

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 February 1989

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

ASBESTOS REMOVAL

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I move:

That the regulations under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986 relating to licence for asbestos removal, made on 17 November and laid on the table of this House on 29 November 1988, be disallowed.

On Thursday 10 November I made a contribution in this House on the subject of fibro asbestos removal. Members will note that that topic appears on the Notice Paper under Orders of the Day: Other Business No. 3, which will be debated later today. In particular, I expressed concern about the way in which the Occupational Health and Safety Commission had treated this matter. Accusations were made that the minutes of the commission meeting had been tampered with. Accusations were also made by me that this measure was purely to facilitate the spread of certain power interests within the industry beyond the current boundaries.

Those boundaries, at that stage, related to carcinogenic asbestos substances, namely, blue and brown asbestos. The Minister has seen fit to press for these regulations in order to serve the power interests operating in the industry today. In particular, the Builders Labourers Federation will be a major winner from these regulations, because they will legitimise its role in a wider framework than previously existed. I do not intend to repeat matters raised in my earlier motion, because they are already on record.

I point specifically to the statements made about medical evidence of the impact of fibro asbestos, and urge members to read the various documents concerned. The evidence is quite clear, from all sources which we have tapped, that South Australia is not only out of step with the rest of Australia on this subject but out of step with the rest of the Western world. The fact is that, by his actions in this regard, the Minister is creating unwarranted fear among thousands of occupiers of asbestos dwellings. His determination to help his mates will have an impact detrimental to this State.

In relation to the BLF, the Minister appears hell bent on reinforcing that union's position in the building industry at a time when it is wreaking havoc, putting investment and employment opportunities at risk, using threats and intimidation as a means of creating fear and uncertainty, and at a time when many employees involved in other unions are being severely disadvantaged by the actions of this scurrilous organisation.

The level of protection afforded the BLF, given its record, is quite extraordinary, and one must seriously question why the Minister is continually comforting this cancer. Last year the Minister provided me with a hand delivered letter urging me to take allegations I had made about pay-offs in the industry to the National Crimes Authority. I assure the Minister that that matter is foremost in my mind and will be attended to at the appropriate time.

I wish to pose a number of questions, because I think the answers will reveal a great deal about the asbestos removal industry. To assist members opposite I will explain a little more than I have previously what is going on today. There are three interests within the asbestos removal industry, as the Minister would be well aware. There are those members who belong to the Asbestos Control Association, which has a very strong BLF influence. Within that group are two

companies which seem to dominate the industry in this State. Outside that control association we have another group of very adequate asbestos removal contractors who are not associated with the building unions at all, who have a metal trades bias and who are continually being harassed by the building unions.

That was by way of explanation. Now I will pose a number of questions, because it is in the answers to those questions that people will see and understand the full extent of the problems that exist in this industry. It is the problems that exist within the ambit of blue and brown asbestos removal which will now be spread throughout all asbestos removal—let us be quite clear about that.

I pose the following questions and the Minister can respond in replying to my motion. Can the Minister explain why contractors using workers involved in unions other than the BLF have been continually harassed by the jack boot brigade of the BLF? Can he explain why certain members of the BLF seem to have advance notice of when work is starting on certain sites where such persons are working? Can he explain why DLI inspectors happen to arrive at particular sites after an earlier visit by a BLF representative has been unsuccessful?

Can the Minister explain why certain key persons in Sacon keep changing the conditions of contracts for those successful contractors who do not form part of a select group in order that losses are incurred? Can he explain with respect to State Government contracts why invitations to tender often circulate on a very limited list? Can he explain with respect to State Government contracts why certain removal firms who have tendered higher prices are given contracts? Can he explain why two companies in this State dominate the State Government contract system?

Those questions have to be answered, because a disease exists—a disease which has to be stamped out. Whilst I have been given the names of individuals involved in various forms of harassment, I do not intend to pursue them here. As the Minister said, I can take them to the National Crime Authority at the appropriate time. There are other questions I would like answered, but I will obtain those answers from another medium, given the Minister's unwillingness to consider the ramifications of the action taken under these regulations. There is no doubt that two firms in this State are gaining greater and greater dominance over asbestos removal. We know that their competitors are subjected to forms of harassment, not only from unions but that they also happen to be the sites that are visited. I have it on very good authority that the two firms which seem to have a preferred position in this State never get visits from the Department of Labour.

I have been given some examples, one of which I intended to use in this House. The Minister and I discussed this matter a while ago. It would be interesting to look at the Emu winery case, and the full information from the point at which the contract was first let to the final outcome and see what occurred on that site in order to understand the problems facing this industry.

I cannot say any more, as the Minister would appreciate. I am just using this as an example of where I believe certain actions have not only put contractors at a disadvantage but also tended to cement the power interests that have existed in the industry. What the Minister intends is that those power interests shall be sustained and that they shall grow. I ask members to note that the February report of Sacon states with great delight:

The Asbestos Liaison Unit has, at the direction of Government, taken over the functions and responsibilities previously managed by the Department of Labour. The unit is now responsible for

approval, inspection and monitoring of asbestos-related issues in all public and private buildings.

Those same people in the liaison unit have caused a great deal of distress to contractors across the State. If there is a problem with respect to safety on sites, why have certain sites been targeted continually—and for some fairly thin reasons—while others have escaped attention? The Minister knows what I am talking about. When he reads *Hansard* perhaps he will respond to each of my questions, because he cannot sustain the argument that all is well in the asbestos removal industry. That is what has previously prevailed. Now he wants that same influence to dominate large contracts involving fibro-cement asbestos, which he knows is not carcinogenic.

The normal rules of safety should prevail on those sites. They should not be subject to jack boot actions and the efforts being made in the industry today by a particular group headed by Jack Watkins. Since I raised the matter last year a number of people have called me to discuss their concern that the industry will be dominated by two contractors in this State.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member of Fisher asks, 'What about the workers?' I am talking about the workers. Can the member for Fisher justify how certain people are harassed on safety issues, yet other sites are never visited?

An honourable member: Complete silence!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Silence! I demand from the Minister an explanation as to why two firms dominate South Australian Government contracts when there are a number of contractors—at least 10 or a dozen under the control association—who are licensed asbestos removers. There are a number of others outside the association who are also competent. In fact, many people in the industry who are not getting jobs led the way in safety before Australia woke up to the problems with blue and brown asbestos and said, 'We must do something about it.' The Minister well knows that.

I do not want to prolong the debate on this subject: I merely want answers from the Minister on what I believe to be a serious problem facing the industry. This problem will spread far beyond carcinogenic asbestos substances. It involves actions on behalf of the Government, I presume, with the knowledge and concurrence of the Minister. It involves pay-offs within the industry, and they have to be stamped out.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Albert Park says that I make assertions. I would be happy if the Minister answered the questions that I have posed.

Mr Hamilton: If you have one bit of evidence, you should give it to the NCA—but you don't have the guts to do that.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The honourable member says that I do not have the guts to go to the National Crime Authority. I remind the honourable member and the House that the Minister happens to be in charge of industrial matters. He has shown a complete unwillingness—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park will have time to participate in the debate at a later stage.

Mr S.J. BAKER: He has shown a complete unwillingness to take any action against the building unions in this State. All I have at my disposal is the right to raise matters in this Parliament. He knows well that, if I raise specific examples, they will be targeted by his smelly union interests. He knows that.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That might be a scandalous statement, but where have we seen action taken to stop the cancer that exists in this State? We have not seen the Minister take action to control the influences that I believe should be stamped out in this State. Nowhere!

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the Minister answers the questions, they will be substantiated in his response—but he cannot answer the questions that I have posed. It is a serious matter. Not only are the regulations inappropriate for the industry because they are out of kilter with the standards across Australia and internationally but also, and very importantly, they will extend the power—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER:—that exists today in the industry. I believe that action is required: the power has to be taken away from these people.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will resume his seat for one moment. Parliamentary debate involves one member at a time addressing the House. It is not a multi-party dialogue involving the members for Briggs, Fisher, Albert Park and Eyre. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you, Sir. I will wind up by saying that not only is this a matter of principle in terms of where these inappropriate regulations will take us, but it is important to understand that this is simply a device to extend the power of the BLF and certain companies in this State.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I now know why the member for Mitcham is no longer the principal spokesman for industrial relations. He has moved for the disallowance of regulations (made prior to the end of the spring session) in respect of the removal of asbestos. Most of his contribution to the House related to the removal of insulating asbestos. He made a number of assertions that I am supposed to know about. He continues to offend against the laws of this State by knowing of crimes that have been committed and not reporting them to the appropriate authorities, and for that he ought to stand condemned.

I put to him that, if he is aware of any offence against any of the statutes of this State and he does not give the information to the appropriate authorities for that matter to be investigated and properly prosecuted if an offence has been committed, he himself is committing an offence—and perhaps we ought to get the Police Commissioner to investigate that. He has admitted in this House that he knows of these things but is yet to report them. He says he will do so at the appropriate time. He made an assertion that I find astounding. He stated that the laws in this State with respect to the removal of asbestos are out of kilter with the standards that apply throughout Australia.

The honourable member wants to disallow regulations that require people who want to remove asbestos contained in cement sheeting to have a licence which costs \$500 per annum. When these people secure a licence and pay the appropriate fee they are allowed to remove asbestos provided they do so in accordance with the code of practice that has been adopted by Worksafe—a tripartite committee established at a national level which sets out safe working standards for the removal of sheet asbestos. No-one in the employing area criticises those standards and, provided one removes the sheet asbestos in accordance with those standards, no hazard is created.

When it comes to putting fear into the minds of people who live in houses with asbestos cladding or roofs, far be it from the Government to have done it: it is the stupid announcements and comments of the member for Mitcham. When one analyses what he has said about this, one sees that he and his like—not the Government, which is about protecting people—have been spreading the fear. The member for Mitcham made great light about the removal of insulating asbestos, how this involves a cartel—this, that and everything else. I have listened with great interest and, if he cares to detail to me the problems that other people are having, I will have the matter investigated by the Department of Industrial Relations to see whether officers, as alleged by him, are abusing their authority because, if what the honourable member alleges is true, it is very serious. It is a very serious allegation to make.

Mr Hamilton: If he doesn't trust you, take it to the Ombudsman.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you. The member for Mitcham has been here long enough and should know better. I now know why he is sitting on the front bench without a title. This matter concerns me, because in this State there are a number of work practices that are very dangerous. They become safe only when they are conducted in accordance with the rules laid down. The member for Mitcham referred to the Emu winery site, where there has been a tragedy. Inspectors who visited the site would have discussions with the contractors who were demolishing the building and removing the material from that site. They would take up with the contractors certain practices which were not in accordance with the codes, and the contractors would say that they would cease work. Everyone would go away, and when the inspector came back at 8 p.m. he would find people working again.

The people who were responsible for the demolition now claim that they have no knowledge of how 50 feet of insulated asbestos piping—which I think everyone agrees can be quite dangerous—was removed from the property. They said, 'We didn't take it away. Someone must have pinched it.' The same thing occurred on the Northfield site, which these people administered; insulating asbestos on pipes disappeared. These are the people whom the member opposite is championing, and then he talks about a rot and how there will be a cartel.

I have been advised that all the people who applied for a limited licence (with the exception of one which took 10 days) waited five working days. I understand that currently 10 people are licensed to remove fibrous cement, and I would hope that as time moves on all the demolition contractors in this State who, in the course of their duties, have to remove asbestos sheeting will obtain the appropriate licence. They can keep their licence on two conditions: first, that they pay the annual fee and, secondly, that they remove the asbestos in accordance with the code of practice. If they do not do that, they are endangering people's lives.

The member for Mitcham, in moving this motion, is, in his own small way, endangering workers and others. His mind is blinded by hatred of people who work for a living and of those who protect workers' lives. That is what he is doing: he is endangering their lives. I would have thought that he had enough brains to appreciate that a very large re-roofing program is being undertaken at the moment. Some of the earlier deep six asbestos is not as good as was claimed by the manufacturers and consequently it is cracking in the valleys. The treatments that have been used have proved to be temporarily successful, but owners of these buildings are upgrading their buildings and are having the asbestos replaced by continuous sheeting.

People who are doing that work will obtain a licence, which they will keep provided they carry out the work in accordance with the code of practice established by Worksafe; no rackets are involved. The member for Mitcham has a fertile mind. If it were the days of Commie bashing, he would be looking under everyone's beds for Commos. All he would find is the utensil which contains the stuff that he talks about.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Hanson speaks about Jack Watkins, who has been criticised here for protecting workers' lives. No-one has been game to publicly criticise Jack Watkins for protecting the interests of workers who suffered from the effects of asbestosis; rather, they imply other improper motives. They do not even know who employs him.

Mr Becker: What, you don't know who employs him?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I said that they do not even know who employs him, because you have never been able to tell us here correctly. I think that the member for Mitcham also referred to the deregistration of the Builders Labourers Federation in this State, or the Australian Building Construction Workers Federation as it is known in the South Australian Industrial Court. He wants the Government to deregister that union, but on what grounds? What would have been the result if we had gone to the Industrial Court and sought deregistration in relation to the dispute which occurred in the latter months of the previous year? What grounds would we have presented to the court? If we had just gone to the court and asked for the deregistration, citing as our reason that we just wanted to deregister the organisation, the court would have dismissed the case, because it had no substance. When the member for Mitcham argues these matters, there is no substance to his argument, and I can now understand why he is no longer the principal Opposition spokesman on industrial matters. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HOUSING POLICY

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House condemns the Minister of Housing and Construction for falsely claiming rents will be increased by 50 per cent under the Federal Liberal/National Party Coalition housing policy and for creating unnecessary alarm, fear and stress among tenants and, further, this House regards such action by the Minister as despicable, disgraceful and totally irresponsible.

The Labor Party is very quick to condemn the Liberal Party every time that it comes up with a workable housing policy or any statement which could assist those in need. We have already witnessed several State elections where each State housing policy announcement has been greeted with almost the same press release condemning the Liberal Party's attitude towards housing for those in need.

Let us go back to the crux of the whole issue. In the *Adelaide News* of 2 November 1988, under the heading 'Liberal homes plan will hit needy', an article written by Kate Thomas stated:

South Australian Housing Trust rents would soar by 50 per cent, forcing families on to the streets, if public housing were abandoned, a State Minister said today. The Housing Minister, Mr Hemmings, fiercely rejected claims by the Federal Opposition that public housing funding was 'inefficient' and 'misdirected'.

The Opposition's housing spokesman, Mr Downer, claimed more low-income families could be properly housed for every \$1 million of public expenditure through home purchase and rental assistance schemes rather than the provision of public housing.

Mr Hemmings said if the Opposition scheme went ahead trust rents would soar by more than 50 per cent and people in poverty would be pushed on to welfare queues.

About one in four South Australians have been housed by the State Government.

Currently, 60 500 households rent from the trust and a further 49 400 either own or are buying their trust home.

'The majority of public housing applicants today have incomes so low that they would only be able to afford home purchase if they received Government grants of between \$20 000 and \$40 000,' said Mr Hemmings.

Channelling the national \$700 million public housing budget into home purchases would benefit few and devastate a successful housing program.

'Mr Downer has put Australia on notice that the Liberals will end public housing as we know it—with disastrous effects,' Mr Hemmings said.

I have read the article in full, because it is necessary to put on record the stupidity and arrogance of the Minister in not accepting or realising exactly what has happened and to illustrate the blinkered attitude adopted by him and his staff in relation to the needs of the people. The majority of people in this country want the opportunity to own their own home and do not want to have to go, cap in hand, to the Government or any other authority to rent or to receive assistance. They simply want to be given the opportunity of owning their own home.

Under the Labor Government nationally and in this State home ownership has stagnated. More people are renting today than ever before. We have seen no improvement in the level of home ownership as a percentage of housing in the community. That is an absolute disgrace. The Labor Party has always had a vested interest in not providing the assistance or encouragement for people to own their own home. In looking at the South Australian Housing Trust, we see a huge organisation—the biggest landlord in the State—providing rental housing for some 61 000 citizens and their families with some 45 000 families on the waiting list. The Housing Trust itself is not meeting the need. Its list has more than doubled during the life of the Bannon Government, and that is an indictment of the Bannon Government and its handling of the economy, as well as of the Hawke/Keating Administration.

The real crunch is that six years ago the South Australian Housing Trust was able to provide some assistance to the very poor families in rental accommodation by subsidising their rents to an amount of about \$23 million. In the 1989-90 budget the South Australian Housing Trust will have to provide \$100 million of rental assistance to its tenants—one of the biggest subsidies ever given anywhere in this country for housing or any other welfare benefit. An amount of \$100 million in rental subsidy must be provided, but we find the Federal Government making available only a very small amount of that money. The Federal Government itself has opted out of providing rental assistance to these people. The Keating/Hawke attitude towards the States and the people in need is providing the crunch.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr BECKER: That is right. As the member for Mount Gambier says, the 'No children in poverty' statement was simply a throwaway line, but we are getting it all the time from the Prime Minister—he is hopeless. Alexander Downer did attempt to rebut the statements made by the Minister in issuing a statement, which I do not recall seeing in the media in South Australia. No doubt the Labor Party was flat out that day to stop any rebuttal. Mr Downer's press release stated:

'The South Australian Minister for Housing is deceitful and dishonest in claiming that the Federal Opposition would cut all funding for public housing,' Federal shadow Minister for Housing, Alexander Downer, said in Canberra today.

The Labor Party would do better in public debate to state the truth instead of massively distorting everything the Opposition says in a disgracefully dishonest way. Mr Downer said that he had always made it clear that the Opposition would continue support for public housing but a bigger proportion of the Federal housing budget would go to encouraging low income families to purchase their own homes.

Mr Hemmings and his Federal counterpart, Mr Staples, have presided over a housing policy which has led to a public housing waiting list in South Australia of 45 000 people, which is over 20 per cent of the total national waiting list for a State which has only 8 per cent of Australia's population.

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Now, for the stupid member who interjected, let me get the message through to you again.

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Well, you achieved what you wanted to, but you are going to get the bloody message. I know that you are pretty dense. The article states that the waiting list of 45 000 people in South Australia is over 20 per cent of the total national waiting list for a State that has only 8 per cent of Australia's population. I would be ashamed to admit to that. It is a terrible disgrace and an indictment on any Government to think that we have such a huge waiting list of people—of families—who will depend on Government support for their housing requirements. The press release also states:

Mr Hemmings and his Federal colleagues have also allowed home affordability to drop to its lowest level since records have been kept and have reduced funding for first home owners from \$306 million in 1984-85 to just \$178 million this year. Not only is Mr Hemmings dishonest in public debate, but he is a failure as a Minister because—like all Labor Ministers—his policies never match the syrupy rhetoric about care for the disadvantaged.

An article in the *Weekend Australian* of 5-6 November 1988, under the heading 'New deal to ease housing prices', states:

The Federal Government is preparing a major new package of measures to ease the burden on new home buyers, renters and those on long public housing waiting queues in the lead-up to the next election.

Measures to improve the flexibility, efficiency and effectiveness of the First Home Owners Scheme (FHOS), rental allowances and public housing programs are being prepared by a Government task force.

The article goes on and on; it continues:

The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, hinted at the new package earlier this week after a Ministry meeting called to discuss the political agenda for the next 12 months.

The final shape of the package, which will be announced in the August Budget, will be determined by Cabinet early next year.

The Government will also consider proposals by the Housing Industry Association (HIA) to sell surplus Commonwealth land and to 'fast track' skilled migrants to ease wage and prices pressures in the industry.

Government sources told the *Australian* yesterday there would be some new ideas next year but no 'magic bullets' or 'quick fixes' to the housing crisis until long-term structural changes were made in the housing sector.

That was on 5-6 November 1988. Of course, we now have this housing crisis—this summit—on housing. In other words, the Federal Government has run out of ideas. They do not know what to do; they do not know how to handle the situation. As a result, it is calling this housing summit. Every time the Federal Government gets into trouble we have a housing summit or a summit of some kind. That is a good old Trades Hall trick. We have known for years what really goes on in the housing sector. Just let us have a look at the situation in Australia at the moment. In an article in the Liberal Party newspaper, Mr Alexander Downer reports:

This is the Australia, where we find that 700 000 additional people have fallen below the poverty line since 1983; who have become destitute.

This is the Australia where the average single income family with two children is \$56 a week worse off than it was in March 1983.

This is the Australia where there are 60 000 people living on the verge of homelessness and 40 000 sleeping out in the open or in refuges.

This is the Australia where 100 000 people are condemned to hospital waiting lists because ideology stops Labor changing Medicare.

This is the Australia where 25 000 young people are denied places in tertiary institutions.

This is the Australia that Labor has never really cared about in its ruthless quest for power at any price.

Then we had the following press release issued on 16 January this year issued by the relieving Minister of Housing and Construction:

'A housing crisis of frightening proportions would envelop the country if Liberal housing policy were ever implemented,' Acting Housing and Construction Minister, Mr Keneally, said today. Mr Keneally was responding to a promise by the Federal Opposition housing spokesman, Mr Downer, that a Liberal Government would redirect public housing funding into home purchase assistance.

'The Liberal Party refuses to recognise that public housing has a crucial role in providing affordable accommodation for tens of thousands of lower income households,' Mr Keneally said. 'Most of these households have incomes so low that they cannot contemplate home purchase and only huge grants would make ownership a viable option for them. Mr Downer is willing to sacrifice a proven public housing program to help a very small number of households into ownership in the cause of conservative dry economic policy. Mr Downer's Liberal colleagues in New South Wales have already begun their blitzkrieg on public housing tenants and housing support groups. Many New South Wales public tenants have had their rents doubled while housing groups have had their funding withdrawn,' he said.

'The biggest losers are those for whom Labor Governments have tried to provide secure, affordable accommodation.'

I wonder whether Ray Rains, the Minister's press secretary, or anybody in the unit assisting the Minister, has studied the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Rents can be increased and are required to be increased to the market level, and the various housing authorities, including the South Australian Housing Trust, must make provision for depreciation. The Housing Trust in South Australia has not done that. Housing Trust rents, under the housing agreement, should be increased by \$10 a week. Thank goodness that is not done. They are getting away with it, but the Auditor-General is not happy about it because he has commented that Housing Trust rents in South Australia should be increased by \$10 a week under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Of course not. I would seek to amend the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement so that we do not have to force up rents. If we can live with the level of rents that we have, we should do so. We should make the organisation more efficient than it is. It is a pity that the Public Accounts Committee did not look into matters affecting the Housing Trust. It might find quite a lot of errors. There are many ways of reducing costs and overheads to keep rents at an affordable level.

I should like to wrap up this part of the debate by putting forward Alexander Downer's point of view. On 26 October 1988, he wrote to the *Advertiser*, summing up some of the Minister's further attitudes. He wrote:

Hugh Stretton's demand for more funding from the Commonwealth for public housing (*Advertiser* 26 October) is misdirected: the challenge for Federal governments is to assist more low income families to purchase their own homes, not to extend the taxpayer-funded dependence of the less well off on the State.

At present public housing accommodates only about half of those Australians living in poverty (and it accommodates some who are relatively affluent). To expect funding for public housing to increase massively is simply not being realistic. Consequently, creative solutions for the same resources as are currently allocated

need to be thought about. Making home ownership more accessible should be the real priority of the Federal Government.

In the first place home ownership will enable the better off Housing Trust tenants more easily to purchase their homes thereby releasing more existing publicly-owned housing resources for those in real need.

The Housing Trust has adopted the Opposition's privatisation policy and is vigorously encouraging Housing Trust tenants to buy their houses. I believe that about 800 are now contracted for sale. Given the opportunity and encouragement, I am sure that Housing Trust tenants will buy those houses. That will free money that the Housing Trust can then spend on the purchase of accommodation for those in need. The tragedy is that the Housing Trust is paying about \$20 000 more for average houses to accommodate people in need than for houses that can be bought on the open market, because of the high span of structure requirements demanded by the Housing Trust. It is ironic that in the southern suburbs, for example, on one side of a road one can see a group of houses being built for the Housing Trust at \$78 000 each, and on the other side of the road private developers are building similar houses for \$58 000. There is something wrong there. Certainly the Housing Trust's requirements need to be reconsidered. The letter continues:

Secondly, home ownership for all Australians—not just the better-off 70 per cent of families as at present—provides social advantages which public housing dependence can never achieve; it provides security of tenure, the acquisition over time of a major asset which will be of great importance on retirement and those intangible assets of pride in a family's own home and self-reliance.

Thirdly, there is substantial evidence—particularly in the United States—to suggest that more low income families can be properly housed per \$1 million of public expenditure through home purchase and rental assistance schemes than through the provision of public housing.

There will always be a role for public housing but the 1940s solutions to homelessness which Mr Stretton promotes are economically inefficient, will never be sufficiently comprehensive to help all those in poverty and keep too many families in the poverty cycle.

Canberra has cut assistance to low income first home owners over the past five years thereby making more, not less, people dependent on a public housing system which, as Mr Stretton suggests, cannot cope. The Federal Government must place a bigger proportion of its housing budget into the First Home Owners Scheme for low income families if it is going to get more low income Australians into decent housing.

The whole thrust of the Liberal Party-National Party coalition housing policy is to encourage home ownership. I was very fortunate to have the opportunity to go to Hong Kong just before Christmas, and I looked at the housing authority there. While in my opinion it has little bearing on the situation in South Australia, out of the 5.8 million people who live in Hong Kong, 2.8 million people are housed in Government housing.

The Hon. H. Allison: And only 2 per cent live in a normal house—the others live in flats.

Mr BECKER: That is quite right. In Hong Kong 2.8 million units of accommodation are provided by the Government. The Hong Kong people now have the opportunity to buy their rental accommodation from the Government, and they are committing up to 40 per cent of their income to purchase a three-square flat, for about \$A50 000. They are queuing up to buy their rental accommodation, without any assistance from the Government. It proves again that people want to buy a little piece of their own country. We should be doing all we can to encourage it. We can do it. We can put these people into accommodation. The Federal coalition policy is the one that can achieve these goals. As I expect to receive further information from Canberra, at this stage I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

UPPER EYRE PENINSULA

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of the House—

(a) the Government should immediately recognise Upper Eyre Peninsula as a natural disaster area due to the continuing difficult situation facing its rural producers and communities;

(b) the Government and financial institutions should provide adequate finances to allow rural producers on Eyre Peninsula the opportunity to sow a crop for the 1989 cereal season;

(c) the Federal Government should change its economic policies to immediately bring about a reduction in interest rates; and

(d) the Federal Minister for Social Security should amend the criteria for social security benefits so as to allow rural producers the opportunity to qualify.

I want to bring this matter to the attention of the House, because anyone with any knowledge of the situation on Eyre Peninsula will recognise that the crisis which is continuing to push farmers to the brink of bankruptcy—while the State Government and the financial institutions haggle over a solution—threatens an exodus of families who have farmed on their land for generations. Hundreds of farming families face a dismal future which has been caused by factors completely beyond their control: excessive drought conditions, increasing interest rates, and a reduction in the value of the commodities that they produce.

Eyre Peninsula has a reputation for recovering from difficult periods second to none anywhere in South Australia. The outlook for agricultural production in Australia is particularly good. When I attended the Agricultural Outlook Conference I was pleased to learn that the reasonably long-term outlook for beef, wool and for grain, particularly wheat, is good during the next three to four years.

To substantiate my comments that Eyre Peninsula has an outstanding reputation for responding in difficult situations, I will cite some figures. From the 1984-85 report of the Australian Bureau of Statistics on agricultural commodities, it is interesting to note that, in the 1983-84 year, Eyre Peninsula produced some \$357 million worth of agricultural products. In the same year, the South-East of South Australia produced approximately \$269 million worth. Eyre Peninsula was second only to the Murraylands, which produced some \$364 million worth of production—a clear indication of the value and the ability of that part of South Australia to produce.

In the current financial year, the Thevenard division of the Cooperative Bulk Handling Company has received approximately 280 000 tonnes of wheat, while the Port Lincoln division has received some 64 000 tonnes. In 1987-88, the Thevenard division received some 478 000 tonnes of wheat; in 1986-87, it received approximately 612 000 tonnes, compared with 388 000 tonnes at Port Lincoln. In 1985-86, the Thevenard division received some 474 000 tonnes and the Port Lincoln division approximately 130 000 tonnes. Those figures demonstrate clearly the ability of the area to produce under reasonable conditions.

A great deal of information has been circulated throughout the community. It is unfortunate that the Government has not recognised that, by helping these people on Eyre Peninsula, it will help itself and the community at large. What must be remembered is that it was the agricultural and mining industries that built Australia and, given a fair go, they will keep the nation going. However, bureaucracies—large institutions—are sitting in judgment on the people who have the capacity, ability and desire to assist the nation and to produce export income, which is the only thing that will bring about a long-term, sound financial base for this country. Unfortunately, they are being controlled by an ever increasing group of academic advisers and outsiders, people with no knowledge of agriculture or of what

must be done. These people sit in judgment, making life difficult for those concerned and, at the end of the day, for the nation. It is time that that situation was reversed.

The State Government, having received poor advice from the Minister of Agriculture, is smarting under a barrage of criticism from around the nation about the tardy treatment that it has afforded those people. It distributed to households on Eyre Peninsula a document entitled 'Government Assistance for Farmers on Eyre Peninsula', which innocent members of the community would think contained a pretty good set of proposals. On page 2, as part of a brief resume of what has been provided, it states:

The Government has given Eyre Peninsula \$28 million over the past three years and up to \$25 million will be provided as additional funds in 1989.

The Government has not given these people one cent: it has lent money. Let us look at correspondence circulated in relation to some of this money that has been 'given' to these people. This is a Christmas present one of my constituents received on 20 December.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is all right for the dense member; he is not interested in the farming community and is obviously reflecting the views of the Government. This document was received by one of my constituents as a Christmas present under the letterhead of the Department of Agriculture, and states:

Following assessment of your application for financial assistance, I regret that, on the recommendation of the Rural Assistance Branch, the Minister of Agriculture has declined your application.

Let us talk about this 'free' money that the Government provided. A letter to another constituent states:

Dear client,

We propose to increase the interest rate on the balance of your loan, not yet due, to 14 per cent as from 1 February 1989.

That is giving away money! That is help! Those were Christmas presents people received from this benevolent Government. At the same time, Government can find \$40 million to build an entertainment centre at Hindmarsh; it can put millions of dollars into an unproductive exercise such as the Timber Corporation in New Zealand, which does not employ one South Australian; but, when we have decent, hardworking South Australians wanting to do something, the Government now wants to increase its interest rates and drive them off their farms in droves.

If this is the best the Government can do, it stands condemned, because future generations will not forget what it has done. If the Government wants to wreak havoc on Eyre Peninsula, that is its decision, but let me remind the House that the community will not forget the decisions of this Government. Now that this matter is being debated in the Parliament, it is appalling that the Minister of Agriculture does not have the time to take his seat in the House. I have been accused by the former press secretary to the Premier, the man who manipulates the news media, of not asking enough questions. Now that the matter is before Parliament to be debated, where is the Minister of Agriculture?

Why is he not facing up to his obligations to be here and listen when the case on behalf of these people is being put to the Parliament? The Parliament is the place in which to raise these issues, and the Minister has—again—failed. He has failed the agricultural industry and he has failed again on this occasion. Let me continue with a number of things that ought to be said. I referred to the need to bring down interest rates. The Keating/Hawke economic strategy is wringing the guts out of this nation. Home owners have been forced from their homes. The Government wants to wring every cent it possibly can from the public while its

mates, the money lenders, the manipulators, the banks and the huge institutions make hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Hon. H. Allison: Is that true, what they're paying?

Mr GUNN: They are paying well in excess of 17 per cent and as much as 22 per cent, and many of them, when facing difficulties, have had penalties imposed upon them because they are believed to be high risks. When people cannot meet their existing debts they have had penalties placed upon them. If the Commonwealth Government continues with its policies, there will be no more young home owners in this country. In addition, the Government will screw the farming community until it does not have the ability or capacity to produce.

If banking is an example of deregulation, heaven help the wheat industry, because the Government will smash the ability of people to retain a bit of dignity by owning their own homes, and the ability of the small business community, including the farming community, to survive. If the wheat industry is deregulated, there will be no such industry in years to come because it will be handed over to the manipulators—to the wheelers and dealers of this world—because there is nothing in it for the average farmer in this community and the farmers will be the losers at the end of the day. Let us look at a few of the letters sent out to some of my constituents, one of whom was told:

We refer to previous correspondence, in particular, our letter of 15 July 1988, your more recent discussions with the Manager of [such and such], and we confirm that we agree with the . . . that sale of assets is inevitable. Once again we suggest that you make every effort to effect a sale of your properties as quickly as possible, and we mention that, unless this is achieved by 31 January 1989, it may be necessary for the bank to consider whether action should be taken under its securities.

In relation to that case, that person has assets of about \$500 000 and liabilities of about \$700 000. If that bank—which is owned by the Commonwealth, the people of Australia—continues to force that issue, it will lose money. There is no way in the world that it will realise the amount outstanding.

Let me give an example of what can happen if a fellow is given a fair go. Say he wants to sow 4 000 acres of wheat and there is every possibility of it being an average year. That would be six bags to the acre or 2 000 tonnes of wheat. At \$150 a tonne that would be \$300 000—and he is on the way back. Even if it had to be then sold he has the chance of getting some equity and he will do something for the community.

In the situation that has now arisen the banks are claiming that they will not sell up anyone. That sounds well to the unsuspecting members of the public. But to leave people without the financial resources to productively use that land is paramount to forcing them off, because the end result will be the same. Too many people have gone from those local communities which are suffering and the exodus will continue. That is why it is absolutely imperative that these people be given reasonable amounts of finance so that they can sow a crop for the forthcoming year.

Let us look at some of the responses we have received from some of the representations. On 24 January I received the following letter from the Minister of Agriculture:

I respond to your letter of 12 December 1988 regards provision of freight subsidies.

As you would be aware, it is not Government policy to provide subsidies and hasn't been since 1982-83. Whilst on the face of it provision of such subsidies appear to assist both the farmer and the land, the level of assistance per farm is usually small and encourages the retention of stock, to the detriment of the land. Such assistance applied at this stage is also unequitable, given that many farmers made more appropriate livestock decisions last Spring when the feed shortage situation was obvious.

The Government has continued to respond to the situation on Eyre Peninsula in a manner which provides high levels of assist-

ance long term in a manner which amongst other things assists the adjustment of those who unfortunately have no future in the industry.

That is not the first response. I have made repeated approaches to the Minister to try to get a bit of assistance for these people, because if they are to survive they must have the ability to produce income. If they get rid of their stock they are up for very large amounts of money when they wish to buy into the market again. Let us look at some of the problems facing councils in this matter. I refer to a letter from the District Council of Murat Bay:

Council acknowledges your letter of 17 January concerning a planned deputation to the Premier.

Although this council is supportive of and wishes to participate in a deputation to the Premier it is unable to attend the planned preliminary meeting at Wudinna on 23 January.

It is council's view that local government should seek the declaration of certain pockets of Eyre Peninsula as natural disaster areas. However, we also believe that the deputation should seek assistance from the Premier by way of funding to enable removal of drift sand from roads. This area is severely affected with several roads being closed by tons of sand covering them. The removal of the sand to enable opening of the roads will be beyond the resources of landowners and this council.

As to meeting to discuss the deputation matters, council feels that this could be carried out in Adelaide prior to meeting with the Premier. . .

The member for Flinders and I attended that meeting at Wudinna to which it was decided to invite the Premier, who unfortunately declined the invitation. I quote from a letter from a bank to a constituent, which was another Christmas present, as follows:

We refer to our discussions and advise that the interest rates applicable to your loan have been increased by 2.2 per cent to 17.85 per cent.

That was to take place on the day after Christmas. We were told this morning on a national television program that interest rates are likely to go up again. If that is the case, it is a disgrace to those people in charge of the national economy—they are going to squeeze another group of people out of the opportunity to produce and live in their homes. I have received also letters from the Far West Rural Service group expressing concern.

While we are talking about interest rates, let us make a comparison as at January 1988 with what is taking place overseas. I have a table of figures which clearly indicates that Australia is doing worse than any other country. On that occasion the inflation rate was 8 per cent and the interest rate was 17.5 per cent.

Canada had inflation of 4.1 per cent and interest rates of 12 per cent. The central Government in Canada has put millions of dollars into the pockets of farmers. Although this country has the lowest subsidised agriculture in the world, we are attempting to compete on an international market, on the international playing field of countries like the USA and the EEC, which are putting billions of dollars into the pockets of their farmers. Meanwhile this Government and its Commonwealth counterparts are prepared to throw the farmers to the wolves.

I read this morning in an interstate agricultural paper that one-third of cane growers could go to the wall. How many other groups will this Government push to the wall while it proceeds with its crazy economic policy, forcing interest rates higher and higher and completely beyond the capacity of people to pay. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a purely statistical table of interest rates.

Leave granted.

INTEREST RATES COMPARISON

Country	Inflation Per cent	Interest Per cent
Australia	8.0	17.5
Canada	4.1	12.0
West Germany	1.6	6.0
Malaysia	2.3	6.7
Japan	1.0	3.3
Sweden	5.7	12.0
USA	4.2	6.0

Based on \$20 000 loan as at 27 January 1988 for one year.
Figures supplied by Financial Institution: supplied by Allen Glover, Crisis Counsellor.

Mr GUNN: I will refer now to a few of the press comments from the media in recent times. The headlines clearly demonstrate to the House the general feeling. I refer to the *Stock Journal* of 9 February 1989, as follows:

RAB 'insensitive to farmer needs'

The Rural Assistance Branch has become insensitive to the needs of drought-affected farmers and most would be better off if they have never heard of it.

Another *Advertiser* article of 28 December 1988 states:

Home buying 'too costly' for most families

Canberra: Fewer Australians can afford to buy a home than at any time since the Great Depression, an industry study has revealed.

The figures, issued yesterday, show home loan repayments for typical South Australian families jumped 5.4 per cent to \$530 a month in the September quarter. Mortgage repayments were taking up almost 27.6 per cent of the typical South Australian household's gross income. But this was a slight improvement on the same quarter last year, when the figure was 28.5 per cent.

What has caused the problems? A few weeks ago in an *Advertiser* article figures were given in respect of the Minnipa Research Farm. Those figures were put together by the Manager and they clearly demonstrated what has caused the problem leading to this situation. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a table of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

EYRE PENINSULA FARMING LEDGER

Year	Rainfall (mm)	Interest Rates (%)	Commodity Prices (tonne)	
			Wheat	Barley
			\$	\$
1979	343.1	11-11.25	114	70
1980	242.7	12.25-12.5	129	113
1981	294.7	15	139	124
1982	137.5	17.5	141	115
1983	257.8	15-16	158	123
1984	260.0	14.5-14.75	145	126
1985	266.9	17.5-17.75	153	111
1986	288.7	16.75-17.25	149	97
1987	172.1	16-16.25	128	90
1988	134.1	15	150	95

Rainfall figures taken at the Government Research Centre, Minnipa, during the growing season, April to October.

Interest rates based on Reserve Bank compilation of reports from major trading banks on customers with overdrafts of \$100 000 or more. Figures taken at June each year show rates used on the basis for setting rates on individual loans, depending on client's risk factor.

Wheat and barley figures from Bureau of Statistics in Australian dollars per tonne for the years ending March.

Mr GUNN: I now wish to read to the House an editorial which reflects clearly the overwhelming view of the majority of people in the South Australian community. I believe that people in the community are sympathetic to the needs of these people because the average person believes in a fair go. People are reasonable and concerned about employment. They recognise that we must produce and that agriculture is really the only industry that can increase production

rapidly. Agriculture is the only industry with the ability to continue to bring huge quantities of money into this country to fund our basic services.

The Hon. H. Allison: It is everlasting.

Mr GUNN: It is everlasting. The *Advertiser* editorial of 7 January 1989 states:

Government must revise drought aid

The State Government's proposal this week for a so-called aid package to help the 400 farmers in the drought-stricken Upper Eyre Peninsula was a final admission from the State that farmers can expect nothing more than token support.

After two years of crisis talks between rural representatives and the Minister for Agriculture, Mr Mayes, the Government has done what it proposed to do all along.

The United Farmers and Stockowners Association has warned repeatedly that some 200 West Coast farmers will be forced to walk off their properties by April this year unless the Government agreed to a realistic funding package. Mr Mayes' aid package simply writes off 100 of these farms as being 'unviable'.

Throughout the negotiations, Mr Mayes steadfastly maintained that the only long-term answer for the West Coast community was to radically restructure its agricultural and financial base, shifting the emphasis from wheat and barley crops to livestock.

Drought, he claimed, had plagued the area throughout its history and State and Federal Governments could no longer be called upon to prop up such a fragile economy.

While most farmers are in favour of restructuring, they claim unless the Government provides the farmers with the substantial, long-term funding needed, diversification must remain an accountant's dream.

Meanwhile, the Minister's apparent inability to come to grips with the challenges facing the West Coast farming community has only served to exacerbate the problem.

When the crisis talks began, farmers were already in trouble because of soaring interest rates and the dramatic drop in commodity prices in mid-1985. Since then, the region has been hit by some of the worst drought years this century—something Mr Mayes has yet to acknowledge.

While other State Governments offer drought assistance as provided under the Federal Government's Natural Disasters Act as a matter of course, Mr Mayes, who administers the Act in South Australia, has yet to recognise the value of these measures.

By any reasonable standard, Mr Mayes' aid package not only fails to recognise the scale of the problems facing West Coast farmers, it is also yet another demonstration of the minister's almost pathological refusal to listen to the arguments of interest groups under his portfolio.

His contempt for the State's rural representatives, however, reached a new high when he launched the very same aid package which the farmers warned him late last month was a 'scenario for disaster'. The move has sparked an unprecedented breakdown in communications between the State Government and the rural sector.

With Eyre Peninsula's \$180 m a year grain economy at stake, the State Government may now have little choice but to remove Mr Mayes from the negotiating table altogether and appoint an independent arbiter to handle the issue.

Meanwhile, the Minister appears to be in desperate need of a whole new *modus operandi*. As a Minister of the Crown for more than three years, it's about time he realised there is more to politics than scoring brownie points at his local ALP sub-branch.

That really reflects the views of many people in agriculture in relation to the manner in which this matter has been handled. There has been a great deal of criticism about the benefits available under national disaster funding. The State Government can continue with the existing aid package, even if the application for natural disaster funding is successful.

In 1983-84 South Australia applied for drought disaster relief and received \$4.5 million. The same year, under those same arrangements, Queensland received \$44 million; it received \$3 million in 1984-85; over \$9 million in 1985-86; \$17 million in 1986-87; and nearly \$13 million in 1987-88. Let us consider the Commonwealth proposal as follows:

'Eligible disaster' means any one of, or any combination of, the following natural phenomena: bushfire, cyclone, drought, earthquake, flood, storm, where the level of damage and distress directly consequential upon such occurrence necessitates expenditure by a State on eligible relief and restoration measures.

An 'eligible measure' means:

(a) assistance to a person in genuine need as a direct result of an eligible disaster, for the relief of personal hardship and distress, including the provision of emergency food, clothing and accommodation; essential repairs to housing; and the repair or replacement of essential items . . .

(b) a concessional-interest loan by a State to a farmer, or operator of a small business, whose assets (including fodder) have been significantly damaged as a direct result of an eligible disaster and who has no reasonable access to commercial finance but who has a reasonable prospect of long-term viability;

The Hon. H. Allison: Why doesn't Eyre Peninsula qualify then?

Mr GUNN: It does. I put to the House and members of the Government that all those people qualify under that criteria. The proposal continues:

(c) a concessional-interest loan by a State to a needy person or voluntary non-profit body whose assets have been significantly damaged as a direct result of an eligible disaster . . .

Their assets have certainly been damaged. It continues:

(e) other acts of relief and restoration adopted to alleviate distress or damage which is a direct consequence of an eligible disaster.

They can also help the councils with fixing the roads and funds are available to construct water pipelines. This Government must understand that the \$8 million would solve the problems for the rest of this century and well into the next century. It is a matter of priority. We have seen \$40 million allocated for the entertainment centre, \$30 million in New Zealand, \$5 million or \$6 million for the Festival Theatre, about \$12 million to repair the tank trap at the back of Parliament House, \$2 million to look after the Government's friends at the State Opera who were so financially incompetent that they could not manage it, and so we could go on. Yet there is no money! The scheme is there. This proposal, under the signature of Peter Walsh, is dated 1 July 1988. I could say many other things in relation to this sorry state of affairs but others want to participate.

Those of us who have been involved with, and lived on, Eyre Peninsula appreciate and understand the hard work and dedication that these people have put into farming and the welfare of the State as a whole. They have asked for very little from Governments and in fact have received even less. Their expectations are not high. They have the ability to work hard and have endured difficulties and hardships for a long time. These people live a long way from the centre of power. They have sent me and others to represent them, and I believe that I would be failing in my obligation if I did not bring these matters to the attention of the Parliament. The Government will fail in its obligation if it does not adequately respond and meet their reasonable requests.

The problem culminated on Sunday at Wudinna when in excess of 1 000 people gathered to express their concern for not only their own welfare but also that of their friends, neighbours, communities, and children. There are not enough jobs now, and those communities which have battled so hard over the past 30 to 40 years to establish themselves and gain a few reasonable facilities will be torn apart if this exodus continues.

The *Stock Journal* of 21 December 1988 contained an interesting article entitled, 'Where have all the young men gone?' It stated:

Wirrulla storekeeper Lois Mitchell says the drought has had a devastating effect on her business.

'My customers are all leaving the region to get work and with two shops in the town and only half the people business is now very difficult,' Mrs Mitchell said.

'The young people were the first to leave as they went away seeking work.'

Mrs Mitchell said to her knowledge only one teenager was left in the Wirrulla district.

'This year a further 29 students and teachers will be leaving the area to go elsewhere,' she said.

'Three years ago the local school had over 200 students—now enrolments are down to 104.'

This is having another compounding and depressing effect on the local economy.

Maxine Ettridge has been driving a school bus for the past seven years.

'Now I will be sitting around waiting until school is almost ready to start again next year to find out if I still have a job,' she said . . . 'It is a lovely town with lots of very nice people and a really good community spirit . . .'

Again, this article points to the need for action. The rally at Wudinna clearly indicated the urgent need for action. The banks and other financial institutions have not only a commercial responsibility but also a social responsibility. In many cases they encouraged people to enter into arrangements and contracts, and virtually begged them to take money.

The Hon. H. Allison: To buy more land.

Mr GUNN: Yes. One bank went into the area to attract new business and handed out money as if it were going out of fashion. Now, that same bank is attempting to force people off their farms. The Commonwealth Development Bank has been the most difficult to deal with. It was set up by the Menzies Government to assist agriculture and development in this country, and it went out and lent money. It is attempting to force people off their land when I believe that that should not be occurring.

At the end of the day, what sort of society do we wish to live in—a society where only the wealthy and powerful succeed and the rest of the community have no rights; where, because of situations beyond their control, people will be driven off their land; where others are allowed to come in and swallow up that land? We do not want absentee landlords—but that is what will occur. We do not want these farmers driven off their land because, in the overwhelming majority of cases, they are by far the best people to manage these farms.

There is a social responsibility and the banks and the Government have to accept that, because I believe that the community accepts it, as do the majority of agriculturalists in this State. This week we read that in America the Government will continue to subsidise the farming communities there because of the continuing drought. If we had the same rate of subsidy in this country, we would be living in clover. The farming community has not asked for that rate of subsidy and it does not want it. All it wants, as do local communities, is the opportunity to survive. These people have nowhere else to go.

Under the Hawke/Keating financial strategy of deregulation, the nation's capacity to develop and to produce through hard-working, ordinary small businesses and little communities and people has been strangled. If anyone thinks that interest rates of over 20 per cent and 15 or 16 per cent for housing are in the best interests of this nation, I challenge them to go out on the platform and explain that to the people.

It is all very well for the Prime Minister to race around the international stage and to give \$30 million to build a bridge over the Mekong Delta and various things of that nature, but he is allowing his own people to be forced out of their homes and off their farms. The current situation is a disgrace. I call upon this Government, all members of this House, and our Federal colleagues to change the situation and to give these people the opportunity to survive, to produce and to trade out of their difficulties.

The new social security arrangements are absolutely shocking. It is bad enough disqualifying people from Austudy benefits and disadvantaging their children, and it is disgraceful to impose an assets test on people applying for pensions. However, the new social security forms, condi-

tions and arrangements which were implemented during the past week will make it impossible for some people to obtain help. It is absolute nonsense to force people to personally hand in forms to the Department of Social Security, and that is happening in the Port Lincoln office. I call upon the State Director and the Federal Minister to act immediately in order to give these people a fair go.

I realise that the department is trying to catch people who rot the system, but I have said before, and I say it again, that I would prefer to pay for a couple of people who rot the system than to prevent deserving people from receiving assistance. There is always a balance in these things and, when people present propositions which make it difficult to rot the system, they should be very careful, because it could disadvantage the needy.

The Hon. H. Allison: It will cost them far more to look after the farmers when they are off their farms—

Mr GUNN: That is right. That is what is happening at the present time. I commend the motion to the House and

I call on all members to support it, because those of us who know the area well and who will remain there for the rest of our lives do not want to see our neighbours evicted or structures torn down. People are already in difficulties watering the turf ovals in order that they may play cricket or football. They do not have many facilities, but they do want to maintain those that they have.

I hope that the Minister, the Premier and the Government recognise the failure of the existing arrangement. I call on the Premier to immediately visit Upper Eyre Peninsula so that he may see the situation first hand. I call on him to accept Mr Gerswich's invitation and I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table which indicates the total farming debt in this country, which is \$8 000 million, and another table which indicates the gross value of rural production. Anyone who reads those two documents will be fully aware of the need for assistance. I commend the motion to the House.

Leave granted.

FARM INDEBTEDNESS TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

At 30 June	Major trading banks (a)			Pastoral finance companies (b)(d)	Common- wealth Develop- ment Bank (b)	Life insurance companies (e)	Ex-service settlement (f)	Other government agencies (including state banks) (b)	Primary Industry Bank of Australia (b)	Total institutional indebt- edness (g)
	Term and farm development loans (b)	Other (c)	Total (b)							
	\$m	\$m	\$m							
1970....	210	787	998	349	176	128	80	351	—	2 082
1971....	212	782	994	333	192	129	83	374	—	2 104
1972....	229	733	963	293	202	125	79	432	—	2 094
1973....	326	715	1 051	303	198	117	71	481	—	2 221
1974....	400	761	1 161	371	203	107	61	499	—	2 402
1975....	408	812	1 220	279	232	104	58	554	—	2 447
1976....	443	874	1 317	254	243	96	54	633	—	2 597
1977....	501	896	1 397	200	254	86	49	696	—	2 682
1978....	583	977	1 560	200	280	80	43	797	—	2 960
1979....	747	944	1 691	244	288	70	39	858	111	3 301
1980....	908	1 037	1 945	321	293	67	34	893	216	3 769
1981....	1 108	1 199	2 307	315	309	74	35	1 004	317	4 361
1982....	1 251	1 181	2 432	366	327	77	33	1 057	429	4 721
1983....	1 442	1 300	2 742	364	367	83	31	1 343	567	5 497
1984....	1 468	1 329	2 797	488	456	82	29	1 471	694	6 017
1985....	1 755	1 729	3 484	637	580	79	26	1 688	730	7 224
1986....	1 964	1 944(r)	3 908	717(r)	685	74	24(s)	1 867(r)	675	7 950(r)
1987....	1 502(r)	1 997(r)	3 499	686(r)	743(r)	89	24(s)	2 336(r)	586(r)	7 963(r)
1988 (s)	1 296	2 385	3 681	534	717	71	23(s)	2 250(s)	670	7 946

(a) Figures for the major trading banks refer to the second Wednesday in July. (b) PIBA commenced lending operations in November 1978. The data shown for PIBA includes both loans made directly by PIBA and loans refinanced through a network of prime lenders comprising banks and other institutions. The data for these institutions have been adjusted to exclude their loans refinanced by PIBA. (c) Includes overdraft and other advances. (d) In the years before 1986, data include some other loans (e.g., leasing etc.) which amounted to \$73m in 1986. From 1984 statistics refer to Corporations whose assets exceed \$1 million. For period 1977 to 1983 threshold is \$5 million. (e) Includes only mortgage loans. (f) Excludes lease agreements and indebtedness to hire purchase companies, trade creditors, private lenders and small financial institutions. (r) Revised. (s) Estimated by the ABARE. (na) Not available.

Sources: Reserve Bank of Australia; Australian Bureau of Statistics; Primary Industry Bank of Australia; Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

GROSS VALUE OF FARM PRODUCTION

Commodity	Record year to 1983-84	Value in record year	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
	(a)	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	(s) \$m	(f) \$m
Crops								
Cereals for grain								
Wheat	1981-82	2 600	3 606	3 203	2 719	2 530	2 035	2 370
Barley	1981-82	463	733	759	587	437(r)	450	484
Oats	1981-82	156	204	130	138	162(r)	182	205
Triticale	(na)	(na)	21	24	28	26	24	29
Maize	1981-82	30	36	46	40	31	30	30
Sorghum	1980-81	152	246	197	181	161	180	219
Rice	1980-81	138	89	123	87	85(r)	129	117
Fruit								
Apples	1982-83	132	134	178	139	185	206	186
Pears	1982-83	42	46	51	64	71(r)	74	63

Commodity	Record year to 1983-84 (a)	Value in record year \$m	1983-84 \$m	1984-85 \$m	1985-86 \$m	1986-87 \$m	1987-88 (s) \$m	1988-89 (f) \$m
Peaches	1980-81	26	25	28	29	43(r)	41	40
Apricots (b)	1981-82	18	18	20	25	27(r)	28	29
Citrus	1982-83	129	138	172	179	184(r)	196	214
Bananas	1982-83	70	87	93	102	141(r)	140	144
Pineapples	1982-83	25	26	34	33	44(r)	42	42
Dried vine fruit (s)	1979-80	135	79	106	140	120	138	140
Wine and table grapes (s)	1981-82	112	141	166	143	161	192	221
Other crops								
Sugar cane (cut for crushing)	1980-81	800	517	512	494	586	615	780
Tobacco (green weight) (s)	1982-83	67	67	63	65	71	75	77
Cotton (including cottonseed) (c)	1981-82	182	269	330	325	373	470	475
Peanuts (in shell)	1981-82	37	40	37	38	42	40	36
Sunflowerseed	1978-79	46	59	88	53	34	53	38
Soybeans	1978-79	25	28	36	28	27	24	53
Other oilseeds (d)	(na)	(na)	14	20	34	25	31	30
Lupins	1982-83	30	64	74	82	136	174	204
Field peas	1982-83	21	25	31	46	96	128	123
Potatoes	1981-82	181	289	162	206	272	207	268
Other vegetables								
(human consumption)	1982-83	388	449	466	508	613	620	648
Crops n.e.i. (e)	(na)	(na)	976	729	895	1 073(r)	1 115	1 202
Total crops	1981-82	6 308	8 426	7 878	7 408	7 754(r)	7 639	8 467
Livestock slaughterings								
Cattle slaughtered (g)	1979-80	2 386	2 118	2 253	2 367	2 820	3 060	3 370
Sheep slaughtered (h)	1980-81	562	385	403	371	492	517	566
Sheep exported live (s)	1982-83	176	218	201	169	211	221	222
Pigs slaughtered	1982-83	415	375	438	438	468	500	538
Poultry slaughtered	1982-83	413	430	513	559	602	652	703
Total (s)	1979-80	3 616	3 526	3 808	3 904	4 593	4 950	5 399
Livestock products								
Wool (i)	1981-82	1 789	2 016	2 434	2 693	3 334	5 461	5 860
Milk (j)(s)								
Manufacturing	1982-83	660	683	600	648	791	859	994
Market	1982-83	451	468	497	533	571	603	635
Total	1982-83	1 111	1 151	1 097	1 181	1 362	1 462	1 629
All other livestock products (k)	1982-83	293	316	316	329	330	338	345
Total (s)	1982-83	3 164	3 483	3 847	4 203	5 026	7 261	7 834
Gross value of farm production (s)	1981-82	12 644	15 435	15 533	15 515	17 373(r)	19 850	21 700

(a) From 1949-50. (b) Includes quantities for drying. (c) Value delivered to gin. (d) Linseed, rapeseed and safflowerseed. (e) Mainly fodder. (g) Includes dairy cattle slaughtered. (h) Excludes the value of wool on skins. (i) Shorn, dead and fellmongered wool and wool exported on skins. (j) Milk intake by factories and valued at farm gate. (k) Mainly egg production, honey and beeswax. (p) Preliminary. (r) Revised. (s) Estimated by the ABARE. (f) Forecast by the ABARE. (na) Not available.

Sources: Australian Bureau of Statistics; Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion which was moved by the member for Eyre. I support his impassioned plea to recognise the difficulties that are being experienced on Eyre Peninsula. I will take up a couple of issues that have emerged during the contribution by the member for Eyre. On one occasion the member for Newland asked about the plight of the unemployed. I will take up that point because, as I have said in this place previously, the viability of the rural industry is of paramount importance and the number of unemployed persons on Eyre Peninsula at present is about the same as the number employed on Eyre Peninsula when the rural economy was buoyant. If we could get back to a situation where the rural economy was as viable and buoyant as it was in the 1950s and 1960s, there would be no unemployment on Eyre Peninsula. I am sure that we could say exactly the same about other areas of the State. From figures available to me, that is certainly the case.

Reference has been made to the amount of money required before the Government is eligible for natural disaster funding. I understand that the figure is about \$8.1 million. I also draw members' attention to the Auditor-General's Report in which it is quite clearly stated that, in the last financial year, \$7.361 million was transferred to Consolidated Account and in the previous year the amount was \$11.571 million. If anything, the Government is making

money out of the plight of the rural crisis and the amount of money being handed over.

Furthermore, the member for Eyre made reference to the \$28 million which has been given to Eyre Peninsula farmers over the past three years with up to \$25 million to be provided as additional funding in 1989. This matter needs to be put into its proper context as it is obviously worded for metropolitan media consumption. The Government has not given that amount of money. It might have made that amount of money available through loans, but it must be paid back with interest. It collected much of the money from the Federal Government initially, but a large amount was for the repayment of existing loans that have been rolling over for a period of time. For the Government to pay back \$7.361 million into the coffers in the last financial year and \$11.571 the year before that, whilst claiming that it is giving money, is indeed a misrepresentation of the facts.

The crisis that has developed did not happen overnight. It is the result of a set of circumstances that have been building up over the past few years. I have raised this issue in this place over that time. We have seen a succession of below average rainfall years, and 1988 was for many the driest year on record. Some records go back 80 years. But that is only part of the story. If dry years were the only problem, farmers could handle that. They have done so in the past and will again in the future. The real problem has

been brought about by circumstances beyond the control of the farmer, for example, high interest rates, high input costs, excessive Government charges, regulations and low commodity prices. Although some may argue this point, I believe that interest rates have been the single greatest problem, particularly when the debt equity ratio reaches a point where banks and financial institutions add penalty rates because of the anticipated risk factor.

High interest rates are bad enough, but penalty interest rates have, in many cases, been the single greatest factor in pushing people over the brink to the point of unviability. The penalty rates are insidious and financial institutions must carry the blame for some of the farmers' problems. Many farmers are being charged interest rates far in excess of normal interest rates. By so doing, financial institutions have accepted that they will have to forgo some debts. If that is not the case, these financial institutions have been ripping off the farmers at risk. They cannot have it both ways. In any event, penalty interest rates have contributed to the financial uncertainty of many. I have written to the Premier and Treasurer, the Hon. John Bannon, calling on the Government to investigate the effects of, first, high interest rates on the viability of primary producers and, secondly, the effects of penalty rates on the viability of those who are now deemed to be at risk. Thirdly, I called on the Government to investigate the feasibility of undertaking some monitoring system of financial institutions to maintain a watching brief on the financial practices of money lenders.

The present actions of some money lenders with regard to interest rates is contrary to the principle of any consumer protection laws in this State or nation. Should the practices happen in any other business the Government of the day would very quickly act to bring in amending consumer laws to protect the consumer. Although the South Australian Government believes that it is doing the right thing with its policies, the actual effect is to remove people from the land, not retain them on the land. The \$250 000 that is available at 8 per cent does just that. It is only available to outsiders to come in and buy out the people in financial difficulty. By doing this they are making the rich richer at the expense of those made unviable by the Government's policies.

The question of subsidies is always a vexed one, but in times of extreme adversity assistance is warranted and justified. Almost every section of the community is subsidised in one form or another. The public transport system for city residents is subsidised by over \$110 million. For years the grain growers subsidised the home consumption price of wheat at a time when world prices were considerably in excess of local prices. How many people in the country would believe that they get fair value for their tax dollar with the Festival Theatre, the Convention Centre, and now the \$40 million entertainment centre? All taxpayers meet that bill but all people cannot make good use of those facilities.

I have spoken briefly about the farming sector. Farmers are at the coal face but the problem goes much deeper than that. Local businesses, particularly those in the machinery and service industries, have been devastated. Employees have been laid off and numerous businesses closed. One has merely to look at some of our country towns to verify that. All this has had an effect on schools, sporting teams and the general social and community structure of our society. One could be forgiven for believing that Governments—both Federal and State—have been using these adverse circumstances as a means of social engineering and community restructuring. The Government's actions and

its demonstrated attitudes indicate that it wants peasant farmers and not a thriving rural economy. By bringing down the rural economy the Government is removing the industry that is most likely to deal with the massive overseas debt problem. That debt is increasing at a rate of \$1 billion per month.

Mr S.G. Evans: It was \$1.4 billion at the last count.

Mr BLACKER: Well, \$1.4 billion. That just aggravates the problem. A little bit of mental calculation indicates that for every man, woman and child in this nation our national debt is increasing at the rate of \$64 per month. That means our overseas debt is increasing by \$2 per day for every man, woman and child in this nation. That is a matter of immense importance and it is something about which the State Government or the Federal Government are not at all concerned. We are going broke and we are going broke quickly.

The Government will not recognise our problem, but other members of the community have. I am referring to the rural crisis on Eyre Peninsula. Let us look at the magnificent response to the appeal undertaken by Mayor Tom Secker in Port Lincoln. Over \$40 000 has been donated to Mayor Secker's appeal. I will later relate to the House the reply that Mayor Tom Secker received from the Premier when he asked for a two for one, or a one for one subsidy on that donation. However, that was not forthcoming and I will relate that story at a later time. I might also add that, of all the \$40 000, not one dollar came from a bank, stock agent, stock firm or from the Government. That has been the response to the community.

We should also look at the response to the United Farmers and Stockowners seed appeal. Some 1 500 tonnes of grain from around the State were donated to the United Farmers and Stockowners seed appeal. That is a magnificent response from people in the community.

We should also consider the response to the request for hay. Hundreds, if not thousands, of tonnes of hay have been donated from around the State. The tragedy is that, because we cannot avail ourselves of the natural disaster funding and, therefore, the freight subsidy funding, much of it has been donated to the South-East. It costs \$47 or more a tonne to get it to the areas of need. People are ready, willing and able to donate hay for the express purpose of stock feeding, but the community has not been able to avail itself of that hay because the Government will not recognise the drought conditions and allow them to avail themselves of the stock freight subsidy or the natural disaster funding.

Furthermore, a request went out for stock agistment. Thousands of sheep have also been agisted at some concessional charge, but thousands more have been agisted at no charge. The community has responded enormously, but the Government has not. Why not? Where is it?

We want and need from the South Australian Government a commitment to recognise this natural disaster and calamity. If such a situation existed in an Adelaide suburb, the Government would soon act. Because it is not under the Government's nose, and, more particularly, at the front doors of the majority of the people of this State, there is this out of sight, out of mind, mentality. There is no evidence that the South Australian Government has been lobbying for the lowering of interest rates. As far as I know, the Government has not said 'boo', and it does not appear to want to do so.

There are many issues that I should like to raise, but I bear in mind the time and the undertaking that has been given. However, the Government owes a duty to the people of Eyre Peninsula. It will collect many times over in revenue any help that it provides to the region. Mention has been

made on many occasions that Eyre Peninsula has often contributed 50 per cent of the State's grain production. It is just one of those things.

There is much doom and gloom, and we need to say that to draw to the attention of the authorities the gravity of the situation. However, I am more positive than that. I believe that Eyre Peninsula will rebound; it will come back with a vengeance. The area has had four or five years of natural fallow. When it gets rain and has a good season immense tonnages of grain will be produced. Eyre Peninsula will rebound. Only a few years ago a certain Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger flew over Eyre Peninsula—he did not have the decency to land—and declared the whole area as drought stricken and that it ought to be planted with pine trees. One could never wish to hear a more ridiculous statement in a lifetime. However, Professor Schwerdtfeger, a Government contact—I am not sure about his exact link—wiped off the Eyre Peninsula, but since that time there have been record grain yields. Only two years ago the District Council of Streaky Bay had the highest grain production of any council in Eyre Peninsula. So, the area has the ability to respond.

There seems to be an attitude within the community that this area is not being properly managed. I strongly deny that. That defence was amply demonstrated on the television program last Friday, when the manager of the Minnipa research station said that the land is better managed now than ever before. Despite the extremely adverse conditions being experienced, when we see the minimal amount of massive drift problems—I say 'massive' in terms of hundreds of thousands of tonnes—there is strong evidence that the land is being managed better now than ever before.

Despite the adverse season, and in some cases soil is drifting from tens of thousands of acres of land, there are no large sand drifts onto roads or against fences. There is a demonstrated management practice, which clearly indicates that the farmers in the area are some of the best dryland farmers in the world. Even former Minister Brian Chatterton recognised that point. He was selling dryland farming technology expertise overseas. To that end, we must support these people and continue along those lines.

The Eyre Peninsula Farmers Action Committee, which principally is based at Chandada, is in operation and it represents people from all over the Eyre Peninsula drought affected areas. In quickly identifying that area, it begins just north of Tumby Bay and takes in a wide belt up the east coast, right across the top, through to Kimba, Minnipa and Streaky Bay and on through to Ceduna, Penong, Coorabie and beyond. It comprises a massive area of Eyre Peninsula. The Eyre Peninsula Farmers Action Committee approached the Governor with a petition—something which I do not think has ever been done before. Despite the pooh-poohing which has gone on and the suggestion that it was ridiculous, I think even the media have begun to recognise that the Crown is the final avenue of appeal to which people can go.

It must be recognised that the Governor has seen fit to identify this problem and he has agreed to visit the area in mid-March. This is something which must be recognised by the Government. I trust that, following His Excellency's visit to Eyre Peninsula, he will, if he has not already done so, ask some pretty torrid questions and question the way in which the Government has handled this crisis situation.

I will not outline the full details of the petition that was presented to the Governor; I will do that at a later time. It is available to anyone who wants to see the nature of that petition. The Eyre Peninsula Farmers Action Committee is to be commended for its initiative in forming the petition. Again, I indicate my full support for the member for Eyre's

motion calling on the Government to immediately declare the drought affected area of Eyre Peninsula a natural disaster area due to the continuing difficult circumstances facing rural producers and communities.

Secondly, the motion calls for the Government and financial institutions to provide adequate finances to allow rural producers on Eyre Peninsula the opportunity to sow a crop in the 1989 cereal season. In this regard I point out that I put this proposal of a crop planting scheme to the Government two seasons ago, but I was laughed at and told by departmental staff that that was ridiculous. I am now quite incensed that perhaps had that suggestion been taken up at that time fewer people would now be in the position that they are in at the moment.

The third part of the member for Eyre's motion calls on the Federal Government to change its economic policies to immediately bring about a reduction in interest rates. I have adequately demonstrated that the matter of interest rates is the principal factor in causing this dilemma for so many people. The fourth part of the motion is in relation to social security benefits and the call for change to allow rural producers the opportunity to qualify.

It has been many years since a motion put before this House has been more deserving of support than this one. I have no compunction at all in asking the Government to give it serious consideration and, if necessary, to provide some hand-outs, if you like. I hate that term, but if it is necessary it must be done, for the benefit of the overall community. We must look at the infrastructure that exists in that area. It is an absolute insult to the people in the area to hear about \$40 million for an entertainment centre in Adelaide. If the people want an arts centre over there, they will go out and put their stalls on street corners and raise the necessary finance themselves. However, I have never seen an endeavour like that of any magnitude used to provide a State-wide facility such as that proposed. I strongly support the member for Eyre's motion, and I trust that other members of the House will do likewise.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SCHOOL AND INDUSTRY LINKS PROGRAM

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I move:

That the House notes with approval the establishment of the School and Industry Links program to provide students with a better appreciation of the workplace and to bring business and industry closer to the educational sector thus ensuring its continuing relevance to the future of South Australia.

Before speaking to this motion, may I say that it is always a pleasure to listen to the member for Eyre and the member for Flinders, particularly when they debate the matters that they raised today. They always speak with a great deal of compassion and conviction and they present their arguments very forcefully, as they did on this occasion. Many of the points that they made have been made before to the Government and the department. What they said does not necessarily fall on deaf ears, although some of what they want done may not always be achieved as quickly as they desire. The Government accepts the circumstances faced by the Eyre Peninsula rural community and is doing what it can within the constraints imposed on it to provide some remedies, and it is holding discussions with the Federal Government, as well.

The motion that I have moved today deals with the changing circumstances of our community. The education system is called upon to do many things, such as preparing young people in very many different ways for the life that

lies ahead of them. Schools are asked to lay the groundwork for the moral, social, intellectual, physical, artistic and political development of young people so that they can become integrated into the community. There are continuing debates about the way in which the education sector should respond to each of those demands for the development of young people. Those demands and those debates will continue because we have a very pluralistic society with many paths to personal and social satisfaction.

Probably the most important thing the Education Department can do is to provide a notion of tolerance and freedom within our community in which individuals can decide the path that they wish to take. We can exercise freedom in many ways but in other cases a freedom is available only when a sufficient skill level is reached. School provides a passport into the world that we are making. The world that we make, the consequences of that world and the new workplaces that are associated with it will be as different from our world as the present world is different from the world of the Middle Ages. The world that we are creating has endless possibilities and enormous potential. There will be great wealth and magnificent achievements, but also a fair share of difficulties and problems. Transport, communication and information technology have revolutionised the work force.

The pattern of world production, distribution and exchange is changing fundamentally and is substantially affecting the Australian and South Australian economies and communities. Consequently, the work force is no longer the place that it was in the 30 or so years following the Second World War. Each decade since that major conflict has had a characteristic flavour, although that flavour is not often realised until much later. Who would say now that the 1980s are just a continuation of the 1970s, although when the 1980s began, that is the way it might have appeared. Now they are almost over.

The 1980s have seen two social characteristics unknown in previous decades which are relevant to this motion. The first is the increasing levels of youth unemployment, and the second is the miniaturisation of the workplace and the fact that it has been overtaken by keyboards, computer screens and microchips. I believe that during the 1980s we have seen an increase in isolation of professions, skills and training and, indeed, of education, with all the consequences such isolation brings—characteristics such as selfishness, rigidity, shrinking horizons, lack of initiative and lack of imagination.

The most highly sought after graduate in the higher echelons of business and industry in the early to mid-1980s was an engineering graduate with a CAD/CAM specialty, followed by an MBA in organisational method and financial forecasting. He is still a very relevant graduate and still very well paid but, interestingly, the demand for such a graduate has now lessened compared with the graduate with a classical or humanist education. Those graduates are being sought more and more by industries in the US and Germany. Certainly, all the multi-national corporations are seeking people with generalist and humanist educations to run their organisations, because they are people with wider horizons, open minds and longer views. Of course, technical subjects have now become part of that generalist education.

This move is seen in the current tertiary debate about the common core first year for all courses, whether they be scientific or generalist degrees. That question leads to the education system itself in the way in which the secondary and primary systems are being structured. The education system has now adopted 1989, the last year of the current decade, as the Year of School and Industry. A report which

proposes that schools and teachers come closer together with industry takes this wider view of the world of work and the increasingly interdependent relationship that is being rediscovered, if you like, between different sectors of our community.

This report proposes that the work force ought to come through the school gates and that school students and teachers themselves ought to go through the work gates. No-one likes youth unemployment. Young people who are unemployed do not like it because of the implied failure; the parents certainly do not like it; society gains absolutely no benefit from young people being unemployed and, by contrast, gains many problems. I do not like youth unemployment: it fails to give recognition to young people, kills their initiative, and prevents them from finding the most common and acceptable route to becoming members of the community and being able to make a contribution to it.

The Year of School and Industry, which is now part of the Education Department sector, aims to encourage teachers and principals to learn more about the world of industry and commerce, to create opportunities for students to gain work experience which will add relevance, meaning and enrichment to their study of conventional subjects, and to encourage business people at all levels to learn more about the education sector. There are more than 180 000 primary and secondary students within the State school system at the moment, and last year some 30 000 of them took part in various school work experience programs. It is now becoming accepted that the work experience program of the education sector, particularly at secondary level, is one of the most valuable areas of a student's experiences.

The program in place this year hopes to lead to the establishment of a permanent structure under which employers, unions and schools will be able to monitor the benefit and value of that work experience and incorporate it in the school curriculum. Students will see work as being important only if their teachers and parents regard it as such. Therefore, if schools are to make work education relevant, interesting and important to students there is a need to establish strong personal links with local industry.

The Year of School and Industry, which is being adopted this year, springs from a report commissioned by the Minister of Education late last year which contains a number of terms of reference designed to establish a structure in which all students are able to participate. The study, which has been recently released, recommends that teachers and all students, including primary school students, take part in a comprehensive work education program as a better way of preparing themselves for the work force. Work education would begin with children when they enter reception and develop right through to the last year of their secondary schooling.

The report will be valuable in bringing the education and business sectors closer together. As a result of these two exercises, I believe that the value of secondary education and of getting a wide and broad experience of what the workplace has to offer as well as what the curriculum has to offer will be of benefit to young people, and it will, it is hoped, provide many more young people with the opportunity to take up employment immediately they conclude their schooling. I therefore ask the Parliament to acknowledge this initiative and give it the support that my motion deserves.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Holidays Act 1910. Read a first time.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Holidays Act to provide that the Australia Day holiday is always to be taken on 26 January. In respect of the occasions when 26 January falls on a Sunday, the Bill provides that the holiday is to be taken on the Monday, as is the case for the ANZAC Day holiday. However, as Sunday is itself a public holiday, it will be possible to arrange meaningful celebrations in which everyone who wishes may participate.

As the Chairman of the Elizabeth Australia Day Committee for a number of years now, it is clear to me and to the members of my local committee that, unless the holiday is actually taken on Australia Day itself, the meaning and significance of the celebration of our national day is often lost. The celebration will be far more significant if all residents and citizens of Australia are able to take part in the activities on 26 January on a day which is a public holiday. That almost all Australians had to work on Thursday 26 January 1989 largely negated the value of the day as an opportunity for all Australians to come together in celebration. The holiday itself on the following Monday was five days late, and any mass celebration of Australia Day would have been meaningless.

New South Wales was the only State to celebrate the Australia Day holiday on the day itself and, while there were some problems with employees taking so-called 'sickies' on the intervening Friday, this problem is much less likely to persist when the tradition of the holiday on 26 January becomes more firmly established. It is also less likely to happen when the holiday falls on another day of the week. It was unfortunate that the holiday actually fell on a Thursday this year, giving those who wish to exploit the system the perfect opportunity to take the Friday as a holiday as well. As a counterbalance to the Thursday holiday problem, employers should note that, as with ANZAC Day, the holiday also falls on a Saturday just as often.

As both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Federal Opposition have pointed out, now is the ideal opportunity to consider this matter, immediately after our bicentennial year in celebration of 200 years of European settlement when Australians are more aware than ever of the importance of Australia Day and of the need for all Australians to celebrate it together on the anniversary of settlement itself rather than on the most convenient day for a long weekend.

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

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

PETITION: AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRE

A petition signed by 734 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the proposed relocation of the Northfield Agricultural Research Centre to the Waite institute site was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SATCO

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Forests): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In August last year, I made a ministerial statement about developments in relation to two subsidiary companies of the South Australian Timber Corporation. Members may recall that in that statement I dealt in particular with the poor performance of the IPL (NZ) subsidiary of IPL (Holdings). It is not my intention in this statement to repeat the text of that statement but rather to report to the Assembly the current position as regards SATCO generally and in particular IPL (Holdings) and its subsidiaries.

The Auditor-General qualified his report on SATCO last year because he was not auditor of the subsidiary companies and because the audited statements were not then available. Those audited accounts have now been made available to the Auditor-General and I expect he will provide his report soon. For the benefit of the Assembly, I am now able to provide information which updates the performance of the SATCO group. It should be noted, however, that financial information included in this statement is interim in nature in that it covers only the first half of 1988-89 and in that it is unaudited.

In the first half of 1988-89, IPL (Australia) has recorded an operating profit of \$0.52 million as against the 1987-88 full year results of \$0.843 million. As regards IPL (NZ), the first half interim result is an 'effective loss' of \$A0.244 million. This effective loss is made up of a six months operating profit of \$A1.056 million, which compares with an operating loss of \$A2.065 million for the full year 1987-88. Dividend appropriations of \$A1.3 million to preference shareholders must be deducted from this operating profit of \$A1.056 million. Similarly, to the 1987-88 operating loss, investment income and foreign exchange gains (*inter alia*) of \$A3.062 million must be added. In other words, in the first half of the 1988-89 financial year, there has been a considerable improvement in the operational performance of this company.

Members will recall that I referred to details of the company's preference share issues in my previous statement and that a portion of the proceeds of the initial share issue of \$NZ40 million was used to repay \$A11.2 million in borrowings from SAFA. As I have indicated previously and as a consequence of this debt repayment, a foreign exchange transaction gain of some \$A1.9 million has been realised and recorded as revenue in the 1987-88 IPL (NZ) result. A total of \$NZ25 million preference shares are now on issue with more than half, as a consequence of a positive interest differential, earning income which will be brought to account in the 1988-89 full year results.

The consolidated result recorded by IPL (Holdings) for the first half of the 1988-89 financial year is an operating profit of \$A1.576 million. After payment of required dividends of \$A1.3m to preference shareholders, the amount available for appropriation or the 'effective profit' of IPL (Holdings) is \$A0.276 million for the first six months of this year. This result compares favourably with that of the 1987-88 full year where, although an operating profit of \$A1.788 million was reported, after deducting the settlement amount and other expenses incurred in resolution of matters in dispute with WINCORP, an 'effective loss' of \$A1.752 million was recorded.

That concludes my comments on IPL (Holdings) and its Australian and New Zealand subsidiaries. However, for the sake of completeness I would like to report briefly on the

results achieved by other SATCO companies in the first half year. Marketing operations in Victoria have produced a six month profit of \$373 000 compared to a full year profit in 1987-88 of \$332 000. In other words, the profit for the first six months of this year has exceeded the total profits for all of last year. Mount Gambier Pine Industries has had a six month profit of \$402 000 compared to \$679 000 for the 1987-88 full year. Shepherdson and Mewett have also recorded a small six monthly profit of \$33 000 compared with full year losses of \$359 000 in 1987-88. Scrimber International and SATCO New South Wales are both expected to commence trading in about June 1989 and, as such, no report as to their operational performance can be made at this time.

Overall the SATCO group, which recorded an operating loss of \$3.819 million last financial year, has recorded an 'effective consolidated profit' of \$A701 000 for the six month period to 31 December 1988. This profit amount (\$A701 000) consists of an operating profit of \$2.001 million from which an appropriation of \$A1.3 million for dividends to preference shareholders referred to earlier must be deducted. This result represents a turnaround in six months of some \$A4.52 million. Whilst considerable scope for improvement in performance remains, these results record a not insignificant improvement upon those for the previous financial year.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions I advise that, in the absence of the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Minister of State Development and Technology will take questions that otherwise would have been directed to the Deputy Premier.

INTEREST RATES

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Following the Premier's approval of a further .5 per cent increase in building society rates which is being announced today, will the Premier give a guarantee, after his consultation with building societies, that interest rates will not increase again in the near future as a result of today's disastrous balance of payments figures?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of the state of discussions with the building societies which are required, if they are to have an increase in their rates, to make that known to the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. I have noticed press reports to the effect that they intend to do so. That would necessarily go to the Minister of Corporate Affairs ultimately. I have made no decision in respect of that matter—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The Leader has already asked his question. He has not been given leave to interject. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the correct procedures have been followed, it certainly has not been put before me. That is all I can say.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Secondly, am I to understand that the Leader of the Opposition seeks control of society rates by the Government?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! And I remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that already he has been called to order for interjecting.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Am I to understand that the Leader of the Opposition is asking whether or not we are in the business—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As I said earlier today, in parliamentary debate one member speaks at a time. Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Briggs.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr RANN (Briggs): Has the Premier been given any indication that the Opposition plans to withdraw from the Industries Development Committee of this Parliament? In a recent speech at Mount Gambier, the Leader of the Opposition criticised the Government's involvement in the private sector. It has been put to me that one of the ways in which the Government is involved in the private sector is through the various incentive and assistance programs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of State Development and Technology to order. The honourable member for Briggs.

Mr RANN: The Industries Development Committee also plays a crucial role in ensuring bipartisan scrutiny and support of the Government's financial involvement in industrial development in South Australia. This morning it was put to me that the Opposition is considering withdrawing from the IDC, in line with its new policy, which would place under threat bipartisan support for industrial development in this State.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Since the early 1940s, when Sir Thomas Playford introduced the Industries Development Act and the procedure was established which saw that Government guarantees would require the approval of a committee of this Parliament comprising two Government members, two Opposition members and one financial adviser (who in practice has tended to be from the Treasury), under successive Governments of both political persuasions and under successive Premiers the IDC has been a cornerstone of much of the industrial development that has taken place in South Australia. I was most alarmed to read the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly, what the member for Briggs is putting before us must give very great cause for concern.

The fact is that something like 94 per cent of the assistance and incentive provisions made to industry under schemes in this State go through the process of approval by the IDC. I would suggest that those members who have been on the IDC have done a great job, and a non-political job. There has been a tradition both of confidentiality and of real ethics in relation to the way in which that job has been carried out. For it to be threatened in any way I think would be very serious indeed, and would be seriously viewed by hundreds of businesses in this State.

It is true—hundreds of businesses have benefited. This is something that the Leader of the Opposition finds repugnant. In fact, since 1986 the Development Fund has provided \$123 million in incentive packages to South Australian industry; it has guaranteed the creation or retention of about 6 000 jobs; and it has encouraged capital expenditure of the order of \$330 million in this State. It is a good, sensible and very effective scheme and it has, as I have said, received that bipartisan support.

It is also true that by the very nature of the guarantees that are given there will be some risk involved. One does not get a 100 per cent record of success with all the companies that apply for such assistance. Indeed, if there was

a guarantee of 100 per cent success there would be no need for the IDC guarantees. So, if members, like the Leader of the Opposition, who are seeking to attack the scheme want to point the finger at those companies that have not done so well, then they are ignoring the overall benefit of the scheme and its purpose. And this has been their tendency—they take the State Bank with its multimillion dollar portfolio, with its billions of dollars of capital assets and pick up one transaction and try to create a lack of confidence in its financial administration; and one can go through a series of other areas.

It is true that companies, from time to time, get into difficulties and need to pick up those guarantees. However, the crucial role that is played has regard to the importance of those companies to the economy of our State. Indeed, in some cases they are crucial to a particular regional area, and I would have thought that members opposite would be very much aware of that.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member who has just interjected would know of a very good example because it involves a town, I think, in his electorate, or if it is not it is in his colleague the member for Heysen's electorate—and that is the town of Mannum.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It is actually in the member for Kavel's electorate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Kavel, I am sorry.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The boundaries changed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, perhaps we will address this to the Deputy Leader. The fact is that the major employer in the town of Mannum is the agricultural company Horwood Bagshaw. That company has been a major recipient of Government guarantees over the years. This follows discussions I had with the late Mr Adler, who was very involved in the support of that company. Without Government guarantees and the support provided by Government—the sort of support attacked by the Leader of the Opposition—that company would not be there, that employment would not exist and that country town would be decimated. One can understand the importance of it. I mention this company which has had considerable difficulties—I am delighted to see the suggestion that it is beginning to trade out of those difficulties. It may be that guarantees need not be called up.

I recall that one of the largest guarantees ever was extended to that company on the application and the very active soliciting of the then Managing Director, who happened to be Mr Bruce McDonald—also the President of the Liberal Party of South Australia. It seems extraordinary to me that, with the way in which Government guarantees are invoked, these things could be put in doubt by the Leader of the Opposition when his close friend and colleague—the very President of his Party—is one of the active recipients of and advocates for just this sort of assistance. There seems to be a quite extraordinary conflict here. I suggest that in the circumstances the best thing that could happen would be for the Leader of the Opposition to say just where he stands in relation to this conflict. Either he and his State President are at one on this issue or one of them is being totally hypocritical in their approach to State development.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to the Premier. With today's balance of payments disaster coming on top of the blow-out in the inflation rate and the threat of a wages explosion, about which the Premier has not so far publicly expressed any concern, will the Premier, at tomorrow's meeting of the Economic Planning Advisory Council, demand from Mr Keating a commitment to major changes in Federal Government economic policies?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The meeting of EPAC, of which I am a member and to which the honourable member referred, is extremely timely, because I think we do meet, in the light of the balance of payment figures for this month, at a time and in an environment when we must seriously assess what is happening in terms of our economic indicators. Along with all other Australians, I am certainly concerned about the level of interest rates and the deterioration in the balance of payments. I can only say that I look forward with great interest indeed to hearing the Federal Treasurer's assessment tomorrow. We will certainly be taking a very vigorous part in the discussion that ensues.

STREET KIDS

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Community Welfare advise what the Department for Community Welfare is doing by way of support for the plight of children living on the streets of Adelaide? Further, are recent claims about the number of children living on the streets accurate?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to answer the question from the member for Adelaide, and I thank him for his continued interest and support for the provision of services for the young people who are, to use the colloquial term, living as street kids. To define that, we are talking not simply about young people who are homeless and living on the streets but also about young people who come from the electorates of many of the city members in this place and who in fact have homes but spend a vast amount of their time on the streets, particularly in such places as Rundle Mall and Hindley Street.

To specifically answer the question of what kind of services are provided by the Government, and specifically by my department, I point out that the Department for Community Welfare, along with a number of other Government and community agencies, provides a wide range of services and support for street kids, and this has significantly increased the resources available. I will highlight a couple of these. As to accommodation funded through the Department for Community Welfare under the SAAP program, funds are made available for three shelters for young people, namely, St John's, Joyce Schultz House and Westcare shelters. They receive a total of \$275 000 and they provide emergency accommodation to young people aged between 12 and 25 years. The family and community development fund provides funds to the Hindley Street youth project for the funding of one full-time worker and operating costs of some \$26 500.

The department also funds three full-time staff of the Service to Youth Council to provide service to street kids, at a commitment of \$82 500. As well as that, through its community centres the department offers counselling and emergency financial assistance. Through the South Australian Health Commission, the Government funds the Hindley Street youth project, to the tune of \$23 000, and it also provides funds of \$40 000 for preventive health services. Also, both CAMHS and CAFHS provide support for young people.

Further, the Second Story provides a range of health and counselling services. I remind members of the House that this was modelled on the Door program, which is successfully operating in New York. Mayor Condous visited people involved in this program on his recent visit to New York and it was highlighted in a range of publicity. Another service that is funded through the Health Commission is the Drug and Alcohol Services Council, which provides two full-time workers, who are located at the Westcare shelter.

I think it is appropriate to refer in my answer to the recent publicity that Mayor Condous has given to the problem of street kids. While I welcome and certainly wish to work very closely with the Adelaide City Council in meeting the needs of young people, I must remind the House that Mayor Condous has in fact not been involved with direct consultation with the service providers and, indeed, with my department. To this end, I am writing to the Lord Mayor and inviting him to establish with me a joint working party which will identify the needs of the street kids in Adelaide, both from an accommodation point of view and from the services point of view. I will certainly be calling on the member for Adelaide and asking him to provide support and advice to this working party, because of his thorough knowledge of these issues. The working party will probably report jointly to both the Lord Mayor and to me so that we can ensure that the workers directly involved with the many projects that I have outlined have direct input into developing an overview and a program for the implementation of the services that are needed.

I also indicate to the House that tomorrow sees the first of the seminars organised by the Youth Bureau. The seminar tomorrow involves a large number of young people who are meeting with Government and non-government representatives to discuss and develop long-term solutions to homelessness among young people. I am delighted that my colleague the Minister of Youth Affairs (Hon. Barbara Wiese) will be opening the first of these seminars. I am sure that other members of Parliament look forward to receiving an indication of the deliberations of this successful initiative.

HOUSING LOAN INTEREST RATES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Is the Premier suggesting, in his answer to the Leader, that the Co-op and Hindmarsh Building Societies have announced an increase in their home loan lending rates without the approval of the Government? In answer to a question from the Leader earlier, the Premier suggested that the matter had been referred to the Corporate Affairs Commission. The Act dictates that there can be no increase in lending rates without Government approval, so I ask the Premier: is the report in the press this afternoon incorrect or did he, as Treasurer, give approval for this increase?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In so far as it is suggested that I have given approval, the answer is 'No, I have not.' I have not had any documents put before me to give such approval.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the next question I remind members that they cannot ask whether reports that have appeared in the press are correct. However, I understood that the initial part of the Deputy Leader's question was phrased appropriately, although he repeated it in an incorrect form towards the end. For that reason I did not call him to order or withdraw leave for his question. The honourable member for Peake.

SKILLS SHORTAGES

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): My question is directed to the Minister of State Development and Technology. What is the State Government doing to respond to skills shortages in South Australia? Earlier this year the Opposition claimed that there were widespread skills shortages in this State. Subsequently, media reports indicated some dispute over the extent of such shortages and their effect on the resurgence of manufacturing in this State.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is true that there are skills shortages in some pockets of this State. In fact, I would suggest that the most serious skills shortage in the State is amongst members opposite. They are clearly bereft of talent to an extent unmatched anywhere in this State. This 'duck soup' of an Opposition would do the Marx Brothers proud! We have the frontbench; we have the not so frontbench; we have the not so backbench, the 'Clayton's' backbench; and the 'Clayton's' frontbench. It really is a Marx Brothers comedy, with the Leader playing Groucho; the new environment spokesperson (who recently was whipped out from in front of the bulldozers by the Leader and put in to drive them) is playing the role of Margaret Dumont; the Deputy Leader is playing the role of Chico; and it seems the silent shadow Ministers are all vying to be Harpo—never asking a question between them. So I would have to acknowledge that there is a skills shortage amongst members opposite. No matter how much they try to have their 'day at the races', changing the odds and doing whatever they want, they will not win the race coming up later this year.

With respect to the more substantial issue of the skills question in this State, I point out that there are areas which need to be addressed, and we have been doing that. This State Government has done more than any other to address the skills shortages that exist in South Australia.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: The member for Mitcham, in whatever role he happens now to play (be it a not so backbencher or something), is now trying to challenge that. I point to the figures that are quite clearly on the public record. For example, in the metals industry alone there was a leap in 1987-88 of 25 per cent in apprenticeship numbers. Generally, apprenticeship commencements in this State were 9.7 per cent higher in the year to January 1989 than they were in the year to January 1988.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: The honourable member says, 'Tell us about the previous years.' Let us just look at some of those figures. We can see that there has been consistent growth in the level of apprenticeship commencements since 1980-81. Many other figures need to be added in there. The State taxpayer pays mainly for skills training through the commitment of the State Government to the TAFE sector. It is quite true that, under this Government, spending on TAFE has grown much more rapidly than under the previous Government.

The number of hours of training delivered to TAFE students in this State is significantly greater now than it was in 1982 when we took power. Indeed, the number of student-hours is about 30 per cent greater. During the period of the Tonkin Government it grew only at a minuscule rate—less than 4 per cent over that three-year period. One could look at other things happening in this State: for example, the 14 group training schemes under which 630 apprentices are training at present. We also see the skill centres.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: The former Minister of Education does not want to listen to this, so he keeps on interjecting to avoid hearing the facts of the matter. The joint cooperation of industry, unions, and State Government and Federal Government financial allocations are going to the establishment of skill centres to meet certain areas of retraining need: for example, in the plastics and rubber industry, the road transport industry, the horticultural industry and, yet to come, the foundry industry training area, the engineering industry training area, and other related areas. This Government is committed to talking with industry in order to ascertain what are the skill shortages, and we regularly discuss these matters with industry. As recently as a couple of weeks ago I chaired a meeting involving the engineering employers organisation to ascertain the main areas of skill shortage and what types of skill are needed. This followed many months of discussion with such organisations which have led to the increased effort that we have made.

However, the problem is not clear cut. Sometimes we are told that there is a major shortage. Indeed, I recall being told that there was a major shortage in the training of people with mechatronic skills—that is, people operating C&C machinery on the factory floor not having the necessary electronic and mechanical skills to operate those machines well. So what did we do? We started the procedures to establish a course at the Regency College of TAFE. We consulted with industry, with unions, and with anyone else with an interest in this area in order to ascertain, first, whether a shortage existed (yes, they said) and, secondly, what the response should be and how the course should be designed. We designed the course accordingly and had it on offer for the first time in 1988.

I was proud that we had done this, but I am sad to say that in 1988 the course did not run because there were no takers for it. We were told by industry that the course was needed and we delivered it, but it did not run last year. This course was designed according to the specifications of industry and in consultation with industry.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: The member for Mount Gambier would not know whether there had been consultation, but I assure him that there had been. We are offering that course again in 1989 and I hope that this time those who complained to us that they could not get people with mechatronic skills will enrol their employees in that course because the course is there and it will meet that area of skill shortage. We continue to actively investigate whatever else we can do to improve the training base in this State, and the figures show that our words are backed by the supportive resources, by human effort, and by the efforts of this Government.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Health explain what action is being taken as a matter of urgency to deal with the tuberculosis scare at Modbury Hospital? The Opposition has been contacted by the family of William Herring. Mr Herring was admitted to Modbury Hospital on 17 November last year. After almost three months as a patient with his illness still undiagnosed he was transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital last week. There he was immediately diagnosed as having TB, according to hospital staff, 'in virtually every organ of his body'.

During his time as a patient at Modbury he was in daily contact with numerous other patients, doctors and nurses.

It was also considered that his family was at risk. The Opposition has been told that Modbury Hospital administration considers it of serious concern that many people may have contracted the disease from contact with Mr Herring during his time as a patient there.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I am always a little concerned when the member for Morphett asks this sort of question and insists on using names. I believe that that is totally unnecessary and in bad taste. I do not want to go into the medical condition of this patient; suffice to say that the medical condition, as I have been advised, was an orthopaedic one. The patient was in hospital for an orthopaedic problem. Subsequently, he was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: —transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for further management of that orthopaedic condition. A chest X-ray was taken. At this stage I have not the details about why TB was suspected as a possible diagnosis. The patient was moved from the Royal Adelaide Hospital orthopaedic ward to a thoracic ward on 9 February where it was confirmed that the diagnosis was TB. As I understand it at this stage, with the patient being an orthopaedic patient there was nothing to indicate to the Modbury Hospital that the person had any other problem other than the problem being treated.

No hospital undertakes every test on every patient for every disease known to man. If a person is in hospital for an orthopaedic procedure, by and large that is the problem that is dealt with. However, it is to the credit of the Royal Adelaide Hospital that it picked up this complaint. As to the degree of infection, I am not able to say at this stage. I would be happy to let the member for Morphett know as soon as I have a further report on that but, in my view, there is no reflection at all on the Modbury Hospital.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I would be happy to talk about that. Certainly, I will do for the staff at the Modbury Hospital whatever is required, if anything is required. I would have thought that the honourable member would have conversations with the member for Victoria next to him who late last year brought in another TB scare to this House which turned out to be a load of nonsense. I am not saying that on this occasion the query raised by the member for Morphett will turn out to be a load of nonsense. Every other query he has brought in here—he seems to bring one in once a month—has turned out that way. I will treat the question seriously, as I have, and whatever we are advised by our health authorities, whatever follow-up is required both for the patient or anyone who has come into contact with the patient, will be done, as was done in the case of the constituents of the member for Victoria. The matter will be handled professionally and quickly. As I said, it is no reflection at all on the Modbury Hospital to have not diagnosed this complaint when, as I understand it, it was treating the patient for an orthopaedic complaint.

NORTHFIELD PIGGERY

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Minister of Agriculture assure residents of O'Halloran Hill, Trott Park and Sheidow Park that the Government does not intend to relocate the Northfield piggery at the Glenthorn Research Farm at O'Halloran Hill? In the Adelaide News of 1 February and again in the Southern Times yesterday the Liberal Party candidate for my electorate claimed that the Government proposed to relocate the Northfield piggery at O'Halloran

Hill. This claim has caused anxiety for many of my constituents who live in these suburbs which surround the Glenthorn Research Farm.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for Fisher for his question. The situation has been dragged up, showing again the way in which Liberal candidates scaremonger amongst the population. It also proves that the member for Fisher is multi-skilled: not only is he an expert in roads but also he has an interest in agriculture, and I am delighted to see that.

It is also fair to say that he has not had his snout in the trough, which shows that he is keen to see that this matter is dealt with properly. It is fair to reflect on the fact that the Liberal candidate is telling a few porkies because, in fact, the recommendation we have comes from the working party. Obviously, this candidate has been encouraged to exaggerate the situation by one of his colleagues.

The working party report to me by the Northfield Relocation Steering Committee was presented in November 1988 and was available for public comment until 31 January 1989. That report contained considerable reference to the relocation of the piggery facility. I will quote from it, because I think that would be useful to the community and the honourable member's constituents to assure them that this is a working party report to the Government and that no decision has been made to date. Of course, the honourable member's submissions and his constituents' concerns will obviously be taken into consideration in any decision. The report states:

The first such unit is the Northfield Pig Research Unit (NPRU). It is not possible to operate a piggery in close proximity to a major housing development such as is planned for Northfield.

If one reflects on the areas that the member for Fisher mentioned in his question one can see that those sentences are very appropriate in terms of his electorate, particularly the suburb of Trott Park. Further, the report states (page 50, section 5.4:

Although there have been no recorded complaints about the piggery [at Northfield], largely as a result of effective management of effluent, it is hardly feasible to operate the unit adjacent to housing. Thus, it appears likely that the piggery will have to be relocated if housing encroaches on its borders.

I am sure that the member for Fisher is more familiar with that area than most of us in relation to the likely location that has been talked about by the Liberal candidate. I am not sure whether that candidate has done any homework in relation to this matter; in fact, I am sure none has been done. He has tried to frighten people, which is typical of Liberal candidates' approach throughout this State and nationally. I assure the member for Fisher and his constituents that I will not be recommending that that piggery be relocated to that area. Not wanting to pre-empt—

The Hon. F.T. Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: My colleague, the Minister of Health, suggests another location, but I will not mention that because it will cause further alarm. Of course, Cabinet will make a final decision, but my personal view is that the possible relocation would be to an agricultural site with research facilities in its vicinity, amenities of support and services. I suppose, as has been mentioned, Roseworthy is one of the options and I certainly would favour that option in terms of its location. However, there are options that we can consider. I assure the honourable member that, as Minister of Agriculture, I will not be recommending that the piggery be relocated to his electorate, particularly to the parts that were mentioned, because I think that better options are available.

In relation to the points mentioned in the working party report, this area would, by definition, be eliminated from

my recommendation to Cabinet as being the appropriate place to relocate the piggery. I ask the member for Fisher to convey my comments to his constituents and to dismiss the Liberal candidate's comments as being nothing more than scaremongering.

DRUGS IN PRISONS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I address my question to the Minister of Correctional Services. Following the findings by Mr Justice Muirhead and the evidence given to the Royal Commissioner about the prevalence of drugs in South Australian prisons, and also the support of the prison medical service for random testing, when will the Government introduce random urine testing to help detect drugs in our prisons?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I thank the member for Mitcham for his question and, if I may say, with respect, it is probably the most sensible question he has asked in the 3½ years I have been in this place. It was a long time coming. He seems a little more relaxed now that he is a backbench frontbencher and is able to focus his mind a little more clearly.

The question is a very serious one and I cannot give a categorical answer, unfortunately. The Government has not yet decided to go through with urine testing for drugs in prisons, and there are some very good reasons for that. I point out to the House what are the problems and the way in which we are trying to deal with them.

On the general issue of drugs in gaols, I can only agree with what the Muirhead Royal Commission said. In fact, the evidence about the degree of drug taking, use and trafficking in Adelaide Gaol was basically put by the Department of Correctional Services on behalf of the Government. The gaol was utterly inadequate, and was an insecure institution where one did not have to smuggle drugs through. Rather, one merely had to throw them over the wall. It was as simple as that. The gaol outlived any usefulness it may have had, and that is why the Government closed it. It cost the best part of \$100 million of taxpayers' money to do so, but that decision had to be taken and indeed was taken.

In our endeavour to keep drugs out of gaols, we have many procedures such as constant surveillance of the perimeters of our high security institutions and a prison dog squad trained in the detection of various drugs, other contraband, firearms, and so on. The dogs are highly skilled and constantly used. We have a system of strip searching in this State, which has been described as quite extreme. In fact, the Muirhead Royal Commission has criticised the system. On balance, whilst Muirhead recognised our dilemma in having to use strip searches, he recommended that we look, if possible, for something else. However, I am afraid that we cannot look for anything else: strip searching is vital where we have contact visits. Even with mandatory searching of everyone who has a contact visit, drugs still get into the prisons.

To make the prison totally drug free is possible in theory. However, it would require not only strip searching of everyone who went in and out of the prison every day—prison officers, prisoners, families of prisoners, members of Parliament and Ministers—but also internal searches. That is something that prison officers have asked me to investigate, and I do not believe that anybody in this Parliament would support it. If we had to internally search everyone who went in and out of gaol on every occasion we would have to engage thousands of people to do it. I do not know where we would get them. If we start internal searching of visitors

we would be into real problems. My officers have been to New South Wales to look at the urine testing procedures and found that it is not very successful.

Mr Becker: What about Hong Kong?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I will refer to Hong Kong in a minute. I have been there and examined the problem. However, the problem in New South Wales is that, if you want to use the urine test as evidence of drug use, the method of taking the specimen and the transport of it from where it was taken to the laboratory must be done under certain conditions or the courts will not use it as evidence. This means that one cannot take a urine sample from a prisoner unless two people have witnessed the giving of that sample. I do not mean in some toilet with the prison officer standing outside the door. You have to witness the genitals of the prisoner, male or female—that has to be done.

It can be appreciated that for this one needs a minimum amount of cooperation from people. It is not like taking a blood test, where if necessary a person can be held down and blood extracted. Without going into any more graphic details, I can simply say that a minimum amount of cooperation is required to do this—or else no prison officer, doctor, or anyone else will go anywhere near a prisoner. It has been found in New South Wales that the only prisoners from whom they can get cooperation are, in the main, shall we say, somewhat inadequate and can be more or less stood over to give the specimen.

I have outlined the problem. If there was some better means of certifying that a urine sample was from a certain prisoner—that is, without a prisoner officer having to watch the genitals of either males or females while giving the urine sample—urine testing would be worthwhile. I am not sure whether any member opposite is suggesting that, under the system we have to use at present, he or she would support the introduction of urine testing. However, urine testing only shows that there is drug use in the gaol—and that is not the problem.

The problem is to stop the drugs getting into the gaol. It is an enormous problem, considering that at Yatala, for example, there are hundreds of movements in and out of that gaol every day, involving prisoners, prison officers, various members of the public, visitors, lawyers, social workers, and ministers of religion. You name it—we have them going in and out every day, and to try to detect, from all those people, anyone who might be taking contraband into the gaol is extremely difficult. If the Opposition has the answer to this, if Mr Griffin—I am sorry, I understand that the Hon. John Burdett is now the shadow spokesman in this area—

The Hon. T. H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The Minister of Housing and Construction made a remark that I will not repeat; but I did genuinely believe that the Hon. John Burdett had retired at the last election. I like the man; he is a gentleman, and I worked with him for 10 years, but I was surprised when I saw his name come up in the alternative Government because I thought that he had retired. However, I am delighted to see that he is still with us and that he will be dealing with the correctional services area, because I have always found him to be a very reasonable person.

I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the Hon. John Burdett—much more so than I have for some other members. If, on the quiet reflection that he has been able to engage in during the past few years, he has been able to think of a way of trying to stop drugs getting into gaols and he can tell us what further procedures we can use, he will be sought worldwide, because there is not a prison in the world that has found the solution to this. Here in South

Australia we run very tight prisons. Members opposite will get constant complaints from prisoners about the way we keep the prisons tight. We will do our best, but we do not pretend that we will be 100 per cent successful.

As regards the matter of urine testing, I can only say to the member for Mitcham that there are some real problems in doing it. I do not want to go any further; suffice to say that it can cost up to \$60 for the analysis of one sample. I do not know how many times the member would propose to test them, but we have 3 000 prisoners a year and it costs \$60 a sample. In New South Wales they have found a trace in only 1 per cent of samples—that is 1 per cent when they have a massive drug problem there. So, urine testing is not the total answer. It is certainly something that this Government is seriously considering introducing into the prison system, but we need some better procedures than those that are available at the moment.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL HOSPICE CARE

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Minister of Health examine as a matter of urgency what steps can be taken immediately to ensure that adequate hospice care is provided at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, even if this must be of an interim nature pending the completion of the rebuilding program and the allocation of long-term resources, in accordance with the Minister's reply given in this House yesterday?

I am advised that the present service is under threat as a result of the recent resignation of three staff members which is at least partly as a result of the inadequate resources now available in the northern region and the stress that this situation has placed those staff members under. I have also received a letter dated 13 February 1989 from the Northern Hospice Care Association, which draws attention to the problems that remain to be addressed, and I would like to quote from that letter. It states:

Submissions for funding for hospice beds have to date not met with much success and the vague promise of 'maybe five beds' in the yet to be redeveloped wards of the Lyell McEwin Health Service provides scant consolation for the central northern community. It has been proven elsewhere that the mere provision of beds within general wards in no way guarantees (a) that those beds will be available when needed for hospice patients or (b) that the necessary nursing and other resources for patients and their families will be tied to those beds. What is more, it would appear that, for a hospice unit to be economically viable in terms of nursing rosters, etc., no less than eight beds will suffice.

I am further advised that, as a result of the redevelopment program, adequate accommodation for a special hospice unit is available in the original buildings. So, while the long-term commitment of the Government is encouraging, it is evident from this letter and other representations that I and other members from the northern area have received that more immediate steps need to be taken.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I have very little to add to the answer that I gave the member for Briggs yesterday. I am aware of the interest that the member for Elizabeth has in this issue. He certainly writes to me frequently. As I told him yesterday, for every letter he sends, the member for Napier sends two, so the issue is kept well before me. As I stated yesterday, it is our intention to have some dedicated beds in the new facility that is now being built—a wonderful facility, incidentally. I believe that 80 per cent of it has been completed and, when one has an inspection of the new wards, one can only agree that the Lyell McEwin Hospital will be a superb health facility. It is a very expensive health facility, but the expense is well justified, and I am at a little bit of a loss to know what the member for Elizabeth means when he says that there are inadequate resources in the

north. I would have thought that the millions of dollars that have been spent on redeveloping the Lyell McEwin Hospital would be living witness to the commitment of this Government.

It is always arguable how many dedicated beds one requires for this facility, and only time will tell. Suffice to say that, if we can dedicate four or six beds as hospice beds, that would be a huge advance on anything that we have now. Whilst the Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital are, of course, taking care of people during terminal illness, a dedicated hospice facility is far preferable. That will come in time.

As regards comments about resignations, I am afraid that I do not know anything about that, but I will investigate for the member for Elizabeth and see whether it is having any effect on the palliative care services that are at present located in the northern areas.

GEPPS CROSS SALEYARDS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): When will the Minister of Agriculture make a decision on Government assistance for the relocation of the Gepps Cross saleyards, or is it now the Minister's intention to renege on earlier commitments he gave to the United Farmers and Stockowners and stock agents at meetings last year?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is interesting to note that, on the one hand, the Leader is making certain utterances about the Government getting out of private enterprise and, on the other, this doyen of private enterprise (who cannot decide whether he wants to be a millionaire farmer or a member of Parliament) is advocating strongly that the Government should get into private enterprise. We should look very carefully at his approach to this question, as it does not seem to be consistent. The Opposition, with all these spokespersons, really cannot get its act quite together. In fact, the member for Victoria is advocating that the Government should get involved in something that is primarily a private enterprise exercise.

I wish to correct the record carefully. I make clear to representatives of the industry from the outset that the Government would find it difficult to be involved financially in this exercise. The UF&S representatives who persistently and consistently have misrepresented my position have been told this and I have since then received a letter of apology clarifying the situation for the record. We made clear from the outset that it would be impossible for the Government to be involved in this sort of exercise as a primary funder or as a principal. Unfortunately, however, the people involved have continually used as a reference the relocation of the horticultural market from the East End to Pooraka. They have said that the Government has a financial interest in the exercise, and have argued that there continues to be a financial commitment from the Government.

However, that was handed over to the people who run and own that market and they did all that. We sold them some intellectual property and work that was done by officers of the Departments of Agriculture, Lands, and Environment and Planning. Nevertheless, it was clear that we made this a totally private enterprise exercise to be owned and run by the people who now operate the Pooraka market.

Clearly, people are confused about the situation. It is not something in which the Government should be involved: it is a private enterprise exercise in the pure sense. Why should South Australian taxpayers be involved in running it. It is exactly the argument that the Leader of the Opposition is

putting forward. Private enterprise should be involved. What I have said is that, in areas that might facilitate the services that are there, I will do what I can to assist and look at those areas.

I have put a submission to the Treasury to see what can be done to help the peripheral related services, but that does not mean for one moment that we would be involved in primary development or have a role in the running or operation of those facilities. Nor should we; it is a private enterprise exercise. It is amazing that we see the so-called leader of the dries of the Opposition, who has been lifted a step forward in his ambition to become Leader of the Opposition, advocating that the Government should get involved in what is a private enterprise exercise. It is extraordinary and does not ring true with what his Leader has been saying. There seems to be a little difference here about how they should approach private enterprise and government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That may be so. The truth is coming out. We find that the policy advocated by the Leader is not being adopted by his spokesman on agriculture. As soon as I can, I will prepare a total response to the submission regarding the aspects of those services in related areas that we would consider assisting. However, as I have said from the outset, this does not involve the Government in being a primary sponsor or funder or having a direct interest in the operation of those sale yards.

SPORTING DRUGS

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): In view of the controversy over evidence being given to the Select Committee into Drugs in Sport, will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say what measures have been taken by the Government to test athletes for drugs and what policy has been adopted by the South Australian Sports Institute on the detection of, and penalties for, the use of drugs in sport in this State?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question, because this is an important issue to the whole community but especially for sport and recreation in Australia. We have been listening to and reading in the media reports of the current inquiries. I do not doubt that this matter is of great concern to sports people in general and especially to many parents who would be highly concerned about the situation that has developed concerning the administering of drugs to athletes.

This State has led the way in this regard, certainly in the democratic world and I should imagine in the whole world, although we cannot be sure what programs have been adopted in the Eastern bloc countries. In November last year, I announced the launch of the South Australian Government Sports Doping Control Program, which is a management program controlled and administered by the South Australian Sports Institute. Since then, tests have been conducted on randomly selected athletes in a range of sports, and I can give members a summary of the present position.

In swimming, four registered members of the South Australian Swimming Association involved in special squad training were tested after a training session with the result that all showed negative for anabolic steroids. One was positive for a drug which was declared at the time of the test and which had been prescribed by the swimming doctor for infection. In rowing, six lightweight rowers were selected at random and tested after a 6 a.m. training session. I think that was reported in the media, including newspapers, radio

and television. The result was a negative showing on all drugs in the international list.

Concerning athletics, 11 athletes were selected at the recent Adelaide games and assays were sent to Los Angeles for a comprehensive analysis of all banned drugs. At this time, no results are available. As a point of interest, one of the athletes tested who has international experience stated that this was the first time he had been tested in Australia. This unique program established by the South Australian Government and administered by the South Australian Sports Institute will be of interest to every other State and to the national program, so I am delighted to be able to support this innovative project which puts us in the forefront nationally.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Apparently the Leader of the Opposition is not interested in the policy that we have adopted, although every other parent in this country certainly is. It is important that the community hear this report and I am delighted to provide an answer to the honourable member's question.

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not further insist on its amendment.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ARTHUR HARDY SANCTUARY (ALTERATION OF BOUNDARY) BILL

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold, for the Hon. **D.J. HOPGOOD** (Minister for Environment and Planning), obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to vest part of the Arthur Hardy Sanctuary in the Board of the Botanic Gardens; and for other related purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. L.M.F. 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

In July 1939, some 13 years before Mount Lofty Botanic Garden was initiated, E. & F.K. Barton (descendants of Arthur Hardy) made a gift to the Crown of 15 acres to be held as a sanctuary in perpetuity.

Until 1973, the area, section 459, hundred of Onkaparinga, was managed as a forest reserve by the Woods and Forests Department. In that year the sanctuary was placed under the control of the Board of the Botanic Gardens pursuant to the Botanic Gardens Act, as the land was contiguous with the upper entrance of Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens (first opened in 1977) and as it was therefore in the interests of the economical management of the sanctuary to do so.

Until the serious bushfires of 1983, the sanctuary was retained in virtually undisturbed condition. However, the area became infested with self-sown weeds and 'weed trees'—viz., blackberry, broom, South African daisy and most importantly *Pinus radiata*. This resulted in it being an enormous fire hazard. Following the bushfires it was necessary to remove much of the damaged timber. A diminished number of stringy bark and exotic trees is all that remains.

The Board of the Botanic Gardens faces two additional problems. First, there is a demonstrated shortage of parking space in spring and autumn at the entrance to the Gardens. Secondly, the present arrangement of fencing of the sanctuary does not allow for a visual improvement to the entrance.

While conscious of its obligations to the Barton family, the Board of the Botanic Gardens now considers it in the public interest to rationalise the boundary of the sanctuary so as to improve the appearance of the upper entrance gate and provide improved car parking facilities for approximately 60 cars, in a suitably landscaped manner. At the same time the board will undertake maintenance and planting of the species which will result in fulfilling its original intended role as a bird sanctuary.

Recent correspondence between the Botanic Gardens Board and the two surviving relatives of Felix K. Barton, Miss M. Hardy and Mr R.M. Hardy, has shown that the family has no objection to the proposal. Previous discussions with the family suggested a wish to retain a mixture of native and exotic trees in the sanctuary, and so the envisaged uses within the neighbouring gardens are consistent with these wishes. The Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens are, of course, a bird sanctuary.

This Bill accordingly provides for an alteration to the boundary to the Arthur Hardy Reserve to allow for improved parking facilities and more professional landscaping of the entrance to the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 provides several necessary definitions.

Clause 4 vests the relevant piece of land in the board of the Botanic Gardens free from all pre-existing trusts and interests.

Clause 5 requires the board to use the land for the public benefit as part of the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens.

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

MARKET ACTS REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November. Page 1775.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports the Bill. This measure resulted in the closure of the East End Market in September last year. I understand that the original legislation was first introduced in this House in 1870; I refer also to the East End Market Act 1872 and the Adelaide Fruit and Produce Exchange Act 1903. I have been advised that it is necessary to pass this Bill because a certain body of opinion has suggested that unless the legislation is repealed it could in some way interfere or impede the development of the East End Market site. Let me say from the outset that the Opposition supports the development of this site.

There is insufficient development in this State, and I believe that it is essential that the area of land on which the market was previously located is prime real estate that

should be productively developed by private enterprise for the benefit of all South Australians. I am not a person who believes that it is necessary or desirable to preserve and maintain buildings which in my judgment leave much to be desired. Having had the opportunity to inspect this site, I believe that the sooner it is responsibly developed the better, because it no longer has any useful role to play.

Mr Becker: It's a good hiding place for rats and mice.

Mr GUNN: I agree with the honourable member: in its current state it certainly would be a haven and home for vermin of all types. It is unfortunate that in relocating the East End Market to the Gepps Cross site, a course of action with which I have no difficulty, the Government in its wisdom has created a situation where the sheep and pig markets at Gepps Cross have been forced to find an alternative site. These markets have been given little time, help or consideration. As I understand it, on every occasion that people have approached the Minister about this matter he has given them a lecture on urban development, which does not impress them. So, I suggest to the Minister that he and the Government have an obligation to assist people who have to provide adequate facilities for the proper marketing of stock in this State in the vicinity of Gepps Cross.

I have been advised that there are people of the view that there is sufficient land in the area to adequately meet the needs of a new market. I know of suggestions that the correct site is further out at Mallala. I am fully aware of that. It is essential that, when a Government takes a course of action that creates new facilities and development, it should be careful not to destroy or dislocate existing industries or operations. The Minister has a responsibility to ensure that everything possible is done so that any transition is as smooth as possible and in the interests of the people who stand to lose the most, that is, the producers and the breeders of livestock.

Many people believe that the Government's decision to relocate the yards at Northfield is a first step towards it completely washing its hands of the Samcor operation and removing totally any Government involvement in that operation. In fact, it may not even allow the operation to continue. Therefore, I believe that when Parliament is debating a measure of this kind the Minister has a clear responsibility to advise the House, the rural community and those people who are employed at Samcor of the Government's long-term plans for Samcor. What does the Government intend to do with the cattle yards at Gepps Cross—are they next in line?

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr GUNN: He has not told us about that. We want to know, because there has been a great deal of tub thumping and promotion about the new market at Gepps Cross which, from my examination, is an excellent facility. I have heard no real criticism of the operation so obviously everyone is happy with it. That is well and good and I have no complaint whatsoever about that.

However, I have a complaint in respect of people who will be affected by the decision to relocate. They have been shunted out of the area because in the Government's view they are part of the rural sector of the economy and have no value because, traditionally, they do not support this Government. We are aware that the Government is urban based and attracts support from within 25 kilometres of the GPO. Beyond that radius the Government loses interest rapidly. Therefore, in supporting this Bill to repeal the legislation, I point out that I am all for cleansing the statute book: there is no purpose whatsoever in having unnecessary legislation, regulation or statutory authorities of any kind.

I have no problem with that whatsoever. I hope that the Government will support my proposal presently on the Notice Paper to set up a committee to deal with a number of similar unnecessary organisations and Acts of Parliament. When the Minister responds, I call on him to indicate clearly where the Government stands on Samcor and the relocation of the cattle yards. What practical assistance will the Government give people who have to provide saleyards in the near future to deal with stock which has to be marketed in that area? The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): This Bill repeals three Acts which relate to places in the north-eastern precincts of the City of Adelaide which, to many people like me, are more or less sacred sites. My earliest memories of visiting Adelaide are of arriving well before dawn on a winter's morning on land under the care of the East End Market company, established under the East End Market Act 1872. The area was known as the 'old market', and we would travel there in a truck which was, by standards among market gardeners in those days, considered to be fairly modern. It was before the end of the Second World War when more than half the vehicles that I recall seeing were horse drawn, and there was the quite acceptable strong smell of horses, their dung and urine throughout the market. Mingling with it was the pungent odour of fresh fruit and vegetables, including cauliflower, carrots, and so on.

My point in making these remarks is to indicate that that site served the population of metropolitan Adelaide well over 100 years until in the 1970s it became evident that it was grossly inadequate. In my judgment it became inadequate in the mid-1960s when there was a massive shift in retailing away from single proprietor family owned greengrocer shops and trucks, to retailing in supermarkets.

Given the way in which its activities were regulated, the East End Market was unable to provide the facilities to meet the needs of that shift in retailing. It became less and less relevant and, in the process, it became more and more difficult for growers to get a clear focus on the supply of their fresh, perishable goods in terms of quantity relative to the demand as assessed by the greengrocers and other customers who went there to make their wholesale purchases.

The demand in the collective sense was determined by factors like the prospects of the weather for the immediate future, whether it would be cold and rainy or whether it would be hot and dry, determining the comparative demand for lines like, say, cabbages *vis-a-vis* lettuces. That being the case, supermarkets and their buyers took advantage of the situation, to the eternal chagrin of people like me who were industry minded and committed to orderly marketing—not price control but orderly marketing—in the sense that we believed that produce ought to be offered for sale and that selling should not commence prior to a particular agreed point in time at discreet intervals during the week (and that was 6 a.m.). Orders taken prior to 6 a.m. were subject to whatever price would be negotiated between grower and buyer at the time of delivery, and delivery was to commence at 7 a.m.

Sure, growers talked amongst themselves and, indeed, I met with growers. More particularly, my brother more so than I met with other growers to discuss what we assessed as being the likely demand for our perishable commodities. That was a practice we participated in knowing the good sense of doing so. It meant that the price determined, if we got it right, would just shift the quantity of perishable commodity on offer on that occasion; it would be a price sufficient to regulate demand so that there was just enough

to go around. Whether lettuces were then 10c a crate or \$1 a crate, in relation to the weather and supply, would determine whether or not they cleared that morning. On occasions when there was an absolute glut—an out and out over-supply—any price was too high, because there were always people who were prepared to simply give the stuff away rather than meet the additional inconvenience and expense of having to carry it back home again.

So much for the way in which such markets operate. It seems a pity that more members on the Government side of this Parliament have never had to make their living in, or indeed have never bothered to try to understand the nature of, that kind of arrangement.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: But I doubt whether you ever understood how price came to be the determinant of whether the available supply would or would not clear, the single most important factor in that determination.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I assure the honourable member that I would be pleased to do that. I know what anxiety can go through one's mind as one harvests the day before. Indeed, on many occasions I worked on after dark, right through the night, and saw the frost settle and the dawn break the following morning. If I were not in the market I might still be at home, as it were, in the garden trying to get more supplies of short lines or to delay the development and maturation of lines which were over-supplied by whatever techniques were at my disposal in terms of cultural husbandry. There were several, and there is no need to detail them now. They are not relevant to this measure. The important thing about this measure—and I have tried to imply it in my opening remarks—is that with the repeal of these Acts go into history a part of this State's institutions which has served the common good and best interests of all members of the general public, and that means everyone who needed fresh food.

In fact, at the time the Acts were passed refrigeration was not known and the technology by which it was possible to extend the wholesome life of fresh food from such produce was little known. Indeed, any such techniques were restricted to simply putting, say, apples in straw and placing them in a hollow where cool air would accumulate so that they were undisturbed by breezes or draughts with the straw helping to insulate. That would be about the best kind of technique available, whether for apples or anything else.

Included in those processes, I remind the House, was the technique of cutting bolts of hessian into strips, which were constantly damped down or at least one end of which was dropped into a trough of water so that, by capillarity, moisture could be moved into the hessian from which it would evaporate, taking the heat away from the produce so protected. The technology I refer to is that of the Coolgardie safe. From that kind of limited understanding of how to best achieve the desired goal of avoiding waste and unnecessary production to the current sophisticated techniques of not only storage but also transportation across great distances, we saw an institution established under the authority of three Acts to serve the interests of South Australia as no other State was served by its fresh fruit and vegetable produce exchange. Constantly consumers enjoyed cheaper prices in Adelaide and South Australia than their interstate compatriots. Market gardeners enjoyed better returns than their interstate compatriots and, in addition, the standard of produce on sale and finally available to consumers in South Australia was regarded by those people who travelled from market to market as being second to none.

In no small measure the Acts we repeal today played a big part in making that possible. It would be remiss of me if I did not, at the same time as commenting on the measure before us and its relevance to the remarks I have just made about quality and value, also point out to the House that the loss of an extremely valuable production resource in the form of the fertile soil adjacent to the Torrens River along the length of its path across the plains now part of the metropolitan area has, like the passing of the era of these markets, contributed in no small measure to the increasing costs and deteriorating potential high quality of fruit and vegetable on offer to the South Australian population in general and in the Adelaide metropolitan area in particular.

There was really no need to allow the Torrens valley to be sold for housing development: it could have been retained as rural open space and rate revenue derived from it by the local government in areas in which such rural land was established, regulated by the zoning which might have been applied to it had we the wit and wisdom to retain it. We would not now be confronting the problem that exists in Virginia with the depleted watertable, nor would we have the present difficulty in obtaining fresh fruit and vegetable from further afield had the decision been taken earlier to hang on to that very valuable and unique natural resource which, coincidentally, for decade upon decade, produced easily the best carrots, celery and so on sold not only in South Australia but all around the country.

In a nostalgic way we can all lament the passing of time and the institutions which those past times provided for us as a service to ourselves in the lives that we lived. It is not my intention to focus on simply that aspect but rather, in the course of seeing these Acts repealed, to make mention of what the passing of the era means to South Australia and how we might have done it better. In summary, the transfer of the wholesaling site from the north-east corner of the city and the precincts covered by these Acts should have been done much earlier than has been the case, in fact, 20 years earlier. We should not have listened to the bellicose rantings of the vested interests of merchants in those times; we as a Parliament (and I was not a member at that time) should have grasped the nettle 20 years sooner. As a vegetable market gardener I know what 'grasping the nettle' really means.

If we had moved the market not to where it has gone but to somewhere more sensible, central and suitable, namely, to land on the old sewage farm adjacent to the railway line near the crossing of Regency Road with the railway, the location of the State Transport Authority bus depot, it would have served the people from the southern suburbs of Adelaide as well as the market gardeners from the Adelaide Hills and further afield. Indeed, merchants requiring access to rail facilities to get goods in and out would find that site far more suitable than the current premises. Had the decision been taken, it would have cost the industry much less and contributed to far better retention of control of their own destiny by the producers of fresh fruit and vegetables—the growers—than has otherwise been the case. By failing to do this earlier we have passed too much of the initiative in the determination of price into the hands of the large buyers—the supermarket chains—and left too little power with the growers, in my judgment.

Accordingly, we have done this State no service whatever, for the profits of those large supermarkets are not reinvested in better retailing facilities in South Australia, nor are they reinvested in research work in the horticultural industries; they are taken straight out of South Australia to wherever

the head offices of those supermarkets are located. If for no other reason, that is why we should have done that.

The fresh fruit and vegetable produce exchange at Pooraka is not a success. *Hansard* of an earlier time records that I have mentioned why I consider the design to be inappropriate. It is also the subject of comment in two study reports that I have placed in the library. The geometry of the area is God-awful; it could not be worse. Any fool could have seen that and now, as I predicted, on a draughty or windy day, the open air design means that dust and debris, quite apart from odours, blow through. It makes our produce second rate on any day when there is adverse weather, especially in hot, dusty weather.

It is impossible to keep down the temperature in the showrooms. It is also impossible to keep the dust and other debris off the produce that we in South Australia must eat. By making the change to those premises, we have substantially impaired our capacity to provide the kind of shelf life that retailers could expect from the produce they purchased from growers in the precincts of the East End Market and the old market, as we knew them, on the sites that are the subject of these Acts. That is the greatest pity of all, and it is this Government's incompetence that delivered that mess to us.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): There is a degree of sentimentality in the repeal of these Acts and sometimes in this place personal sentiment can be recorded, at least for those who were long-term users of the East End Market, as growers or employees, and who, in some cases, had a pretty hard life in that regard. I take note that the member for Mitchell worked at the market and he would know that, even today, it can still be a pretty boisterous place. Once the bell went, it became a rat-race of people going in all directions with hand carts.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I agree with that, although picking brussel sprouts on a frosty morning when your own mother was crying, as you were, made you realise that it was cold and a tough game. You also learnt the lesson not to warm your hands, otherwise you got chilblains. I was sorry to see the East End Market close. Those close to me who are still in the industry did not agree with me; they supported the Pooraka site and worked hard to achieve it. The growers, by their own efforts, have done a good job in achieving their goal and in telling the Government to stand aside. However, I am not sure that, in the long term, it will prove to be the ideal place. Like the member for Murray-Mallee, I feel that there are some problems.

My great-grandmother was killed on 9 April 1888 when she was tipped from a cart near the Belair golf course on her way to the market. She was not found until many hours later. Strangely, my wife's great-grandfather was killed in Hutt Street, also going to market. He was tipped from a trolley because a steamroller being used by the city council frightened the horses and he fell from the dicky-seat and received a broken neck. That is a connecting line that went right through until I began to go to the market as a very young boy. I remember my father coming home with his first truck—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I said it would be sentimental, and it will be recorded because the actions of people in those days are not recorded today. The community of Carey Gully raised money to pay the rent on a property for 12 months so that a widow could continue to work the garden for herself and her six children.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I know what the honourable member thinks, but it will be there for others in my electorate to know, because they have that connection. In 1934, a man said to my father, 'Here is a cheque; go and buy yourself a truck, you will never survive going to market in a motor car.' It was an open cheque, with no guarantees, and the man's name was Frank Chardon. I am doubtful whether one would find that sort of person in the community today, not knowing—seeing my father had become insolvent a couple of years before—that he would ever get his money back.

When I went into the market on a permanent basis at age nine in 1939 when the War broke out, I had some hard lessons to learn. I had to learn as a boy to understand my fellow man and to take some of the rough stuff. I remember Mr Bishop senior saying to me when a chap named Johnny Moss slapped my face, as he alleged, for selling him an underweight of beans—because the scales balanced he thought that he should get a few extra—'Son, if they closed all the doors in this place and opened the ones in the north and told the honest to go out there and the dishonest to go out the south, and they all made an honest decision, not one of them would go out the north doors'. That was the sort of camaraderie that went on in that place: if you cheated once you would be known right throughout the market. I think it was a place to learn.

I suppose that the market was the core of the food supply for many areas. The member for Mitcham would know this—churches, service clubs and other groups would go through the market and ask for donations of fruit and vegetables to take to families which might be suffering or for bazaars or a service club fundraising function. Many poor families went through the scraps, the stuff that was thrown aside, and, for instance, cut out the good half of a cabbage.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: They got by. The honourable member would know that there was a Labor Government around at the time in the Federal field, but I do not think it was politics; it went right through the country. If the market was still there there would still be people going there to do that. They may still do it at Pooraka, but it is more difficult because of the sort of arrangements there.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, they do it at the supermarkets; the member for Mitchell is right. That is unfortunate, but at least they have the initiative to do it themselves. The one thing that I want to record is that I believe that, over the years, in all areas where there was a third person—a middle person—that person nearly always made the money. It was not always the small greengrocer, it was the merchants or packers, as we called them. The people who sent their goods down from the River Murray area—Murray Bridge and the member for Chaffey's area—and asked the merchants to sell them on consignment quite often got taken to the cleaners. The merchants drove around in their flash cars and had the big flash houses and the grower would get a report saying, 'five hours too ripe' or 'the market was slow'. This is the view that I have expressed about the new market where the merchants become dominant and the individual growers less significant.

I hope that we never start thinking about passing laws at the merchants' request to force everyone to sell their goods through the Pooraka market. That will be the next move, and I think that we should condemn it. Individuals should be given the opportunity to do the best they can with the goods they produce, if we are to have a free style market. The East End Market served a good purpose. The old and

new markets, as we knew them, were established by people who put their money where their mouths were, worked the buildings up, took a punt and, eventually, they or their successors made a lot of money through the increase in the value of real estate. I do not class that as exploiting; I suppose they suffered in the early days.

Perhaps one should not record some of one's early contact with the market, and I accept that argument, but it was my background. We had a tough time during the war years and, if some of today's youth had to do what we did willingly in those times, they would say to their parents, 'Get lost! We're going down to community welfare and they'll look after us.' I must accept the repeal of these Acts because they are of no use any more, but with the markets go many memories and stories of significance to the early years of this State. They were relied on for the supply of fresh vegetables and fruit, and sometimes poultry.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the Opposition for supporting the repeal of the Market Acts. Responding to comments made by the member for Murray-Mallee, the success of the Pooraka development should be put on record from the point of view of the developers and the principals involved. I think that the nods of members opposite during the speech of the member for Murray-Mallee would endorse the success of the Pooraka market, notwithstanding that the members said that it is 20 years too late. That may be so, but I wish to pass on my congratulations to the people who have managed the redevelopment of the markets.

My local fruiterers and people who use the market are delighted with it, even though people from my electorate must travel considerably farther. From what I have been told, they see nothing but advantages coming from the market. That view has been expressed to me by people in the industry, and I wanted to put that view on the record because those people who have been involved with the development might feel that in Parliament's view they have not been successful. On the contrary, the comments I have heard suggest that it has been a success and that those people who undertook the scheme should be congratulated. I am delighted to see that it is succeeding and providing a continuing service to all members of the community who have been involved in the industry. It is, in the end, of course, of benefit to the consumer.

South Australia continues to have the lowest prices for food, certainly for fruit and vegetables which figure largely as an important part of the diet. The last cost of living figures, I think, showed that South Australia enjoys the lowest level in Australia. That is a significant factor and reinforces the Government's approach and the industry's handling of the fruit and vegetable industry.

In summary, it is important that we see the passing of the East End Market in relation to future development. As the second reading explanation reported, the establishment of the East End Market involved three Acts of Parliament, in 1870, 1872 and 1903; they were private Acts known as special Acts for the purpose of giving private citizens the power and privilege to establish markets which were used for public benefit.

The Acts have very well served their purpose but now their time has come and, with the apparent support of the members of the Opposition (for which I thank them), these Acts will now be repealed and we will get on with the process of allowing the new facility at Pooraka to support and service the industry throughout this State. We are now recording another important milestone in terms of the hor-

tical industry in this State, one that I think will go on to benefit the State for many years to come.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I refer to allegations of illegal activity in the building industry against Mr T.G. Cameron: I first raised this matter in the House on 7 April last year, more than 10 months ago. I based my question to the Premier not on unsubstantiated allegations but on statutory declarations. One declaration had been made by a prominent union official. Mr Ben Carslake, a person the Premier in earlier times liked to befriend; another was made by a builder; and a third by a contractor. All pointed to practices by Mr Cameron of the type the unions have long pretended to oppose and sought to outlaw.

There were allegations of abuse of Mr Cameron's position as a union official; there was evidence of illegal activity; and there was evidence of deceiving home buyers. The Premier, in his reply, admitted, 'I will have to look at the question.' But what did he do? And, more importantly, what should he have done?

We found out yesterday that on 12 April the matter was referred to the Department of Consumer Affairs. There it remained until the Opposition revived this issue on Tuesday—more than 10 months after my original question. The Parliament is invited by the Premier and the Attorney-General to believe that this issue, of pivotal importance to factional power plays in the Labor Party, just remained buried in the bureaucracy for all this time.

The Premier said yesterday that, as no further report had been made to him or the Attorney-General, they were entitled to assume there was no need for follow up. The Attorney-General went even further and blamed public servants for the failure of this investigation. The statements of the Premier and the Attorney are a cowardly and contemptible evasion of their responsibility. What is more: they are simply not capable of being believed.

I have some personal knowledge of this matter as a result of contacts within the Public Service. I know there was concern in the Public Service that the initial report prepared by Mr K. Smith would not be acted upon. The Premier admitted yesterday that this had happened, but his explanation, his excuses, were unacceptable. The Premier said yesterday that the matter of Mr Smith's report 'was raised with the Acting Senior Assistant Registrar on occasions by normal reviewing procedures'. The Premier did not say who did this. But the House is entitled to assume it was the Minister's office. This is the normal way in which matters raised in Parliament are dealt. They are referred to the responsible department and it is the responsibility of the Minister to ensure that the department deals with them effectively and expeditiously.

The Premier also said yesterday:

At no stage was the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs or the Manager of the division made aware of the issue or of the delays which had occurred in the preparation of the report.

This is just not true. The Premier and the Minister knew the matter had been raised in Parliament in April last year. They knew it was a trigger for tension within the Labor Party. A report in the *Advertiser* on 18 January this year

revived the issue. It contained comment about delays in having the allegations investigated.

On the same day, I released a statement demanding assurances from the Government that the allegations had been fully investigated. I know that a number of journalists made contact with the Premier's Office then, a month ago, seeking comment. So it is just not credible for the Premier to claim that the Government was entitled to assume that there was no need for further follow-up. On Tuesday, in answer to my first question about the matter, the Premier said there was no basis to the allegations against Mr Cameron, but how could he assert this if the House is now asked to believe that the Premier had received no report on the departmental investigation?

The facts are clear. The Government hoped that this issue would die. The Premier and the Attorney-General failed to fulfil their ministerial responsibility to ensure a full and comprehensive investigation. On Tuesday again, the Premier tried to evade the issue only to be caught out with the production of a report he should have known about. The Premier and the Attorney-General want to protect Mr Cameron. The Premier, in particular, has used Mr Cameron to lock the left out of parliamentary preselections in the Labor Party.

Their relationship goes back a long way. At the time these abuses of union office first occurred, Mr Cameron was a paid official of the Australian Workers Union. This is the same union in which the Premier served as an industrial officer. There are statutory declarations that Mr Cameron used the offices of the AWU to engage in shoddy activity in the building industry. The Opposition presented evidence yesterday that it was continuing as recently as a year ago.

Over this whole period, the Premier and Mr Cameron have been close friends and colleagues. They have depended on each other to establish power bases in the Labor Party, yet the Premier now invites the House to believe that he knew nothing of these activities, that he knew nothing of concerns within the union movement and the Labor Party about them. If the Liberal Party can find out about them, no doubt the Premier did as well. He cannot claim selective deafness. He cannot expect the House to believe that, after this issue became a public one, he did not talk to Mr Cameron about it or hear the concerns of prominent Labor Party officials.

The Premier's statement yesterday holds no water at all. If the Government really had been interested in getting to the bottom of this matter, it could have done so long before now. There is clear evidence that Mr Cameron has been involved in illegal practices. An investigation officer in the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs established that fact almost nine months ago. What remains to be shown now is the extent of those practices. Again, however, I am concerned that the Government will try to sweep the matter under the carpet because, if Mr Cameron goes, the Left can regain control of the Labor Party. A spokesman for the Premier is quoted in this morning's *Advertiser* as saying that the investigation should be completed in two weeks. However, any proper investigation will take more than two weeks. It will require checks with the records of all council areas in which Mr Cameron has perpetrated his shonky practices; it will require interviews with people such as Mr Carslake; and contact with people who worked with Mr Cameron.

In this respect, the Opposition was contacted yesterday on behalf of a painter who did some work on houses built by Mr Cameron. In that contact, it was put to us that Mr Cameron had used many 'seconds' materials in what were purported to be new homes.

Most were of doubtful quality. His usual practice was to rent the houses out for 12 months and, one day before moving, to sell them. By borrowing the theoretical cost of the houses, he was able to keep building more. To ensure that his tenants departed peacefully at the time he required, he used a 'heavy' by the name of Eddie Watusi to avoid any conflicts with the Landlord and Tenant Act. Eventually, finance became difficult, the pyramid toppled, and one particular contractor was left holding many bills.

These are all questions which the investigation must look at. This will take longer than two weeks. Already we have one departmental report asserting a range of malpractices by Mr Cameron including: building homes as an unlicensed builder; using a builder's name and licence number without permission; no written contracts between the parties; company names and partnerships on council building applications not being registered with the Corporate Affairs Office; and threats against inspectors of the Builders Licensing Board.

Parliament now awaits the 'full and comprehensive report . . . on the extensive building and investing companies and partnerships in which Mr T.G. Cameron is involved'—the report that Mr Smith of Consumer Affairs recommended almost nine months ago should be compiled. Parliament, the public, and his own Party members can further judge Mr Cameron when this report is available. We can already conclude that there has been a complete failure of responsibility by the Premier and the Attorney-General to have investigated a matter central to factional tensions simmering in the Labor Party.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I want to take the available time this afternoon to speak about a resource within my electorate that is extremely valuable. I refer to the Parks Community Self-Help Group, which is an organisation that runs the Parks shelter. This shelter is situated near the Parks Community Centre and it works within the catchment area of the Parks Community Centre in providing a shelter for all types of people in difficulty and crisis. This centre is fairly unique inasmuch as it does not just service the requirements of the immediate area but in fact services people from all over the place. The statistics for the centre give details about where people come from and they demonstrate that many people come from other areas of the metropolitan area, interstate and even overseas.

The shelter assists all people—adults of all ages, couples, children, and entire families. Most shelters have fairly strict rules as to whom they will take, whether they specialise in families, in single or elderly people, or in single aged males, or whatever. Some shelters only deal with certain problems. Some problems relating to mental disorders and violence are not looked after and taken into the particular shelters. That is not the case with the Parks shelter. Everyone is taken care of, and the only criterion for refusal under any circumstances is if they just physically do not have enough room to accept any more people. It was interesting to note that in the past financial year 895 people were given assistance and a total of 852 people were refused entrance, purely for the reason that they just did not have the room to take them.

The Parks shelter was formed 10 years ago and has been given great assistance by the Housing Trust in that time, especially in the initial set-up stage. The initial shelter consisted of a double Housing Trust unit situated at Hamley Crescent, Angle Park, and that unit and the shelter struggled in the early days in particular. They were very hard times and I would like to pay tribute to Ina Mount, who has been heavily involved with the shelter. In fact, I think that she

was one of the founding members of the shelter and she has continued all these years to make a very heavy commitment to this very worthwhile organisation. She is still a member of the staff and does her share of roster duties. She has been President of the self-help group for many years and she is currently Secretary.

Another person who has given extremely valuable service is Joan Sharp, who has been involved for many years. Jill Prime also deserves high mention. Jill is currently the President of the self-help group and is a highly qualified nursing sister who gave up a well paid job to come down to the Parks and work hard and long hours involving lots of problems at the shelter. She is doing this work for almost no money whatsoever.

I refer also to Dr Bampton of the Parks Health Service who has given valuable service over the years and still does, not only as a member of the committee but also through his invaluable medical assistance and advice. About 4½ years ago there came a turning point with the shelter when a fire destroyed a storage shed at the back of the double unit at Henley Crescent. The group could not afford to replace the shed, and there was substantial media coverage of this situation at the time. One man approached the committee offering his help. He explained that some years previously he had decided that he would become a millionaire by the time he was 30. He achieved that ambition, certainly on paper. He referred to a substantial business crash when he was left penniless and homeless, with nowhere to go.

This man—Graham Thompson—was taken in and helped by people, which made a lasting impression on him. He was so grateful for that help and support when badly needed that it made him think, and he vowed that if ever he got back on his feet he would do whatever he could to help other people in a similar position. To his great credit, he has done that. From the time he inquired about the shed he has supported the group. He financed another shed and offered support in whatever way he could. Subsequently, he became a successful businessman again and continues to support the Parks shelter.

The shelter then shifted to Wilson Street, Mansfield Park, in a trust double unit and acquired a second double unit adjacent to the one in Haven Street. The Government funds the Wilson Street shelter, and Graham Thompson has continued over the years to fund the Haven Street shelter. This is a magnificent contribution, which is valuable in the community. Today, nine staff work at the shelter, but they receive only 1.5 salaries per year from the Government. That sum is split among the nine workers, so that it covers virtually only petrol and a few out of pocket expenses. Staff work 24 hour shifts from 10 a.m. to 10 a.m., two staff members per shift. The majority of the staff do two shifts per week.

The only charge at the shelter is for food. The charge of \$25 a week is imposed for each adult and \$1 a day for children. Evidence that this charge only covers the food bill is that last year the total food bill amounted to \$23 508, while the charges levied by the shelter brought in \$23 977. The shelter just broke even on that expense. As I said, the shelter caters not only for individuals but couples and families. It provides shelter, food, assistance and advice. The shelter regularly liaises with me as the local member.

I am approached by people who are in desperate need of shelter. I refer them on to the Parks shelter. If the staff have any problems that I can help with, they come to me. The shelter staff also liaise with the Housing Trust, the Department for Community Welfare office in the immediate area, the police, the local government, local doctors,

the Parks Community Centre, Crisis Care, local churches and so on. It is a magnificent community network set up to give mutual support.

Last year alcohol abuse was very high on the list of problems concerning users of the shelter. This year the major problem for people using the shelter seems to be just an inability to cope. In addition, there is an unusual number of quite elderly people seeking refuge at the shelter. The incidence of victims of domestic violence is also very high. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a statistical list of these issues.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can you assure me that the matter is purely statistical?

Mr De LAINE: Yes.

Leave granted.

Parks Community Self-Help Group

Statistics from September 1987 to August 1988

Persons accommodated at shelter:

Adults	435
Children	351
15-20 year olds	109
	895

Referred by:

Crisis Care	404
DCW	81
Lifeline	8
Social Security	37
PSHG	113
Emergency Housing	77
Self	100
Other	75

Reason for referral:

Homeless	601
Domestic violence	182
Unable to cope	94
Other	18

Locality where came from:

Local	89
Metropolitan	441
Interstate	244
Country	111
Overseas	10

The total number of people refused shelter during the period September 1987 to August 1988 was 852.

This total consists of men, women and children.

On leaving shelter:

Returned to family	90
Moved to flat/house	184
Went to friends	93
Moved to trust homes	61
Moved to other shelters	48
Went interstate	132
Admitted to Hillcrest	2
Not known	120
Other	165

Resources used while in shelter:

DCW	443
Foster Care	—
Housing Trust	189
Emergency Housing	102
Public Hospitals	41
Glenside	2
Hillcrest	2
Parks Health Centre	139
Dr Chan	—
Locum Dr (after hours)	46
Ambulance	4
Lifeline	—
Crisis Care	212
Police	19
Salvation Army	29
Social Security	92
Mansfield Park School	17
Family Planning	35
CAFHS Sister	20
Legal Aid	15
Parks High School	6
Rape Crisis Centre	3
Other	—

Mr De LAINE: I believe that this shelter is unique in South Australia and possibly Australia. There is a fine group of people on the management committee. There are representatives of many local organisations and valuable assistance is given, as I have said before, by Dr Bampton and Parks Health Centre, the Housing Trust, the Parks Information Centre and the police. Bearing in mind some of the very violent people who come to the shelter looking for spouses that they have beaten up, and so forth, there is quite a high risk to the staff. There can also be risk as a result of the psychiatric problems of people seeking shelter at the refuge. The number of staff is fairly substantial but I am pleased to say that the local police look after the shelter very well. They come past and keep a very close watch on the place.

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): Earlier this afternoon the member for Mitcham gave us a very instructive 10 minutes outlining the details of the conduct of the Secretary of the ALP, the relationship between the Secretary and the Premier and the difficulties that that is causing to the Labor Party. However, 10 minutes is scarcely enough to even begin to analyse the machinations in the Labor Party that have arisen as a result of this tremendous brawl that has been in the making for 10 years and which, as yet, has not been resolved. It is very easy to follow these events because of the enormous media coverage. In fact, when I checked the background I was surprised at the number of column centimetres that have been devoted to brawling in the ALP.

Of the whole activity so far (the very high point, is probably yet to come when the ALP or the Government, deals with Mr Cameron) was reached with a substantial headline in the *Sunday Mail* of 15 January which read, 'Punches thrown in Labor brawl'. The article read:

Bitter faction-fighting for control of the Labor Party erupted into as barroom brawl on Friday night . . . sources said one left supporter abused Mr Paul Dunstan and threw a punch. He was dragged off by friends but later made several attempts to hit Mr Cameron. Mr Cameron is a former official of the union—

that is, the AWU—

and a prominent member of the centre.

In the *Advertiser* the next morning we read that it was more than a punch that was thrown; efforts were made to smash a beer glass into Mr Cameron's face. All of this is part of what has been described as a 'tale of intrigue and deception that rivals any novel'. They are not my words; they are the words of Mr Justice Northrop of the Federal Court who had to hear the case brought by the AWU and its protagonists. That case was brought in an attempt to resolve this power struggle. It is clear that the struggle has not yet been resolved.

It is interesting that those who obviously have an acute interest in this issue suddenly find they have an even more acute interest in the papers that they have before them. ALP members are looking in every direction to make sure that they do not have to hear the truth about the Party to which they belong. The Party to which they belong has, as part of its constitution and general rules, a rule according to the governing body. Rule 6 (a) (1) states:

The supreme authority of the Party in the State shall be convention. Its decision shall be binding on all members of the Party.

If one follows that through, one will realise that all members of the Party, which includes the parliamentary members, are bound by whoever has the majority on the floor of the convention. The struggle for power that is currently going on in relation to the floor of the convention is being settled not by reasoned debate and argument or issues on their merits but by punches in bar room brawls, by crude weight

of numbers, and by beer glasses being smashed into the faces of people who do not toe the union line.

It is a pleasant thought for South Australians that the Government they elected is now being controlled by thugs! That is what the media reports, none of which have been denied, clearly show—a Party controlled by thugs and standover men, and some of them are now in the minority. But with the events of this week and Mr Cameron's depredations (shall we describe them kindly) being brought to public light, it has been interesting to watch the faces of members of the Government as these matters have been revealed in Parliament.

I think very few of us have seen the Premier looking so pale around the gills as he did this week when questions about Mr Cameron were being asked. On the other side of the coin, very few of us have seen the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture looking like a couple of pussy cats who had swallowed the cream. Yesterday, they were absolutely delighted when the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham got to their feet—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE: Yes, they even wanted copies of what had been read to the House by way of detail of Mr Cameron's misdoings. As we walk around the corridors we see the Hon. Terry Roberts and the Hon. George Weatherill looking immensely cheerful; they really look as if they have something to be delighted about. They are the happiest they have ever been because they can see that at the end of this brawling road there is the possibility that once again they may gain the numbers on the floor of the convention.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE: The person who is really suffering in all this is the Premier. A correspondent for the *News* (Allan Yates) on Tuesday 17 January stated:

While Mr Bannon has a firm grip on the parliamentary Labor Party, he does not have the same comfort zone at the machine level.

It would be fair to say that anyone who was watching the Premier yesterday would say that he was definitely not in a state of comfort; in fact, he looked extremely uncomfortable, as well he might. He was described by Ms Deborah Cornwall, writing in the *Advertiser* of 19 January, as being in an 'invidious' position. Ms Cornwall was quoting a key power broker for the embattled left faction, Mr Mick Tumbers, who admitted that the move—that is, the move to force the union into a last resort option—had placed the Premier in an 'invidious' position. The article states:

He said the failure of Mr Bannon, as national ALP President, to resolve the factional tensions between the union movement and his own ALP branch now threatened to destabilise the Government.

There you have a member of the left saying that the Government is being destabilised. Another member of the left, Mr Terry Roberts, MLC, the left convener—

Mr Oswald: The one with the smile on his face.

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE: Yes, the one who is looking terribly cheerful this week. But of course Mr Roberts always looks cheerful, and he has reason to be. He is well-represented in this Parliament, he lives in my electorate and he and I are on good terms. The *Advertiser* of 16 January states:

Mr Roberts said the battle for voting control at the convention had become so intense the faction brawling had 'spilled over' into the unions which represented 60 per cent of the convention votes. What we have now is a New South Wales-type situation where the dissatisfaction amongst the factions is filtering into the sub-branches and the unions. In New South Wales the interference in union ballots and the stacking of branch memberships was the

direct result of the Party machine's refusal to accommodate all factions.

Of course, we know what happened in New South Wales: Stephen Loosley was sort of dispensed with not long before the New South Wales election and we know what happened to the Labor Government in the New South Wales election. We can see a re-run of that about to happen in South Australia. It is interesting to contemplate the plight of a political Party deprived of its general secretary weeks or months—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE: —in any event, in a very short time before an election. We know that the left has been able to win preselection for only one candidate of the 10 nominated in the past two State conventions. It is fascinating to see in the current issue of the *Labor Herald*—that esteemed journal—the build-up for the new ALP politicians. On page 2, the heading is: 'Our politicians—the next generation'. We have some smiling faces: Mr Colin

McKee, the candidate for Gilles; Mr Paul Holloway, the candidate for Mitchell; Ms Colleen Hutchison, the candidate for Stuart; Mr Michael Atkinson, the candidate for Spence; and Mr Kevin Foley, the candidate for Semaphore; and there are a couple of other candidates—for Mitcham and for Hanson—who will not make it. In fact, it is doubtful whether some of those I have named will make it. On another page there is a subheading, 'More new candidates'. Who do we have there? We can only assume that they are members of the left. They are no longer in favour. Mr John Quirke is described as another new candidate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE: Perhaps members opposite will tell me whether Mr Quirke is a permanent member of the centre left.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 21 February at 2 p.m.