it would be of considerable value to members opposite to read the Leader of the Opposition's speech in *Hansard* tomorrow and analyse the figures therein which give a pretty graphic indication of the difficulties South Australia is experiencing.

The member for Hartley's comments are to be expected. However, they are away from the point. We cannot stand in isolation from the rest of the States of Australia in relation to the difficulties that are developing. They will have an influence, as was outlined by the Leader this afternoon, and it will be felt by the Labor Government in this State, as it will be felt by the Liberal Government in Tasmania, the National Party Government in Queensland and, indeed, by all the other Labor Government States. Comments made by the Federal Treasurer on the news services earlier this evening are a pretty fair indication that a large

number of Labor Party members, whether in the State or Federal jurisdiction, are still living in expectation of a series of events that will not occur.

It is very clear that the Prime Minister and his Treasurer have at long last agreed to acknowledge reality. It is very encouraging that at present they are reacting to a course of direction which was offered to them by the Federal Leader of the Opposition (John Howard) some weeks ago. They have acceded to his request to take the Australian public into their confidence in relation to the disastrous course which has developed and which is continuing to develop as a result of the Federal Government's approach to fiscal matters and indeed to very many other matters.

An issue that we on this side of the House have frequently drawn to the attention of the Government here (and this has certainly been drawn to the attention of the Federal Government) is that one cannot continue to spend and hope to come out on top: the pit is not bottomless, as several members would have us believe. Frequently we have witnessed the spectacle of the Premier of this State, and indeed other Ministers, advising members on this side of the House that they should not expect the Government to go on a shopping spree in undertaking a whole host of new initiatives.

On most occasions when that lecture has been delivered by Ministers opposite they have criticised Opposition members in a very false way because, invariably, a member on this side has been providing an indication to a Minister of a perceived community requirement, the interests of which members here represent. In drawing difficulties to the attention of the Government, very rarely have members clamoured for an immediate answer, although members have suggested to Ministers that it is high time that the Government got its priorities right and used the limited funds available to provide essential services rather than spend them on airy fairy activities. I do not want to highlight in debate this evening each and every one of these areas of activity.

I now want to draw to the attention of the House a document that is put out on a monthly basis by the National Australia Bank. I refer particularly to page 7 of the January 1987 monthly summary where, under the major heading 'Productivity in the workplace', attention is drawn to the very difficult circumstances prevailing in Australia at present—because of the cost pressures, and the claims of the labour market (we have seen something of the activity of the BLF here in South Australia in recent days relative to that) and the fact that there is a singular lack of increased productivity. Had these claims been made when there was a guarantee of increased productivity, some relief might have been in sight. Regrettably, that productivity has not materialised. In this document, under the heading 'Capital expenditure plans', the following comment is made:

High interest rates have put pressure on the Government's current strategy of using tight monetary policy to support the dollar. Not surprisingly, the outlook for lower demand in a climate of high interest rates has dampened capital expenditure plans.

Before one can greatly increase productivity and job opportunities, and before one is able to institute new initiatives to provide additional employment or opportunities, one must have capital expenditure. The possibility of redirecting existing capital into new areas exists, but it does not initiate the same sort of drive or the same degree of job opportunity that flows from the introduction of new capital expenditure. The article continues:

The proportion of firms anticipating higher capital expenditure over the next 12 months reached its lowest level since December 1982. Twenty-three per cent of those surveyed expected an increase in capital expenditure outlays, contrasting with 28 per cent in June 1986 and 25 per cent in March 1986.

Very clearly, Federal and State Governments have failed to provide the environment in which industry in all its forms is prepared to commit additional capital expenditure to provide for additional work opportunities. The article then proceeds to indicate that the last peak in capital expenditure plans occurred in March 1985, prior to the Government's decision to drop the investment allowance after June 1986. The article points out:

Although some easing in plans would have been expected in the following period, the extent of the fall in capital expenditure plans is disturbing.

It is well to dwell on the words 'is disturbing'. An initiative that the Government expected to have a desirable influence on the manufacturing industry of Australia, with a consequent multiplier effect in relation to job opportunities and a better way of life, has just not come about. The article picks up the point of the Government's decision to drop the investment allowance. With the experience of many years of fiscal activity, I believe that any Government would understand that the quickest way to turn off the tap of capital input is to make it less attractive for people to turn on the tap.

We have seen this with the destructive effect of negative gearing and we have seen it in relation to this failure to provide for investment allowance. To prime the pump, there is a need to give the people who have the funds the opportunity to show a benefit on their initiative. Whilst a tremendous amount of money has been flowing in the background of these takeovers (which do nothing other than bolster various companies' end of year profits or end of year reports), this has done nothing to generate funds for the purpose of actively creating jobs for the potential betterment of the community in which we live.

One thing that has become very apparent from statements that have been made in the past few days—particularly today in relation to statements made by the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer—is that the Premiers of the States collectively are expected to reduce their demands on the Commonwealth. Naturally, if the States are to have less funds available to them or must put more of their own resources into their own existence, then the States will have less funds to make available to, for example, local government.

I was surprised, in the information which was provided to the House earlier this afternoon by the member for Adelaide—a person whose assessment of affairs I respect; a person who obviously has been close to local government and recognises the importance of local government to a community—to hear him suggesting that now was the time for local government to really take up the suggestions of the humanity report and to undertake new initiatives. I make the point to the member for Adelaide—as I do to any other member—that to seek to prod local government into a position of response without providing it with the additional wherewithal is to seek to take the odium of incompetent management away from the State Government and place it on the shoulders of another tier of government.

Local government is having enough difficulties of its own at the present moment in satisfying its ratepayers with the demands being made of it, and local government is finding itself in that position of having to demand more from its ratepayers because of the increased number of commitments, initiated by Federal and State Government, which have suddenly been placed on local government to fund. One can list in the South Australian scene the extension of costing of the library service to local government; the statements by members of this Government to increase the cost of the provision of valuations; the increase in the cost of providing rolls for elections; the change in the emphasis

upon subsidies for Country Fire Services; and a demand on many local governments to triple or even quadruple the amount of money they are expected to put into Country Fire Services.

I do not want to debate these issues at any length this evening other than to say that local government already has had forced upon it additional costing for which, in many cases, it had not budgeted because there had been no prior consultation—in fact, there had been no post-consultation—and, in most circumstances, these additional costs were drawn to its attention after it had set its 1986-87 budget. I believe, from moving around the State in local government circles, that local government is starting to say to Government, 'Enough is enough.'

I also believe that the ratepayers, the electors of local government, are starting to say—and are going to say with even greater force than they have in the past—to their local governing bodies, 'We will not accept a situation where you initiate a whole range of new programs under the heading of the requirements of community service without there being an input from State Government—an input which, obviously, State Government will not be able to make because it does not have the funds with which to do it, and at a time when many of those local governing bodies have not even completed the introduction or provision of initiatives which have been required of them previously.'

To hold out to a group of electors the bait of new creches, of new initiatives at a time when there are no funds with which to provide them, is to do a disservice to those communities. It is a situation that will bring about a number of disgruntled communities, because they will find that the local governing body is quite unable to fulfil the commitment which another tier of government—the State Government—is suggesting for them. I am not denying that many of the initiatives would be of tremendous value for a community. I am not suggesting that a community would not be able to make good use of many of those new initiatives.

What I am pointing out, however, is that those initiatives will not be able to be put in place except at a major cost, and it is a cost that many people in the community are unable to meet at this time. The member for Eyre and the member for Flinders have indicated to this House on recent occasions the very grave difficulties which are applying in rural areas, not only to the farming community but also to the service organisations that provide for that farming community to meet their current commitments.

For the first time in a long time we are having people walk off their properties because they cannot meet their debts, and there are no ongoing funds available to them from the banking system to provide the opportunity for them to put in next year's crop. As they leave their communities, they become an additional statistic or claim upon the welfare of the Commonwealth and the State. As they leave, so do the service organisations: the bakers, grocers, post offices, unofficial post offices, the welding services, etc., lose their opportunity to provide additional employment. So, it is a continual downhill drive. Where, then, will a community of that nature find the additional sums that would be required to pay an elevated local government charge to undertake a number of these initiatives?

The one good thing that I will say about the document which has been prepared is that it requires each community to be consulted in relation to what new initiatives might be undertaken in that community. I proffer the advice that very few of those communities, particularly once they get away from the city and even including the city, will be able to undertake any of those new initiatives without there being an input of funds from an external source. I believe

that we do a mischief and a great disservice to the community in which we live if we keep talking up the introduction of these new services at a time when, as a responsible Government or responsible Parliament, we should be drawing to the attention of the community at large the inability to respond.

At least the Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer today have made a move in the right direction in that regard. I hope that the Premier will do likewise, instead of fudging questions, and that he will from this point on start to answer some of the very critical questions which have been put to him by members of the Opposition and the community at large, so that we as a total community can better understand precisely where we are going.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): This evening I would like to talk about the progress that has been made in the area of children's services in recent times in my electorate. I do not need to remind the House of the Bannon Government's commitment to excellence, equality and efficiency in the provision of care and education services for our children from the very earliest age. This Government believes that much vital learning and social development occurs before children enter primary school. The Children's Services Act of 1985 is a reflection of this commitment, as is the work that is being done throughout the State, and more particularly in my electorate, to meet the needs of a very young population.

A report from the Department of Environment and Planning released in late 1985 indicates that the population in my electorate has increased markedly since 1980 and will have increased by approximately 85 per cent by the year 2001. This increase is no more marked than in the 0-14 year age group, which comprises about one-third of the population. The proportion of children aged less than four years to the rest of the population is also significantly large. It is for this reason that the State Government has identified the Happy Valley council area as an area with a pressing need for child-care services and is responding to this need.

It was my great pleasure late last year to attend the official opening of the Happy Valley Community Child Care Centre by my colleague the member for Mawson, whose untiring efforts towards the provision of child-care in the southern suburbs were acknowledged by the management committee's invitation to open the centre. Work has now started on the new child-care and community health centre at the Hub, Aberfoyle Park. Together, these centres will provide subsidised care for up to 150 children each week. The centre at the Hub also includes accommodation for the Happy Valley Family Day Care Service and a small community health facility. This facility is operating in the Happy Valley shopping centre at the moment and will move to the new complex once it is completed. A subsidised 40 place child-care centre, opened early last year in the Hallett Cove area, is available to residents of Sheidow Park and Trott Park.

These services are complemented by family day care services operating from each of the local councils in my electorate. Nonetheless, there are still waiting lists. The Government readily acknowledges that priority has been given to the provision of child-care for children whose parents work outside the home and child-care in the workplace. Although these needs have not yet been completely met, much progress has been and will continue to be made. I believe that it is also time that further attention was given to occasional care and out-of-school-hours care.

With the contraction to the small nuclear family and the consequent lack of support that extended families can offer, the question of respite from caring for young children 24

hours a day has become a very important issue. This problem is exacerbated by the physical isolation of many people in new developing areas such as my electorate. The Minister of Children's Services has successfully negotiated with the Federal Minister for Community Services to obtain an extra 245 places for occasional child-care. I congratulate the Minister on his efforts. Funding has also been provided for an out-of-school-hours care for 30 school age children to be cared for at the Aberfoyle Park Neighbourhood House. The \$8 100 grant allocated will go a long way to enabling parents to find employment, knowing that their children will be safe and well looked after.

In the area of preschool education, it is unfortunately usually the case in my electorate that demand exceeds the number of places available. Once again, the Government has done much to redress this imbalance. The most recent addition has been the Flagstaff Oval kindergarten, which was opened in 1985 by the then Minister of Children's Services. This new facility caters for children, considerably easing the enrolment pressure on other kindergartens in the area.

In November 1985, in response to a parent delegation, the then Minister of Children's Services approved an extension to the Chandlers Hill Children's Centre. The extension has given the centre the capacity to teach 30 four year olds per session as well as catering for pre-entry and play groups. After some annoying delays, work has now been completed and the Chandlers Hill Children's Centre is working to full capacity. The only problem they face at the moment is traffic congestion around the children's centre, which is directly opposite the Happy Valley Primary School on Education Road. I have been pressing the Minister of Education and the Minister of Water Resources to look at this problem in the hope that some E&WS property immediately to the north of the primary school can be made available for a car park and drop-off zone.

To ensure excellence in preschool education the State Government has continued to make up Federal funding cuts in that area. Further, we are committed to work towards an optimum staff child ratio of 1 to 10 by 1989. Progress towards this optimum has already been achieved. I have already cited examples of how this is happening in my electorate. However some parents have expressed to me their concern that new entry provisions, while working towards this end, may adversely affect the ability of preschools to cater for the individual education needs of all children. I urge the Minister to ensure that the new provisions are fully discussed and monitored to avoid this possibility.

The education and care of children in the home is supported by play groups and toy libraries. These are areas which rely heavily on input from local government and local communities. There has been a great deal of work in providing these services in my electorate such as the neighbourhood house to which I referred earlier and a number of other organisations such as church and community groups. These are dependent on self-help, Government and council input. These facilities play an important role in the social, physical and educational development of young children. It is important that they continue to be improved so that these advantages can be offered to all preschool children at minimal cost. In my electorate, the most urgent need in providing these services is the availability of suitable accommodation, for which they are heavily dependent on local councils.

Through the Children's Services Act the State Government is actively encouraging, by way of its consultative structure, the participation of parents in the decision making

process. Such a committee can be effective only if parents choose to participate. I note that the Act offers support in allowances and expenses for members of consultative committees and regional advisory committees, as well as secretarial and other services and facilities for the effective operation of the committees.

I believe that it is important that this support is adequate to encourage participation by as broad a cross-section of the community as possible. Further, I believe that the work and existence of the committees can only be worthwhile and truly representative if this support is adequate. Also, participation at the subregional level is imperative to the success of the whole structure and so should be actively promoted throughout the preschool community.

Much has already been achieved to improve children's services in South Australia and in the Fisher electorate. Much still needs to be done. This Government is committed to ensuring that the best possible care and education for our young children is available. The effective operation of the consultative committees can help to ensure that decisions made take into account the views of the community when caring for our children.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the former Minister, Lynn Arnold, and the current Minister of Children's Services on a very successful first 18 months of operation of the Children's Services Office. Of course, a lot of credit should go to the Director of Children's Services, Brenton Wright. Surely it is not the easiest task in the world to come into a new job and set up a new office, especially one as vital as the Children's Services Office.

On this note, I was interested to receive my copy of the annual report for 1986 of the Children's Services Office. It is an excellent report. I think that the report clearly identifies the direction in which the State Government is going in the area of children's services and also quite clearly identifies where the needs are. I was interested to read the section on the southern metropolitan region. Of course, as members will know, that covers my electorate. The southern region covers an area that extends from Mitcham and Unley in the north, is bordered by Anzac Highway, includes Glenelg North, the Fleurieu Peninsula and as far south as Victor Harbour. It has the greatest number of services of any one of the Children's Services Office regions. There are in the region 75 preschools, 30 child-care centres, 19 child parent centres, 18 toy libraries, 24 out-of-school-hours care programs, 28 vocational care programmes, five family day care schemes and approximately 153 playgroups.

The report quite clearly points out that many of the older suburbs in this region, those closer to the city, are currently experiencing a regrowth of young families and the southern suburbs in the Fleurieu Peninsula are characterised by extremely rapid development. That is certainly very much the case in my electorate, as those people in the Children's Services Office would no doubt be extremely well aware.

The annual report emphasises that over the first 12 months the regional office has undertaken several tasks. These have included maintaining preschool services, gaining a working knowledge of services and needs of the region, incorporating functions such as family day care and licensing of child-care centres, developing support and cooperation with and amongst the services, and being involved in the planning and support of new services.

Representatives from different services and support sectors have an opportunity to meet and discuss issues of concern while attending sessions of the in-service program which ran from March to June 1986. The program covered a wide range of topics and was held in 25 locations throughout the region. Over 200 people from approximately 80

different service centres attended the program. Evaluation sheets have provided useful information and will be used to plan future programs.

The report emphasises and quite accurately reports that, with the rapid growth and the new housing developments in southern metropolitan areas, existing services are extremely taxed and unable to meet the demand. I appreciate the fact that the people in the Children's Services Office are realistic. They face up to their responsibilities extremely well and, from my point of view, are extremely approachable. That all goes to make sure that our children in this State have the very best start to their lives.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): In supporting this Bill, I mention the fact that funds are included to cover the Government's loan to the *South Australia* America's Cup syndicate. If ever there was an extravagant waste of taxpayers' money on a rich man's toy, this project is one of them. I could go on and claim that the Bannon Government's involvement in an attempt to justify the expense was a great confidence trick. The involvement by the State in the America's Cup syndicate was almost laughable. The State was used, and it used the syndicate as a cheap pre-election gimmick. I believe that the State was conned. My question to the Premier today demonstrated how embarrassed he is and how he hopes that the issue will die, but I can assure him that it will not. The question that I asked the Premier today related to an article in yesterday's *Advertiser* which reported that the syndicate's financial result is equivalent to a loss of about \$1.8 million if the Government loan and interest are to be repaid. It quoted the Chairman of the syndicate (Mr Graham Spurling), as follows:

The Government has supported the campaign with a \$1.4 million grant.

The previous statements by the Premier on the matter suggested that a decision on whether or not to convert the loan to a grant would not be made until the syndicate's books had been fully audited. I asked the Premier to clarify the situation and of course he got very testy. It is understandable that the Premier does not like being questioned at length about any pet project that has not delivered the goods, and that is exactly the case with the America's Cup syndicate, because no-one will ever convince me that the amount of money that was spent on that project was justified. It is unbelievable that anybody could think that the amount of money spent on it would benefit the average citizen of South Australia or, by gaining a high profile for South Australia, that it would in turn bring more tourists to the State. On Thursday 12 February the Premier said in this House:

We advanced those moneys—

and he was talking about the America's Cup syndicate— on the basis that, whatever residual was available at the end of the day, we would have to convert that amount of loan into grant. We will not make decisions about that or the actual figures until all accounts are finalised and audited. I am told that that is imminent. A final statement of receipts and payments is being prepared. The Government and the Auditor-General will peruse them and the Auditor-General's certificate and report will be required before any decision comes into effect.

I cannot understand why the Premier would claim in this House that the question I asked today had already been answered, because 12 days previously really he did not give us an answer or any indication when we sought clarification on that issue. How long does it take for the Government to make a decision? How long does it take the Government to let the people of South Australia know exactly where they stand?

I believe that the Government does not want to be accountable. The Government wants everyone to forget

about the America's Cup syndicate. Those people whom it particularly wants to forget are the disabled, the unemployed, the frail, the sick, the homeless and those who are now struggling to afford reasonable accommodation. I tip that this \$1.4 million loan will be converted into a grant at about Easter time, but there is no doubt in my mind that the Government and the Premier know exactly what will happen in relation to this America's Cup syndicate grant, and I believe that he should tell the people now.

When it comes to decision making, this Government is the slowest. Indeed, it is one of the slowest that I have known in making decisions which are required by the community in order to know where they stand. If any Government procrastinates or dillydallies, it does not do anything for the confidence of the State, for commerce and industry or for the public in general. As an example, I refer to the vacancy created on the State Bank board by the unfortunate death of the late Hon. Don Simmons.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I am absolutely delighted that Molly has been nominated, because late last year I promoted the suggestion that Molly Byrne should be considered for the vacancy, and I made a speech again last Thursday afternoon in this House reinforcing my belief that it was time that we started looking at placing consumers on boards. I believe firmly that the State Bank board should not be just the domain of men and that it was high time that a woman was appointed to that board. I am therefore very pleased for Molly Byrne, because I think that, if any former member of this House deserves recognition for what she has done for her Party, for the State and for her electorate, it is Molly Byrne, and she deserves the opportunity to serve on the State Bank board. I have sufficient faith in her capabilities to know that she will undertake her role in a very sincere and conscientious manner.

I know that certain business people and some of the so-called Government sops within commerce and industry may feel disappointed that they were not successful with their applications, but Molly Byrne will represent the consumers. I always argue that consumers should be considered for representation on boards, and I certainly believe that the next board that should give consideration to the appointment of a consumer is that of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. However, under this Government, if history repeats itself, it will take a long time before we see that aim achieved. I hope that the women's movement and the women's network on my side of politics will insist that a woman be appointed as the next representative on the Electricity Trust board.

There are many more aspects of the Bill, and I trust that it will continue to fund the Aboriginal Work Unit. Last Friday afternoon I visited this unit and met the staff. I place on record my appreciation at the opportunity to discover and see at first-hand what has been achieved in such a short time and what can be done. Any employment and training scheme, particularly this program, that assists and supports any section of the community deserves the fullest support. In 1981 I had the opportunity to witness first-hand a training and placement scheme for persons with epilepsy.

A similar program was started here in 1983 and assisted over 150 unemployed persons who acquired a whole range of skills. Over 70 per cent of those who attended the 16 week course obtained full-time employment. The program was a tremendous success. Many people were given their first job tryout and many were given worthwhile employment. Unfortunately, late last year the Hawke Federal Government killed the scheme by asking the sponsor, the Epilepsy Association of South Australia, to contribute 25 per cent of

the overall funding, and that turned out to be an impossible task.

The irony of that program, which operated for three years, is that it was cost effective. Every person who was put into employment paid taxes, obtained health insurance and was a worthwhile contributing member of the community. So, the Federal Government benefited more than the State Government, but of course one cannot measure in dollars and cents the immense benefit that these people derive from being employed.

Nothing is worse than being unemployed, on the dole, or condemned for the rest of one's life to receiving invalid or sickness benefits. That is why I take a special interest in such groups as Aborigines. Hopefully, the Aboriginal Work Unit will not be treated in the same way by the Bannock State Government. It was established when Cabinet, on 6 May 1985, approved the establishment of the Special Community and Aboriginal Projects Unit as part of the Government's policy to promote and foster the trade training and employment of Aboriginal people in the provision and maintenance of essential engineering services and building works in the Aboriginal communities in the remote areas of South Australia.

The Special Community and Aboriginal Projects Unit, which is now titled the Aboriginal Works Unit and is headed by Mr Les Nayda, comprises a number of positions filled by Aboriginal people and operates as a separate entity attached to the South Australian Department of Housing and Construction. The unit provides and maintains State Government assets and associated housing for Government employees in remote areas of South Australia. In addition, the unit provides a consultancy service to Aboriginal communities and organisations in the construction and maintenance of essential engineering services and building works, technical expertise for planning development, and preparation of budget information for clients and town planning.

The unit has offered positions to four apprentices in the pre-vocational course in addition to the established Department of Labour placements and quotas. The future objective of the unit is to employ apprentices in the trade areas that particularly relate to the technical services offered by the unit in the provision and maintenance of essential engineering services to Aboriginal communities. It is hoped that eventually the Aboriginal Works Unit will operate as a totally separate Government entity responsible on behalf of major funding bodies for the control of maintenance and construction of engineering and building services in all Aboriginal communities in the State.

So, shortly after the unit came into operation, Mr E. McAdam was brought in and given a brief to evaluate the works program being conducted by the works unit. Again, this work follows closely the pattern to which I have already referred as regards the previous program. It is worth recording some of Mr McAdam's comments on the progress that has been made by this small, effective unit, as follows:

The main thrust of my report highlights the fragmentation and lack of coordination in delivering training and employment programs for the Anangu people in question, plus the lack of community control and involvement in this process. In my opinion there are ample employment opportunities for Anangu people in the North-West of South Australia, but very little emphasis to provide appropriate training programs to supplement long-term employment objectives.

As, you are aware, your unit is responsible for essential services and maintenance in the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara communities and as such are in a very strong position to ensure that training and employment projects be implemented across the communities in close consultation with the Yankunytjatjara and Pitjantjatjara councils as well as with the respective Community councils.

It is vitally important, as a first step in consultation with the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara councils, to establish a regional

training and employment coordinating committee to develop appropriate policies and planning at a local level.

Equally as important is the consideration of an amalgamation with the Aboriginal Section of the Department of Technical and Further Education or, in the very least, an agreement which clearly establishes definite guidelines incorporating training and employment objectives.

During the course of my deliberations I was also concerned with the role and function of the Education Department (State) who appear very inflexible and aloof, and in my opinion, are not providing a sound base for the Anangu children who, after all, will be the people that your unit and others will have to liaise with the future.

Whilst I am aware that it is not within my brief to make comments on the performance of the Education Department in the North-West of South Australia, I feel that it is vitally important that they (Education) reassess their position, and accordingly I am recommending that an independent review occur administered by the people themselves in an attempt to reverse a very disastrous situation. Finally, I wish to acknowledge you and your unit's commitment to provide appropriate training and employment opportunities to the Anangu people in the North-West of South Australia and wish you well in your endeavours.

That report was addressed to the head of the unit. Since establishment, the Aboriginal Works Unit's project officer has liaised closely with the Department of Technical and Further Education in carrying out preliminary work associated with the establishment of effective training programs for Aboriginal people living in communities.

At the initiative of the unit, the South Australian Department of Housing and Construction allocated four positions in the 1986 pre-vocational courses for Aboriginal people. Two out of the four students successfully completed the course and enter into apprenticeships with the department in 1987.

Further pre-vocational positions will be offered to Aboriginal people in 1987 with the view to commencing apprenticeships with the department in 1988. It is proposed that the department accepts responsibility for a number of Aboriginal people to commence apprenticeships in 1987 on the basis that the department cannot guarantee permanent employment after the successful completion of their apprenticeships.

The Point Pearce Aboriginal community is now to be awarded the contract for the construction of a new school at Point Pearce. Similar to the teacher housing project, local labour will construct the school in accordance with the documentation provided by the Aboriginal Works Unit. The documentation has been prepared to adapt to the unskilled labor. The technical officers of the unit will provide on site guidance in building and engineering techniques as well as arrange for an on site trainer/educator to be present over the 16 week construction period.

The forward planning and work in hand within the unit indicates confidence, determination and a sense of pride in achievements up to the present. The drawings and the pictorial evidence, the standard of the workmanship and construction, the terrain on which the workers were employed, and the obvious attention to detail are a credit to everyone who was involved in the project.

We must continue to foster and encourage the Aboriginal Works Unit. I commend the staff and those involved in all aspects of the unit up to the present. An opportunity is being given to these people who previously were left to fend for themselves. People who have been discarded in one respect are now being given an opportunity to participate in making a direct contribution by way of the skills that they will acquire and as a result of creating a permanent structure for their community. They are also involved in and will be consulted as regards the design of the structure, the requirements of which must meet the harsh conditions of the area in which the buildings are being constructed. These people are being given a sense of belonging, a sense

of feeling and a sense of acceptance. It is more important than anything else to encourage these young people to be part of our community and for them to be given this opportunity.

Of course, the battle for survival will be to obtain the support of the State Government and, more importantly, that of the Federal Government to allow these people to continue with their projects and to enable them to tender for and win these projects. I therefore, trust that the State Government will continue to support and encourage the unit and help it obtain more of the works that are allocated by the Federal and State Governments. To cover their overheads, these people work on a small mark-up, in the same way that anyone else does. It is important that in the early stages these people be given the chance to improve their skills. As it develops, this team will grow and the expertise acquired will make it a far more efficient organisation, although it should not be thought that it is not already efficient. However, the unit should be given every opportunity to develop, and it should be supported and encouraged. I support the initiative of the Minister of Public Works and Housing and Construction in establishing the unit. The Minister responsible and his Government should ensure, for the sake of South Australia, that this valuable program is not lost.

I hope that the Minister responsible, his Cabinet, and the Minister at the table who is vitally involved in the project through his leadership and control of technique and further education will ensure that the appropriate encouragement and support will continue to be given for as long as it possibly can be so that these people may be given recognition and their proper place within the structure of the Government works program and the Public Service structure.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the Bill and congratulate the Government on its commitment in particular to the provision of sporting and recreational facilities throughout South Australia. I would like to place on record the excellent precedent set by the Federal Whitlam Government 1972-75 in spending more than any previous Government in this important area of sport and recreation. Since that time Governments have generally responded likewise and spent a good deal of money in this area, and I refer to the present Bannon Government in particular. As this is a very important area within the community, I certainly support what is being done.

Unfortunately, local government is generally dragging its feet compared to State and Federal Government activities. Of course, there are exceptions but by and large that is the situation. In my electorate of Price there is a serious lack of recreational facilities and, in particular, recreation grounds, especially in the areas of great demographic change. Some newer areas in the electorate are well set up for sport and recreation, but some of the older areas have been badly neglected, mainly by local government. There are large areas that have seen changes from the traditional nuclear family, which was the norm about 30 or 40 years ago. Since that time a gradual change has occurred where the children have grown up, married and left home, leaving in the houses parents who over the years have become elderly and some of whom have passed away or gone into nursing homes or institutions.

Within a relatively short space of time large areas in this category have assumed a completely different character by virtue of the fact that these elderly people eventually pass on or move out of their houses, which apart from being old are generally in disrepair, resulting in low prices attracting a lot of young people into the area. This is good in that it

brings in many young families who do an excellent job of restoring these old homes, and who settle in and raise families.

Here is where the problem in these old areas arises. The character of the area changes over the years, and Government and local government do not really see the changes until they are upon them. When the families of 40 years ago lived in these areas there were plenty of paddocks and open spaces for children to play in. The difference now is that these open areas no longer exist and there is a real need for community recreational parks and grounds where children can play.

To compound the problem we have a fairly major redevelopment of some of these areas. Where there used to be large homes on very large blocks we now find that the areas are becoming medium to high density with developers moving in. There are now a lot of small homes sometimes on very small blocks. Of course, there were always areas in and around Port Adelaide itself where there were lots of small houses crammed together on very small blocks, in some cases only slightly larger than the houses themselves. The children used to play in the streets, because there was very little traffic, as the average person lived close to his employment and did not have a motor vehicle.

In the Port area itself there was the Port canal and the river set up with pontoons. I can remember there were three quite large swimming clubs which serviced the community exceptionally well. The children had swimming and playing facilities right at their doorstep and there were no problems. As I said last Thursday, there is now the development of the Super K- Mart on top of where that canal was and it is not possible at this stage to reinstate the swimming facilities within the Port River because of the high levels of pollution encountered there.

Another problem is the high price of land, which is putting more and more pressure on the need for high density housing development and therefore less likelihood of getting land left over for recreational purposes. It is true that some areas are earmarked for recreation and parks by the Housing Trust, in particular, and by local government. I might add that the Housing Trust is doing an excellent job in developing areas for housing; with over 40 000 families waiting for housing, this is crucial. Rightly so, the priority is for the money to go into housing, and these recreational areas that have been set aside have to wait. Unfortunately for the young families in these high density areas, the need for these recreational facilities exists now.

The Woodville and Port Adelaide councils especially, in my electorate, have endeavoured to overcome some of the problems by buying up properties when they become available and setting up pocket parks adjacent to where these families live. Unfortunately, in both areas they have often had to abandon the idea after several years because these pocket parks tend to become a haven for undesirable elements who congregate there to drink and create vandalism and hooliganism, which makes the parks unsuitable for youngsters to play in.

In the Parks area, which is on the other side of my electorate, there are some excellent grounds and facilities for sport. The Parks Community Centre, in particular, is world class, but in proportion to the population many more facilities are required. In the Port area itself, I remember there was a cycling track, for instance, which was the home of the Port Adelaide Amateur Cycling Club, one of the oldest cycling clubs in Australia. This club celebrated its centenary year in 1985. The club had quite a good track on a property within 300 or 400 yards of Port Adelaide itself. In 1951 the Port Adelaide council of the day decided that

with the greater Port Adelaide development the track would have to go but they promised to replace it with another modern track at a later date. Here we are in 1987 and we are no closer now to having this track than we were in 1952.

Another club that has been disadvantaged, and is still disadvantaged, is the Port Adelaide Amateur Athletic Club, situated on an oval which in the last four or five years was cut exactly in half by the new Grand Junction Road extension. I intend to negotiate with the appropriate Minister and the Port Adelaide council to endeavour to get a track for these people and also to get the area extended to something like it was. Both these clubs have produced many excellent athletes including, from the Port Adelaide Amateur Cycling Club, Olympic gold medallist and dual Commonwealth gold medallist Michael Turtur and, from the Port Adelaide Amateur Athletics Club, many State and national champions.

This lack of facilities occurs not only in the electorate of Price but in other electorates with old residential areas that have undergone or are undergoing demographic changes. The problem is not really the fault of any particular Government but arises from circumstances that have evolved. These things happen gradually: people pass on or move out of the area and are gradually replaced by younger people moving into the area, and when various problems become obvious it is often too late for them to be solved for the benefit of these young people with young children. Local government must accept some of the blame due to lack of forward planning—although I guess it is always easy to be wise in hindsight. Today, with our superior knowledge, modern survey techniques, computers, etc., together with lessons learnt from previous mistakes, I am quite confident that these sorts of problems will not occur in future. However, as has been mentioned by other members today, there is a real need for Federal and State Governments to work very closely together to ensure the best result in all these areas for our grandchildren and those to come after them.

Another area that is causing problems, not only in my electorate, concerns planning appeals or planning matters pertaining to local government areas. The Planning Act, as amended a couple of years ago, brought in some very sweeping and excellent changes and, by and large, is working very well. However, problems are starting to emerge, and I refer to a particular example in my electorate. Some years ago, I think in 1971, special dispensation was given by the Woodville council for a stately old home on large grounds to be used as a reception centre for weddings, parties, seminars, conventions, production launches, etc.

The use of these premises is not suitable for a built up residential area and has caused disruption. This disruption to adjoining and neighbours properties has been absolutely disastrous and intolerable. I have been involved with some of these problems, and with one in particular in my capacity as a councillor for the city of Woodville. Excessive noise emanates from this establishment late at night, with the usual loud bands and so forth. Under the special dispensation provisions, all activities should finish at midnight but, of course, as the years go by functions have gone on longer and longer and these days finish at perhaps 2 or 3 a.m. Residents who live right next door to this establishment have problems in the early hours of the morning—apart from having to put up with the noise during the night. One family with young children who live next door are forced to visit friends and relatives on Saturday nights in order to get the children out of the house, because they just cannot sleep, and they come home as late as possible on those occasions.

However, people then find in the early hours of the morning, when the function has wound up, that there are drunks staggering around, perhaps urinating at the front of or even in their gardens. Also, there is a slamming of car doors, revving of engines, tyre squealing and the occasional crash, and this just makes it impossible for people to get their rest. This also goes on to a lesser extent during the week. Added to these problems one finds that litter all over the area makes the place very untidy and messy.

As I have said, families are forced to go out at night to avoid the noise but, in addition, in the day time and at weekends, when weddings are often held at this establishment, neighbouring residents find that they cannot cut their lawns: they are abused and told to shut up because a wedding is in progress. They are unable to carry out essential maintenance on their homes. The ministers or whoever are conducting the ceremonies in progress even complain about the neighbouring children making too much noise when playing in their yards, and they ask for the children to be kept quiet. If this was not enough, the owners applied to council for permission to expand this facility. Council supported the proposal because of support of a preponderance of business people on council. The neighbours appealed to the Planning Appeals Tribunal but now, almost two years later, the matter is still unresolved, with some of the neighbours many thousands of dollars out of pocket.

Another problem with the planning legislation concerns a person in my area who has a small supermarket. He applied to council about 18 months ago for permission to put on a fairly modest addition to assist him in the conduct of his business. It was to be mainly a storage facility. The additions were approved by council but another supermarket owner, approximately 1½ kilometres away, appealed to the Planning Appeals Tribunal. This was done on very shaky grounds: it was under the guise of appealing against this approval because in his opinion there were one or two car parking spaces too few on this supermarket car parking site—even though the supermarket is on the corner of a very quiet side street, where parking is certainly not a problem.

This occurred 18 months ago but, because of the terrific build up of cases in the Planning Appeals Tribunal (about 1 500 when I last checked), the case has yet to be dealt with. Obviously, the complaint by this other person was based on business competition reasons and not on planning grounds. Nevertheless, the matter has to wait to go through the court. The person who has appealed almost certainly will not win the case but he has held up the additions proposed by this supermarket owner and another 50 per cent has been added to his costs, plus all the legal costs that this poor applicant has endured. There is a real need to address the problem—not only in terms of compensation for such hold-ups but more importantly to tune the legislation to drastically reduce the number of appeals waiting for hearing by the Planning Appeals Tribunal. The matter must be looked at urgently, as the situation is already quite bad and it is getting worse each day. I support the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I, too, support the Bill. In speaking in this debate members on both sides of the House canvass many issues. Tonight I shall address the question of the industrial scene in South Australia. As a preamble to these remarks, I shall make some comments about the industrial scene and particularly how it relates to workers in this State. One could say that for many years in South Australia, as a worker, a trade union official and now as a member of this Parliament, I have heard an ongoing abuse in relation to the attitude of workers in this country and in particular here in South Australia.

We have heard from conservative elements that the workers should lift their game; that they should produce more; that they give a poor performance; that we need a reliable and dependable product so that we can export, which will assist the State's economy. There is no doubt, and I think we all agree, that there is no perfect situation in terms of the industrial scene in this State and in Australia in particular, but I get a bit sick of people ridiculing the trade union movement and the workers in this State. I think that it is about time that we should also, given that there are problems in those areas, look at the executive arm of business in this State.

I am not saying that all executives are bad, nor do I believe that all trade unions officials are bad, but I think in this case that some of the executives in business in this State should look at themselves. Executives, I have heard over many years, tend to blame the troubles of the State's economy on union recklessness and the crippling wage bills. The truth of the matter is that wages comprise only 10 to 15 per cent of total costs in most industries, and it is estimated that 30 per cent of costs are caused by waste and error which could have been avoided with better management.

These are not all my words: these are words taken from the transcript of a *Four Corners* program on 8 December 1986. In part I will relate some of the statements made on that program. I quote:

Australian managers could afford to be smug about their British counterparts were it not for their own poor performance. A highly respected Swiss survey of 28 countries rated Australia 23rd on managerial talents, well behind countries like India, Turkey and Mexico. During the lunch break at a recent management seminar in Sydney we thought we would test the Australian manager's capacity for self criticism...What do you think is the biggest problem facing Australian business today?

Quite predictably the responses from a number of the business people were:

I'd have to say over-taxation and lack of incentive.

Another said, 'Over-intervention of Government.'; another, 'Cost of labour.'; another, 'Union influence and power in this country.'; and the last said, 'External circumstances.' It is quite clear that on many occasions managers look to blame the workers for their own inability; in effect, to use the workers as scapegoats. They are not just my words, and I will come back to this later, about people in this State and their comments about what is happening in terms of the managerial expertise that is lacking in some parts of industry in Australia and here in this State.

For example, John Sprouster, General Manager of Nashua—and I think everyone knows Nashua—is one of the top businessmen behind a group in this country called 'Australia for Quality'. His aim is to catapult Australian management into the twentieth century. He is quoted as saying:

Eighty-five per cent of all the problems in a business can be directed to the senior management.

I think that is a pretty sobering statement for all of us in this Chamber and for business people, in particular in South Australia, to reflect on. When asked:

What do you think is the biggest problem in Australian management today?

John Sprouster said:

A lack of understanding of what really is required to achieve quality, productivity and competitiveness.

When asked:

How would you describe the standard of management in Australia?

John Sprouster's comment was, 'Poor.' The article goes on to talk about the long surviving AWA and about the AWA Ashfield plant in Sydney. I do not want to incur your wrath,

Mr Deputy Speaker, and I do not want to get away from the South Australian scene. Suffice it to say that he refers to the AWA showpiece achievements in the submarine detection system called Barrow Sonar Buoy. It was researched by AWA, but the company lost its RAF contract to a British competitor, Plessey.

Similar statements were recorded in this program about lucrative telephone deals which had been lost to the American giant, GEC and the Swedish company, Ericssons. The report of this program goes on to say:

In theory, AWA, like Australia, has a lot going for it. The company has won design awards and employs some of the best engineers in the country. AWA has been criticised for being reluctant to take risks, for missing out on golden opportunities. The most infamous involved the Interscan system of air navigation. Interscan was invented by scientists at the CSIRO, but AWA was not prepared to put up the money to develop it fully. An American company was, and Interscan, now worth billions of dollars, is used at many airports around the world. AWA relies heavily on Government contracts for its survival.

I understand that recently AWA was taken over by another company. People may say in this debate, 'What are you leading up to? What are you talking about?' I am talking about what has happened in this State to the motor car industry and, in particular, to what has happened with Holden's. My colleague the member for Price, who worked there prior to coming into Parliament, I heard on many occasions at Party meetings in and around the Port talk about the problems of the motor car industry and the effects particularly on the western suburbs of Adelaide.

In the *Four Corners* program Jenny Brockie goes on to say:

If AWA has a few problems, they are nothing compared with those facing the management here. In the last six years General Motors-Holden's has lost more than \$500 million.

That is not peanuts: not small bickies, but big brass. The transcript goes on to say:

Holden's major competitor, Ford, has streaked ahead, picking winners and using new management techniques. Last year Ford recorded a profit of \$100 million. GMH's main problem can be sheeted straight home to management: dumping a popular model like the Kingswood—

and I see my colleague nodding in agreement—

and backing a series of vehicles people just didn't want to buy. These crates are full of imported Japanese engines designed for the Commodore, a decision taken before the collapse of the Australian dollar, which is now an economic albatross for the company.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not like to interrupt the honourable member when he is in full flow, but I wonder whether he anticipates linking his remarks to the Supply Bill.

Mr HAMILTON: I will not incur your wrath, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will certainly do that. I ask the House to bear with me a little longer, because what I am saying has implications related to questions asked here today about the Woodville industrial complex.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is always tolerant and will bear with the member for a little while, but I hope that he will link his remarks to the Supply Bill.

Mr HAMILTON: I certainly will. There is a need in the State to recognise and appreciate the need for greater education and greater training, not only for those people who want to go into a particular area of the workforce but for management. This Government, as you are well aware, Sir, over the years has provided assistance through the Small Business Corporation to assist small business people in this State. I applaud that, and know that most members in this House at some time or other would have utilised the services of the Small Business Corporation in South Australia on South Terrace by sending to it prospective business persons and business people in trouble. I think that you can

see what I am alluding to: this Government has provided assistance to business people in this State.

I get annoyed when people attack the trade union movement and workers. Today questions were directed to the Minister of State Development and Technology about the future of the old GMH plant at Woodville, the industrial site on the corner of Cheltenham Parade and Port Road, Woodville. I applaud what the Minister has done in going to Hong Kong and through Asia to try to sell the message of what Australia (and South Australia in particular) has to offer. I applaud those sentiments as opposed to carping and criticism. I am not opposed to constructive criticism, but I wonder about the motives of people who are constantly criticising and saying that we have one of the worst industrial records, or that we have major problems in the industrial scene in this State. I say that management and executives have a role to play in this State to work constructively with the trade union movement and, in particular, with the Government. I believe that these comments are within the ambit of the Supply Bill.

There is a need to recognise what we have missed out on in this country. Many years ago in America there was a guru in management expertise named Deming. The Japanese picked up his expertise and implemented it in their country. I do not have to relate to people in this place what the Japanese have done since 1945. They embraced Deming's philosophy. 'Management in this country has a lot to answer for in terms of its attitude to workers': those are not my words, but the words of a person well respected in the industrial scene in South Australia, Graham Spurling, who, when he took over Chrysler, which is now Mitsubishi, became preoccupied (and correctly so) with improved quality.

Mr Spurling believes that Australian managers should get back to basics, that that is the first step in quality and good relationship with our workers. He is quoted as saying on the *Four Corners* program:

So you've got to start off and say: The people I work with are basically good people and take them on board and make that assumption. Trust them, tell them the things you want to do. Tell them the truth.

I believe that the workers in this State in particular will respond if management is prepared to come forward and lay its cards on the table. This is done in other countries, and I see no reason why it should not be done in this State. Mr Spurling also said:

We've got a policy of saying we're going to work in a cooperative spirit with the unions, with the people in the unions, the people on the shop floor, and recognising that there is a hierarchy in the unions, and recognising the unions—they're politicians, they need votes . . .

That is a realistic appraisal of the industrial scene in this State.

When I hear statements, such as I have heard today from the member for Bragg, which affect the economy of this State and in which he said, 'Let's tramp the trade union movement', I reply that the political reality is that that has not worked and, in my view, will not work. Confrontation with the trade union movement in the industrial scene in this State will not work. It will have an impact upon the economy, but it will not assist in our efforts to try to get people to go into that old industrial GMH site at Woodville. We need positive vibes to be sent out to interested people. Rather than kicking the trade union movement on every occasion, management should be looking to its own laurels and not just kicking the hell out of the worker all the time.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for further consideration of the Bill.

Mr KLUNDER (Todd): In these days of increasing budget constraints Governments get squeezed between decreasing revenue and a greater need for Government spending, especially in such areas as community welfare. There exists, therefore, a greater need to scrutinise expenditure, and by the sound of the departments that is certainly being done. One dimension of such expenditure which I think could be considered and which is not currently being considered is the relative importance of the last few hundred thousand dollars within each separate departmental budget. At the risk of being totally abhorred by each of these departments, (or administrative units as they are now known), I wonder whether a comparison of each of these tail end margins is likely to prove useful. To clarify what I mean by that, I will give an example which is purposely rather a dramatic one.

I refer to a comparison between renal units in the Health Commission and RBT units in the Police Force. Clearly, here there are two units which are neither at capital value nor recurrent value comparable in costs, although, for the purpose of this exercise, that is irrelevant. The point is that both of them are or may be capable of saving lives, but their comparative effectiveness will not be considered because they are part of different empires. For instance, if one talks about a CAT scan versus the dollar equivalent number of renal units, then someone in the Health Department will make a decision whether or not to purchase a CAT scan or the equivalent number of renal units and, hopefully, that decision will be based on proper and reasonable criteria. Similarly, extra RBT units versus extra motor cycle patrols are probably considered within the Police Department on their respective merits. The point I make is that a comparative methodology across departments to my knowledge does not exist.

I have no doubt that the creation of Cabinet subcommittees has contributed markedly to a reduction in duplication in various departments and a proper dovetailing of efforts has probably contributed greatly to the efficiency and effectiveness of departments. However, I do not think that the particular area of finance about which I am talking has come under the aegis of the Cabinet subcommittees. In a just world, of course department A would not have money to spend on fourth order priorities while department B had not yet completed its list of third order priorities. Of course, in practice it would be next to impossible to establish a pecking order of equivalent priorities between different departments, but I do not think that that is necessary. It should be possible to look only at those marginal last few dollars in each department and to look at what hopefully will clearly appear to be anomalies at the tail end of each of the departmental priorities.

I stress that I have no basis whatsoever for the example that I am about to use and that it should not be seen as pointing the bone at any particular department. The example that comes to mind (however undeserved it may be) is whether the last one-tenth of one per cent in the Education Department (which is an amount of some \$600 000 to \$700 000) is capable of being shown to be as important to education as it might be, for instance, to another department such as Community Welfare or to any department which is experiencing an increase in unsolicited demand. I really do not know how one makes that determination. The temptation to increase or decrease the amount of money that is available across the board is a very strong one in that it preserves relativities, and that in itself stops all argument about relativities, but also it may preserve unjust or unrea-

sonable relativities or unjust or unreasonable situations. While the pain of comparing the margins of appropriations will be a great one, the rewards in terms of placing the available money at the point of greatest need is also very considerable.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): That is one of the shortest grievances that I have ever heard. However, I commend the member for Todd on some of the points that he made. Yesterday the Minister of Tourism and the Chairperson of the South Australian Tourism Industry Council (Mrs Wendy Chapman) launched the South Australian Tourism Plan which will take this State's tourism forward from the current year until 1989. One of the strategies of that plan is to ensure that the existing tourism structure is geared to meet the objectives of the plan. The action identified as being important to implement that strategy is to examine the existing structure and functions of key tourism organisations. I suggest that, as a result of input from the industry and from Government sources over many months, the first target for review in terms of the Government's tourism structure should be the Department of Tourism itself. I believe that, as a matter of urgency, a total independent review of the Department of Tourism and the replacement of the Minister should be called for by the Premier and the Government.

The Department of Tourism is in a critical condition, and I suspect that the previous Minister of Tourism, who is on the front bench, is well aware of that fact. The tourism industry is certainly aware of it. Morale in the department is at rock bottom, the department is running out of money and the Minister is regarded as a lightweight with no leadership capacity whatsoever, and our international representation is being cancelled. If the situation is not addressed by the Government as a matter of urgency there will be open revolt within the tourism industry at the Government's failure to meet its needs.

Ms Lenehan: Come on!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Come on? I will come on and proceed to give chapter and verse as reason and justification for what I recognise are very strong statements. The Minister has endorsed this plan.

Ms Lenehan: She launched it.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: She launched it, she has endorsed it and she has made no financial commitment whatsoever to the implementation of the plan. It is utterly foolish to endorse a plan and to know that it is not possible to implement it because there are no resources to do so.

Ms Lenehan: You haven't read the plan.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I have read the plan and I know what the Minister has committed herself to. I know that the Government cannot possibly meet those commitments because, even for the current financial year, the department's budget is fully expended. Five months before the end of the financial year no money is left for marketing, for brochures, for literature for maps or for essential promotional services to the State and tourism industry. Officers from the Department of Tourism will tell you that they cannot even take a taxi from a function which they are bound to attend in an official capacity to get back to the department. They have either had to walk or take a Bee line bus, if indeed there is a bus, and from tomorrow there is likely to be no bus. But, no money will be available to the departmental officers for taxis.

The department's contract with its advertising agency expired in December and has not been renewed. This means that the Government is without its most essential promo-

tional tool at a very critical time when the State urgently needs promotion and marketing advice. It is no use the Minister saying, 'We are relying on market surveys because we want to judge the direction in which we will next go.' The department and the Minister knew that that contract would expire in December. It is absolutely irresponsible to leave a key Government department without an advertising agency and advice for a matter of several months while it dithers, because it does not have the money and is incapable of making a decision.

The South Australian Tourism Offices in New Zealand and Los Angeles were recently closed and the officers from those two cities recalled to Adelaide. This occurs at a time when the Minister says how critical it is that we attract international tourists. New Zealand has just been wiped off. Our representation in Los Angeles and the West Coast of the United States, which is an important potential market for South Australia, has been cancelled.

As I said, morale in the department is at a very low ebb, and staff resignations have decimated the department's capacity to do its job in selling the State. In recent weeks there have been resignations from the Deputy Director of Tourism (who is also Director of Marketing), from the Marketing Manager of the Department of Tourism, from the Overseas Sales Manager, and from two senior travel officers in the booking office. Also, further resignations are pending as senior staff simply despair of getting any leadership at all from the Minister. In the next few weeks there will be further resignations, and that department is in a critical condition and therefore urgently in need of review.

Since her appointment the Minister has not even bothered to make herself known to some senior longstanding officers in that department. As the former Minister knows, it is a relatively small staff. It is possible for a Minister, if not to know all the staff on a first name basis, at least to have been introduced to them and to be on nodding acquaintance terms with them. However, officers in that department have never met their own Minister, even though she works in the same comparatively small building.

The tourism industry is extremely critical of the Minister's lack of interest and consultation. There has been very little personal contact between her and key people in the industry, just as there is very little contact between the Minister and senior officers whose advice she should be seeking constantly and whose opinions she should be calling for constantly.

The Minister has taken no public stance whatsoever on the exclusion of South Australia from representation on the Australian Tourism Commission, which is proposed by the Kennedy report. That is a matter on which she should have taken a high public profile as soon as the report was released, yet we have heard not a word from her that a key tourism State has been excluded on the recommendation of a Commonwealth report. Nothing has been said by the person who is supposed to be the advocate for tourism in South Australia. A Minister of Tourism in this State needs to be much more than a page 3 cover girl charming snakes and spinning dice. She needs to be much more than that. She needs to be able to give leadership and a sense of direction. She needs to be a vigorous advocate for the industry both in the Cabinet and in the community. On those counts the Hon. Barbara Wiese has failed most miserably to meet the not unreasonable expectations of the industry and of the officers of her department. On those grounds the industry believes that she should be replaced. At the same time the Premier should institute a complete review into a department that deserves the best political and financial resources that the State has to offer. This is because of the critical

role of tourism in the State's economy, the fact that at present it is the only growth industry in South Australia, and the fact that it is a growth industry that depends on the Government for its corporate promotion (I do not say its entire promotion, but the corporate promotion of the State). The fact that the department has fully spent its funds by February of the financial year is a total indictment of the Minister and her incapacity, her lack of advocacy, and her general apathy when it comes to getting the best deal for tourism. Those things are not good enough.

When time permits, I will elaborate on each of the issues that I have raised. Individually, each is highly significant and important; collectively, they are a scandalous indictment of a Minister who has totally failed to fulfil her obligations to her portfolio. I do not exaggerate when I say that the feeling in the industry, as well as the feeling in the local government area which, from what I have heard, is equally strong, will force the Premier to act. At the very least, he should as a matter of urgency insist on a complete review of the functioning and staffing of the department and of the reasons why a key department that is so important to the State's economy should have fully spent its budget with four months of the financial year still to run. I call on the Premier to act promptly and to insist that tourism be given a fair go.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I totally reject the claim and the calls by the member for Coles. I could not believe what I was hearing from her.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: You have had your chance to denigrate the Minister of Tourism.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must direct her remarks through the Chair.

Ms LENEHAN: I am sorry, Sir. In the 10 minutes that I have I should like briefly to address some of the points raised by the member for Coles. I made some very brief notes as she was speaking. First, she talked about the fact that the Minister had no leadership and was lightweight. She referred to the launching of the strategic tourism development plan for South Australia for the next two years. She talked about the fact that the Minister did not have the confidence of her department. She spoke about the fact that three senior people, including the Deputy Director, Marketing (Mr Andrew Noblet), had resigned. Let us look at this. Two of these people came from private industry, from the private sector and, as I understand it, Mr Andrew Noblet said at that time that he would be involved in the department for about five years. This is the fifth year of his involvement, so he has gone back into private industry from the public sector. He has resigned, and I will tell the House why these people have resigned. There is nothing about which to be denigrating.

They have resigned to form a company, to go into private enterprise and to provide professional depth for the local tourism industry. They will provide a specialist inbound operation and consulting services for the tourism industry. Surely the tourism plan talks about cooperation between both sectors.

The member for Coles, as Minister, presided over the department when people were brought from the private sector to the public sector—to the department—and everyone said that that was an excellent idea. Now, people in the department have moved back into the private sector, and this is perfectly normal and reasonable. Do you seriously suggest that we have a sterile, stagnant department with no movement between the private sector and the public sector? Of course no reasonable person will accept that, and I certainly do not accept it.

Let us look at what has happened since these people have formed their private company, which surely is a reasonable thing for members opposite to support. We on this side support it. This movement has allowed a review of the marketing operations following the market research study that has set new directions for marketing, and this complements the plan.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I was prepared to give the member for Coles a go but she obviously—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume her seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is under the impression that the number of interjections coming from members architecturally on my left is completely out of order and seems to be designed to provoke the honourable member into raising her voice.

Ms LENEHAN: It is interesting that members opposite are not prepared to hear what I have to say because it is factual and embarrassing to them. The approach adopted by the department at present is a scientific approach, not a seat of the pants approach over which members opposite presided. In fact, the member for Coles was responsible for a seat of the pants approach. Regarding the budget about which the member for Coles has talked, I understand (and I want it on the public record) that all marketing programs will be fulfilled for the remainder of the year, so the member for Coles is just talking absolute rubbish.

The other thing that must be addressed is the suggestion by the member for Coles that the Minister does not consult. It is interesting that members on this side know that she does consult, so where is the member for Coles getting her information? The Minister consults very regularly with the senior and middle management of the department, and it is interesting that the member for Coles obviously does not know that. Are you suggesting that, in times of tight economic restraint when all departments have been asked to tighten their belts, an effective and efficient administration should not be implemented in the Department of Tourism?

The other thing that I want to refute is the whole question about the Minister. I find it personally offensive that the member for Coles said that the Minister should be much more than a page 3 cover girl wearing a snake.

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: That is exactly what the honourable member said, because I wrote it down as she spoke. I believe that is really a gutter type of attack, although it is the sort of attack we have become used to from the member for Coles. In other words, she has no sense of humour and no understanding. The Minister arrived at this function and was asked if she would be prepared to be photographed with the snake and, in the spirit of that request, she agreed. I would suggest that the Minister is a very gutsy lady, unlike the member for Coles. In this morning's *Advertiser*, in the 'Back Chat' column, Samela Harris describes the Minister's experience yesterday in launching the strategy plan as reacting 'with splendid sangfroid', saying, 'That's tourism making

an impact on the Minister.' I would suggest to this House that it is indeed the Minister making an impact on tourism. What we are hearing are very sour and bitter comments from a person on the opposite side of the House who is indeed very grubby and who is not big enough to see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: If I heard the member for Mawson correctly, she described me as 'grubby'. I find that remark quite offensive and I ask her to withdraw it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! On reflection, I not only take the point of order raised by the honourable member for Coles. I take the point of order further and, rather than simply request the member to withdraw the remark as having been offensive to the honourable member for Coles, I rule that the use of the word 'grubby' to describe the member is probably unparliamentary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult to have to warn and name a member at this stage of the evening.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: For defiance of the Chair I reluctantly name the honourable member for Victoria. Does the member wish to give an explanation of his conduct?

Mr D.S. BAKER: What explanation would you require, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The Standing Order which requires the silence and respect of all members at the time when the Speaker rises to his feet. The honourable member has been given the opportunity under Standing Order 169 to make a personal explanation to the House.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Under rule 169, Mr Speaker, I apologise.

The SPEAKER: In view of the lateness of the hour, I will accept the explanation of the honourable member for Victoria. The honourable member for Mawson.

Ms LENEHAN: Mr Speaker, I withdraw my comment, and I wish to place on record that, in fact, unlike the allegations made by the member for Coles, the Minister, in respect of the Kennedy report, has written to the Hon. John Brown, who has now agreed to appoint a representative upon the Minister's request. So, perhaps the honourable member would like to apologise.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Heysen.

Ms Lenehan: Of course not—you're not into apologising, are you!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I imagine that the debate we have just been part of will continue for some time. I want to refer to a matter that has been brought to my notice in recent times relating to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* a week or so ago and suggesting that the South Australian Government was going to make it mandatory to install water saving dual flush toilets in all new homes and buildings as a water conservation measure.

At the outset, let me say that I support the idea of conserving water, particularly in a State that is regarded as the driest State in the driest continent. The release went on to say that it is estimated that the average household could save up to 32 000 litres of water a year, or about 88 litres of water a day, through the introduction of a dual flush cistern. The article also pointed out that it was intended to bring down legislation which would apply to the E&WS Department sewer network before Easter. I was interested to see that the *Advertiser* editorial also picked up this point,

as have other media sources. I repeat that I concur with the need to take some action to conserve water in this State.

As a result of that article, I recently received a letter from a constituent of mine with another suggestion along the same lines. I want to bring that suggestion to the attention of the House on the basis that the Minister of Water Resources might pick it up. In fact, it is my intention to forward a copy of the letter to the Minister so that he might give some thought to the matter raised and give it a try.

The writer of the letter was referring to the press report in the *Advertiser* of 17 February regarding a proposal from the Minister to introduce legislation to compel builders to install dual flush toilet cisterns in all new installations connected to E&WS supplies. The writer of the letter suggests that he is opposed to that proposal on certain grounds, the first of which is that the dual flush system will be more expensive. He suggests that a better result can be achieved simply but effectively by omitting to fit the suction cup or device that is fitted to a cistern to hold open the valve until the cistern is empty. The cistern will then only flush while the button is held down by the operator. That is simple but fairly logical. So in most cases even less water will be used than in a dual flush cistern, and that is what the exercise is all about.

I am not sure whether the writer has actually tried this out, but he obviously understands the system and suggests that it works. He goes on to say that the necessary adjustment can be made by the householder on any existing cistern. This is a simple concept which could be promoted by the E&WS Department in preference to imposing an added cost on homebuilders. I repeat that it has already been suggested that this will apply only to new installations. The Minister is not suggesting that people will have to pull out their current cisterns and change them over. However, it does make sense that with a fairly minor adjustment the same amount of water, if not more, could be saved. The writer of the letter has suggested that if I see merit in the view that he has expressed he would be grateful to see that promoted through my office.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No. I have not installed one at this stage of the piece. I am not terribly good with my hands: I am not a handyman, but I am sure there are plenty of people who would not have a great deal of difficulty carrying out the adjustments that have been suggested. So, in all seriousness, I bring the matter to the attention of the Minister. As I said earlier, I would be pleased to send him a copy of the letter. I will be interested in his comments. This proposal makes sense to me; it fulfils the objective that the Government and the Minister are trying to achieve. It is even simpler and less expensive than what is proposed by the Government. I will leave that matter to the Minister.

In the few minutes that I have left in this debate, I once again express my concern at the time taken by Ministers to reply to letters and answer questions. I have referred to this matter on a number of occasions, as have some of my colleagues. It is a serious situation. As members of this House we are responsible for making representations on behalf of our constituents. I believe that the appropriate way to do that is to write to the Minister or to put a question on notice, seeking a response from the appropriate Minister. I have just been through copies of a number of letters that have been sent to Ministers over the past six months. I was horrified to find that a considerable number of letters are outstanding. Replies have not been received to letters that were written as long ago as October last year—and these related to fairly simple matters and were not subjects that needed to be put into the 'too hard' basket. Ministers have

now had some five months to reply to some fairly simple matters that were brought to their attention. It is obvious that they are not spending enough time or effort in relation to their responsibilities as Ministers of the Crown to provide answers to questions that are asked.

The other thing that concerns me is the number of letters that seem to get lost in the mail. On seeking advice as to the whereabouts of a reply to a letter forwarded to a Minister, I am amazed at how many times one finds that a Minister has not received a letter, that the whereabouts of correspondence is unknown, or that it has been lost in a department or something. As far as I am concerned that is not good enough; it is a disgrace and it is about time that the Ministers responsible got off their backsides and ensured that members of this place are provided with necessary information. The same thing applies to questions on notice. Currently, some questions that I asked have been on the Notice Paper since September last year—again, a five month period. None of them require a lot of information; they relate to fairly straightforward matters, but the information has not been made available. I do not know whether it is because Ministers just do not want to provide the information or because such questions are getting lost in the system. However, I ask members to take account of these matters.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Tonight I want to talk about some issues affecting my electorate. I refer particularly to transport, and I am delighted to see the Minister of Transport in the House. I am sure that he will be interested in what I have to say about transport in my electorate and in the southern area. First, I refer to several questions that were raised in this Chamber last week concerning the Government's investigations of an O-Bahn system, which would serve the south. I asked the Minister of Transport a question last Tuesday—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I don't think the Minister was too impressed with that question about a southern O-Bahn.

Mr TYLER: Well, the Minister gave a very good answer. He said that the Government was investigating an O-Bahn or a light rapid transit system to serve the southern areas. He stated that there were problems with finances at the moment. However, the Government, in doing the right thing and acting responsibly, is certainly investigating how we can best serve the transport needs of the southern area. I am sure that the Opposition would agree that at the moment resources do not permit us to build an O-Bahn system, but I hope that those sorts of resources change and that the Government might be able to build a light rail system or a light transit system. Some great challenges face the Government, Parliament and the community in the southern areas in meeting the transport needs of a rapidly expanding area. I know that the Minister is very conscious of this and my colleagues, the member for Mawson, the member for Bright, and the Deputy Premier are all very conscious of the needs of the southern area.

I refer to another question that was raised last week on the O-Bahn. I am pleased that the member for Morphett is in the Chamber: it was he who asked the Minister of Transport whether the member for Mawson—my friend and colleague from the southern area—and I were naive and simplistic. The member for Morphett in his usual manner selectively quoted from a press article. To put the record straight, I want to read the press article to the House. According to the article, the Leader of the Opposition's proposal was to build an O-Bahn bus link along the existing Bay tram line. I shall now read into the record the article, which was published in the *Guardian Messenger* of 4 July

1984. Headed 'Liberal O-Bahn plan for the Bay tram line', it states:

A radical plan to build an O-Bahn bus link alongside the existing Bay tramline is being investigated by the Liberal Party. The concrete guided busway would follow the tram corridor from Adelaide, through Goodwood, Glandore and South Plympton to Glenelg. Trams would continue to run on their own line. The announcement of the O-Bahn investigation seems certain to cause a storm of protest from people living alongside the tram line.

I point out to the member for Morphett, who is presently in the Chamber, that, interestingly, this is mostly in his electorate. The article continues:

Liberal Leader, John Olsen, said during a recent overseas trip he had discussions in West Germany with engineers from the Daimler-Benz group about extending the O-Bahn service to the south-eastern suburbs using the tram corridor as an expressway for the bus. 'O-Bahn could work in tandem with the existing Glenelg tram as far as Glenelg and there would be no reduction of the tram service,' Mr Olsen said. 'There would be a much greater utilisation of the tram corridor if express buses were able to run between Glenelg and the city along the route. Concrete guideways for the O-Bahn buses could be built either side of the tram tracks to allow both transport modes to use the corridor. The major benefit of allowing the O-Bahn buses to use the Glenelg tram corridor would be for people in outer south western suburbs.'

Buses from these suburbs could feed into the O-Bahn system from Brighton Road and Morphett Road and then complete the journey express without interruption. An O-Bahn bus could run from Glenelg to the city in little more than 10 minutes, cutting at least 15 minutes off the journey for passengers from the outer south-western suburbs. Something must urgently be done to upgrade public transport services for people in the south-western suburbs.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr TYLER: And I notice the member for Bragg has just walked into the Chamber. He is a Johnny-come-lately. It is good to see him back in the Chamber, interjecting as usual. What I was trying to explain to the House before the honourable member rudely interrupted was that the Liberal Party was trying to build an O-Bahn bus system down the Glenelg tramline. The article continues:

Something must urgently be done to upgrade public transport services for people in the south-western suburbs and I am convinced O-Bahn can once again provide the solution by utilising the Glenelg tram corridor.

What an absolute farce! What we need is transportation for people in the south, not the south-west. The south-west is very well served by a trainline which runs through Brighton and Hallett Cove and services the western side of the southern area. What we do not have is a rapid transit system serving what I call the south-east of metropolitan Adelaide—those suburbs from Darlington through Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park, Happy Valley, and Morphett Vale East.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Stirling, Aldgate, Bridgewater.

Mr TYLER: You have a fine train system in that area. The member for Morphett selectively quoted and used that article to imply that the Labor Party did not support an O-Bahn bus system to serve the south. That is baloney. If I refer to an article which was in the *Hills and Southern Messenger* of 13 June and 20 June 1984, in one of the first articles after I was preselected as candidate I was asked a question about transport services to the south, and I would like—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Still working for the Minister of Transport then?

Mr TYLER: I was not, in fact. I was working for the Minister of Tourism and Local Government in those days. I would like to quote this article, which states:

Mr Tyler said the issues he would concentrate on in Fisher would be child-care and transport. 'I don't really think our answer lies with roads but there should be a system such as O-Bahn or a light rail system of transport,' he said.

As members can see, quite clearly, very early on I indicated my support for an O-Bahn or light rail system for the

southern area. The 'naive and simplistic' part of the member for Morphett's question came from an article which appeared on the same page. I would like to quote it, because it clearly states why we objected to an O-Bahn servicing the south-west—because it would duplicate the services. It said:

The Labor Party has blasted the O-Bahn investigation by the Liberals.

Mawson MP Susan Lenehan and Fisher ALP candidate Phil Tyler claim Opposition Leader, John Olsen is utterly out of touch with the transport needs of residents living in Adelaide's southern suburbs. They have branded Mr Olsen's plans for an O-Bahn transport system linking suburbs in their electorates with the city as 'naive and simplistic'.

To start with, it was not going to link suburbs in our electorate at all. It was going to link suburbs in the electorate of the member for Morphett. The article continued:

'This so-called plan would completely duplicate existing services,' Ms Lenehan said. 'He has returned from his overseas trip to trumpet his proposals for better transport services without recognising the real needs of people in the southern region,' Mr

Tyler said. 'The crying need is for a service to help people living in the eastern part of the south taking in suburbs such as Flagstaff Hill, Aberfoyle Park, Sheidow Park, Happy Valley, Reynella East and Morphett Vale East. Obviously the Leader of the Opposition spent too much time at Disneyland—he has no appreciation of the real transport needs of the people in the southern region.'

That quite clearly states (and the member for Morphett decided he could completely ignore it) that the people of the south-west have a very good transit system serving them at the moment. People of my electorate and of that of the member for Mawson do not. We have a bus system but no rapid transit system. It is something I have been calling on the Government to do, and I was absolutely delighted to see the Minister say, 'Yes, the Government is investigating a light rail transit system or O-Bahn service for the southern area.'

Motion carried.

At 10.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 25 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 24 February 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FISHERIES REPORT

246. **Mr S.G. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: Has the Government committee announced by the Deputy Premier on 1 May 1985 and headed by the former Director of Fisheries, Mr A.M. Olsen, which was to report by the end of that year, completed its study into the sensory perception of fish and, if so, when will a report be tabled and, if a report is not to be tabled, will the Minister inform the House whether any persons were able to indicate that fish do or do not feel pain?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The report has not been finalised because of difficulties in obtaining information from overseas. A report should be presented to the Minister of Lands by the middle of the year.

PREMIER'S 1986 CHRISTMAS CARD

267. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What was the cost of production (artwork, design, photography and printing) of the Premier's 1986 Christmas card, how was this cost met, how many cards were printed and how many were not used?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The cost of production of \$1 635 was charged to the Premier's Office in accordance with normal practice. All 500 cards printed were used.

HISTORICAL HOUSES

268. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. What are the locations of registered and/or recognised historical houses owned by the Government or owned privately?

2. What is the estimated cost to the Government of their maintenance this financial year and how does this amount compare with each of the previous two years?

3. What financial assistance is now available to the public to maintain and preserve historical homes?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The administrative effort required to provide an answer to this question cannot be justified. However, I would be pleased to answer any specific query the honourable member may have on this matter.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

270. **Mr M.J. EVANS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction:

1. What is the "rise and fall" formula used by the South Australian Housing Trust for calculating the variation in the amount of the rate payable to scheduled maintenance contractors?

2. How long after a change in one of the variables contained in the formula is a new schedule of rates prepared and distributed to contractors?

3. Will the formula be varied to take into account the effect of the current industrial campaign for superannuation and the recent decision of the Arbitration Commission in relation to occupational superannuation?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The formula for calculating maintenance scheduled contractor rates is based on determinations made by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in respect to relevant building trades awards. For example, the most recent decision resulted in an increase of 23c in the base hourly rate for carpenters, made up as follows:

(1) Previous weekly rate for (38 hours)	\$361.76 per week or \$9.52 per hour.
(2) New weekly rate as at 1.7.86 (38 hours)	\$370.50 per week or \$9.75 per hour.
(3) Increase per hour	\$0.23 per hour.

Increase in the trust's scheduled rates for carpenters is determined by the following calculation:

(A) Determined Increase + Additional amount to cover operating overheads	\$0.23 cents
(B) \$0.23 × 52 (weeks per year) × 65%	

40 (weeks worked per year)	\$0.19 cents
Total Increase	\$0.42 cents

(1) Previous scheduled hourly rate for Carpenters	\$19.08 per hour
(2) Current scheduled hourly rate as at 1.7.86	\$19.50 per hour
(3) Hourly rate increase	\$0.42 per hour

2. The updated schedules are distributed to contractors as soon as possible following any relevant increase. However, the revised rates are effective from the date any new award is handed down and contractors are entitled to claim any underpayments already made prior to the receipt of the revised schedules.

3. The current rates reflect all previous and current determinations handed down by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in respect of the Building Trades Awards relevant to scheduled maintenance contractors.

BODIES CONTROLLED BY DEPUTY PREMIER

286. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. How many statutory authorities, permanent committees, commissions, corporations, trusts, boards, tribunals, councils or committees of inquiry is the Deputy Premier responsible for in each Ministry under his control and what is the name and address of each body?

2. What funds were—

(a) appropriated to;

(b) spent by; and

(c) earned by each body in the year 1985-86?

3. What was the value of each body's total assets as at 30 June 1986?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The administrative effort required to provide an answer to this question cannot be justified. However, I would be pleased to answer any specific query the honourable member may have on this matter.

PETROL TRADING HOURS

294. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour:

1. How many service stations have been closed due to extended trading hours and how many persons have been made redundant by such closures?

2. Is the Government prepared to reconsider or review petrol trading hours and, if not, why not?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Labour has not been formally advised of any service station that has closed or any persons

made redundant as a result of the introduction of extended trading hours.

2. The Government is prepared to review any legislation when it is in the public interest to do so. There has been no need established for any review of the petrol trading hours.