

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 16 October 1979

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Council, say, first, by what date the 7 000 jobs for young people promised by the Liberal Party during the election campaign will be created and, secondly, by what date the 10 000 jobs promised by the Liberal Party during the election campaign will be created?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: During the course of the election campaign, no specific date was given by which the jobs would be created. It was said during the campaign that, as a result of the Liberal Party's policies, those additional jobs would be created in the South Australian community.

After the past nine years of Labor Government, it will, of course, be an extremely difficult task for the Government to revive the South Australian economy as quickly as it would like to do. We have already indicated initiatives that the Government is taking to put the economy on a better course, with a view, in the longer term, to establishing job opportunities for those people in South Australia who are presently unemployed.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister say how it was possible during the election campaign for the Liberal Party to be absolutely precise about the creation of 7 000 jobs and 10 000 jobs respectively but how he can now be so vague about the date by which these jobs will be created?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Liberal Party was able to be relatively precise in assessing the number of jobs expected to be created by its initiatives. Since assuming office the Government has been undertaking a review of the previous Government's programmes and has had access to information, which was not available to it previously, indicating the difficult task for the Government in getting the economy back on the rails. However, there is already an air of confidence in the business and commercial community, as well as among the people of South Australia generally, and this, combined with the initiatives that the Government will be able to initiate and implement, indicates that there will be substantial employment prospects in the future.

PLAGUE LOCUSTS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Minister of Agriculture is well aware that South Australia is facing a serious threat from plague locusts this year. Part of the control programme developed by the Labor Government over the past several months involved the use of aircraft to spray larger swarms of hoppers. I assume that this is not one of the many programmes developed by the Labor Government to assist people in this State that the Liberal

Government has decided to cancel. If the plan is to go ahead, the aerial spraying programme may be in some jeopardy as a result of the severe shortage of Avgas in Australia. I would like an assurance from the Minister that the reserves of Avgas arranged by the Labor Government for this programme are still available. Can the Minister still assure the Council that there will be adequate reserves of Avgas on hand to cope with all requirements, and will he say whether he has taken steps to ensure that priority is given to implementing control measures to combat the locusts, and outline what those steps are?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Acknowledging that the Government cannot say precisely when the 7 000 and 10 000 jobs promised by the Liberal Party during the recent election campaign will be created, can the Minister give the Council some approximate date by which it is expected that the jobs will be available for unemployed people in South Australia?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: No.

TUBERCULOSIS

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about tuberculosis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: A recent newspaper report referred to the tuberculosis threat to Australia from incoming refugees. According to the report, the *Australian Medical Journal* warns that Australians are particularly vulnerable because of their low exposure to this disease, and because most people have received no vaccinations and there is no compulsory regular medical check in respect of this disease as there was some years ago. First, as this disease is easily transmitted and spreads rapidly, can the Minister assure the people of South Australia that every precaution is being taken to ensure that the community is being protected against any outbreak of tuberculosis? Secondly, can the Minister assure the people of South Australia that the Government's promise of severe financial restraint on the South Australian Health Commission will in no way jeopardise or embarrass the Health Department in its attempt to control this disease?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Leader of the Government in this Chamber anticipate that the jobs referred to in my previous questions will be created within one year, 10 years, or some period in between? If it is not possible to estimate within those periods when the jobs will be created, can the Minister give the Council any idea when those election promises will be fulfilled?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not prepared to give the honourable member any indication of a fixed time by which that objective would have been achieved. As I have already indicated, we came into office with a very difficult economic situation in this State, which had the worst

unemployment of any State in Australia.

That is one of the difficulties we have to overcome. The policy speech, as well as the Budget, which honourable members will have an opportunity to consider in detail later, indicate that we are prepared to act quickly to restore confidence in South Australia. We intend to introduce a number of taxation concessions and they will have a direct effect on the confidence of people in South Australia.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Community Welfare.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Minister would be aware of the latest union-bashing exercise by the Federal Government in legislating to deprive people who are stood down, through no fault of their own, because of an industrial dispute, within the same union, taking place possibly in a completely different part of Australia. The Minister would also be aware that the Federal Government indulges in these exercises almost weekly in the hope of some short-term political gain. Whilst there may be some short-term political gain, it is certainly against the long-term interests of all Australians.

Does the Minister of Community Welfare agree with the decision of his Federal counterpart (Senator Guilfoyle) to no longer pay unemployment benefits to workers who are stood down through industrial action to which they are not a party? How will the Minister advise his department on its payment of benefits to people in distress through being denied unemployment benefits by the Federal Government? Further, what is the approximate additional cost to the State of meeting the needs of people so distressed by the Federal Government (unless, of course, the Minister is going to allow them to starve)?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The guidelines for the payment of Community Welfare Department benefits have not been changed, and I do not propose to change them. People who qualify for those benefits at present will continue to qualify. Without first consulting officers of my department, I cannot answer the question about cost, but I will consult with the officers and bring down a reply.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question also about the payment of benefits.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The other day I asked the Minister a question similar to the one just asked, and he answered me by saying that he would look at the matter. Today, however, the Minister has given a different answer altogether. He said that benefits would continue to be paid along the same lines as they are paid now. I point out to the Minister that most benefits are paid on the basis of guidelines determined by the present Federal Government.

One matter that worries me a great deal was raised last week, and I refer to the possibility of the Federal Government denying unemployment benefits to people who seek some form of training and who, it may be considered, possibly come within the education system. A very good letter from a member of the community appears in today's *Advertiser*, referring to the Federal Government's proposals. I am concerned that the State Government will fall into line with the Federal Government and not pay any attention to the plight of

those people who are denied benefits. Does the Minister consider that many young teenage people in the community will be denied benefits because of the possibility that the Federal Government will introduce the scheme outlined by Mr. Viner at a youth conference in Canberra several days ago?

Will the Minister say whether his department will pay a benefit that is being denied people by the Federal Government? There is a precedent here, when members recall what has been done in the past by a previous Government.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: When asked a question last Thursday, I did not give a weak answer. The answer I gave (page 12 of *Hansard*) is as follows:

My department will continue the policy that it had previously regarding community welfare and community welfare payments. Where unemployed persons have claims on my department under the existing guidelines, those claims will be met.

That was quite consistent with the answer I gave the Hon. Mr. Blevins, and that is my answer to the honourable member now. Where a person, whether unemployed or not, and for whatever cause, has a claim under the existing guidelines or rules, it will be met.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister reveal where the guidelines are parallel with those applying to the benefits provided by the Federal Department of Social Security, and will he have them published?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will provide for the honourable member, and make public in the Council details of the guidelines or rules.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General say why the Liberal Party, during the election campaign, in addition to giving the specific indication that 7 000 and 10 000 jobs respectively would be created, did not indicate also to the public within what time or by what date such jobs would be created?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Party indicated the jobs that were expected to flow from the implementation of the policies that it presented to the people of South Australia. We continue to believe that that is a reasonable estimate of opportunities which will be created by the implementation of those policies. We did not tell the people of South Australia by what time we expected to achieve the job opportunities, simply because we were not in Government and did not have access to information—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:—on which we could base any estimate. In any event, it depends on so many contingencies that it would have been quite irresponsible for us to make that specification.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General make a statement to the Council in the near future, when the Government has assessed all the information that it did not have at hand when it was not in Government, indicating whether or not there is any revised estimate of the 7 000 and 10 000 jobs? When it has that information, will it then be able to say by which date these jobs will be created?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The matter will be considered by the Government, which will then consider whether or not it is responsible for it to make that decision and what sort of statement should be made.

BOAT LAUNCHING FACILITIES

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment. In view of the Government's dedication to cutting almost all forms of public spending, will it abandon the previous Government's commitment to provide a major recreational boat launching facility in the southern metropolitan area? If not, when will it proceed, and how does it propose to finance such a project?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

BIRD SMUGGLING

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Attorney-General a question regarding the smuggling of and trafficking in birds.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: In June, the former Premier (Hon. J. D. Corcoran), Attorney-General (Hon. C. J. Sumner) and Minister of Environment (Hon. J. R. Cornwall) asked the Police Commissioner, Mr. Draper, to call for a full police investigation into allegations of smuggling of and trafficking in birds. Although the new Government has said nothing regarding the matter, I have received requests from officers in the National Parks and Wildlife Division to ask this question in the Council.

There being much speculation in the division that charges are to be laid against certain officers, morale is not good. Indeed, speculation about this matter is not good, either.

If one has read the press reports and followed this matter, one would realise that it is recognised as a multi-million dollar smuggling racket. Although I have read only briefly about certain species of bird, it seems to me that many of these birds can be sold overseas for up to \$10 000. In view of the concern being expressed by people that these birds are being killed in the course of being trapped and that some of them are being crushed and killed in the course of being sent overseas, will the Attorney-General say when the results of the police investigations into bird trapping and smuggling initiated by the former Government will be known? Secondly, have the tapes recorded by Mr. Bert Field been acquired by the police? Thirdly, how was this achieved, and, finally, is it likely that arrests and prosecutions will follow in the near future?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Although I am aware that an inquiry is at present being undertaken, I am not aware of its present status. However, I will refer the matter to the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Environment with a view to obtaining a report for the honourable member.

URANIUM WASTE DISPOSAL

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question regarding uranium waste disposal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy have continually assured Parliament that the problem of disposing of high-level radioactive wastes is solved by the method of vitrification. The Premier told Parliament on 31 July that the waste disposal problem was not now a technical one but basically one of public relations and reassurance. A report in the 15 January 1979 issue of *Newsweek* stated:

U.S. scientists have dismissed the French technique of vitrification (locking the waste in glass) as too dangerous because it involves liquefaction of intensely poisonous wastes at high temperatures. Tests have shown the glass to be unstable, and subject to cracking, which could lead to leaks.

In view of this report, does the Minister still claim that vitrification is a safe and proven method of permanent waste disposal and, if so, on what grounds does he make this claim?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

OVERSEAS TRAVEL

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the Minister of Agriculture has made provision for any overseas travel for the forthcoming 12 months? If so, will the Minister tell the Council which countries the Minister of Agriculture intends to visit? When does he intend to travel to those countries; for what purpose is he doing so; and, finally, who will accompany him, and for what purpose?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with my colleague regarding the matter. In the meantime, however, I assure the honourable member that the Minister of Agriculture does not intend to travel overseas. That aspect was misreported. The report related to the amount of money to be spent on overseas travel. That sum of money is partly for travel by officers and partly for the expenses incurred during the trip by the previous Minister and his wife. However, the present Minister of Agriculture does not intend in the near future or in the next 12 months to travel overseas at all, but I will consult with him further and bring back a reply.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I find it difficult to understand how provision could be made and be referred to in the press in relation to overseas travel and including my overseas visit earlier this year, as all the costs associated with that trip were covered previously. I find quite satisfactory the Minister's explanation regarding departmental officers. However, I find it difficult to understand how the Minister of Community Welfare can imply that some of the provisions in this year's Budget can relate to costs that were completely covered during the previous year.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My colleague's report will make that clear.

ABATTOIRS LEGISLATION

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the Minister of Agriculture intends to introduce before the December recess legislation announced in the Governor's Speech concerning meat hygiene to enable quotas on the entry of meat into the inner-metropolitan area (that is, the Samcor trading area) to be lifted? Has the Minister of Agriculture altered the terms of any quotas on the entry of meat into the Samcor area since 15 September? To whom were the altered quotas given? What were the terms of the original quotas, and what are the terms of the altered quotas? Finally, is the Minister convinced that the quotas for the two Mount Gambier abattoirs are adequate to maintain employment in those works?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with my colleague and bring back a reply.

FLAMMABLE FURNITURE

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question relating to flammable furniture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: In the United Kingdom recently, a departmental store fire was responsible for the deaths of 10 people.

At the inquest the Coroner was told that furniture containing polyurethane and polypropylene was responsible for the rapid spread of the fire. I believe that the burning of these materials creates high levels of smoke and toxic gases. It is the home use of these things that I am more interested in, because of the danger from fires, radiators and cigarette butts.

—Can the Minister say whether the manufacturers of these products supply sufficient warning or instruction about the handling and use of these articles? If these types of article are handled in South Australia, and such warning or instruction is not given on those articles, will the Minister take the necessary action to ensure that warning on handling and use of the articles is given to all purchasers?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not aware of the details that the honourable member wants. I will consult with my officers and bring back a detailed reply. I can certainly give the honourable member the assurance that, if any further warning is needed on any article, I will make sure that it is given.

FISHING LICENCES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Minister of Fisheries has explained the Liberal Government's policy concerning B class fishing licence holders in the following terms:

We will preserve the right of the present holders of B class scale licences to continue their practice, but will phase them out by attrition.

Will the Minister explain what he means by "attrition"? On what terms and conditions will B class licence renewals be refused in the licensing period 1980-81? On what terms and conditions will B class licence renewals be refused in the following year? What is the estimated period at the end of which B class licences will cease to exist because of this process of attrition? Does the Minister intend to end the limited moratorium on conversion of B class licences to A class licences for those part-time fishermen wishing to convert their part-time fishing activity to a full-time one? Will the right of remaining B class fishermen to have employees be altered in any way?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

LIBERAL PARTY ADVERTISEMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is further to one I asked last Thursday relating to an advertisement which was published by the Liberal Party during the recent election campaign and about which a trenchant complaint was made by the Australian Democrats' representative, the Hon. Mr. Milne, in this Chamber. By whom was that Liberal Party advertisement perused? What advice did the Attorney-General receive? Was the advertisement con-

trary to the Electoral Act, or misleading? Was it unanimous advice that the Minister received? Was a written opinion obtained and, if so, will that opinion be tabled?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I do not intend to disclose to this Council who gave me advice on legal matters; nor do I intend to table that advice in respect of this or any other matter. I indicated to the Council last Thursday that the advertisement, about which the Hon. Mr. Milne made some complaint at the declaration of the Legislative Council poll and about which the Leader of the Opposition raised a question, had been perused and that I was satisfied that it did not infringe the Electoral Act and that the statements contained in it were accurate.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Was the perusal carried out by departmental officers or by some other independent person? If it was carried out by an independent person, will the Attorney-General indicate from whom the opinion was obtained?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not prepared to disclose that. If the Leader questions the validity of the advice, it is competent for him to seek his own advice and draw my attention to any finding if it conflicts with the answer I have already given to the Council.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Was the advice received from one or other of the Attorney-General's departments?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have already answered, and I am not prepared to take this point any further.

CIGARETTE SMOKING

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Minister would be aware of his colleague's concern about damage done to the health of people in this community who are, unfortunately, addicted to tobacco. Immediately upon taking office as Minister of Health, the Minister gave a lecture to an air-conditioning organisation expressing her delight in fresh air, a healthy lifestyle, and various other matters. If my memory serves me correctly, she introduced a private member's Bill further to restrict the sale of cigarettes to minors; that was a good idea.

The Federal Health Department issues a list showing the amount of tar and nicotine in different brands of cigarettes so that people who have this addiction can minimise the damage done to their health by smoking the brand of cigarette that contains the least amount of damaging substances. The problem is that not everybody reads that list; the lists are not all that freely available. It would not be a bad idea for the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes to be clearly displayed on the packet; then, people would be perfectly clear as to how much damage they were going to do to their lungs and other organs. Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to do everything in her power to have the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes marked on the packets, along with the warning that smoking is a health hazard?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with my colleague and bring down a reply.

LIBERAL PARTY ADVERTISEMENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General ask officers of the Crown Law Office to give him an opinion on the electoral advertisements to which I referred earlier?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I do not see that I need take the matter further. I have indicated what the advice has been.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Not from the Crown Law Office.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have indicated what the advice has been, from wherever it has come. It seems to me that that answer suffices. If the Leader wants to take his own advice, he is entitled to do so.

CRIME

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General say by when the level of violent crime in South Australia will be reduced, as promised by the Liberal Party in the recent election campaign?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is incredible that, having been in Government only a short time ago, honourable members opposite seek to establish fixed time limits on matters.

We made a promise to the people of South Australia that, in respect of the incidence of crime, we would give every assistance to the Police Force, and that we would take other initiatives in the community to assist in reducing the incidence of crime. That is a promise that we made. It is not a target that can be measured in terms of time.

PRIVATE SCHOOL

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a short statement before addressing a question on a new private school to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I understand that during August a public meeting was held and sponsored by a group known as the Torrens Valley Christian School Association for Christian Parent-controlled Education regarding the establishing of a school for Christ-centred education. Some of the publicity matter in support of that meeting stressed the following points:

Christian education requires a Christian point of view for the whole curriculum, a God-centred programme in every department and "born-again" educators. It is a school that understands and seeks to be Christian every hour of the school day. The Christian church brings the Bible from Sunday's church into Monday's classroom, and it opens all of its other books in the light of that basic text.

Much more information is contained in the sheet that was sent to me. I understand that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the setting up of a school by the Torrens Valley Christian School Association for Christian parent-controlled education, and it indicates that this group intends to start a school in 1980. Has this group applied for a licence, as required by the Education Act, to run a private school in South Australia in 1980; where will the school be situated; what will be its enrolment; what fees will it charge; and what grades will it cater for? Further, has provision been made for a grant to be made to this school for 1980 by the committee which distributes State Government grants to private schools and, if this is so, in which category of grants is it catered for? Finally, if no licence has been granted, will the Minister ensure that no unlicensed private school is opened in South Australia next year?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Minister of Education and bring down a reply.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE DIVISION

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a statement before directing a question concerning the environment to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: First, does the Government propose to second a senior officer or officers from the Criminal Investigation Branch of the Police Department to assist in the reorganisation of the inspection section of the National Parks and Wildlife Division? Secondly, have discussions been held with the Commissioner of Police regarding secondment? Thirdly, what are the names of officers to be seconded? Fourthly, in view of the Government's proposal to reduce Public Service numbers, how can an adequate permanent inspection service be provided?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will consult with my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

MIGRANT VOTING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Minister of Local Government believe that there is any discrimination between migrants from different countries in their voting rights in Australia? If he does, what is this discrimination, and how does the Minister intend to resolve it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The matter to which the honourable member refers is associated with the policy that his Party brought forward prior to the recent election. That policy, as I recall it, was one in which his Party proposed, if re-elected, to allow voting rights for migrants immediately upon their taking up residence—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You're not right.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: A certain period of time was involved. It was certainly prior to their becoming naturalised or taking out Australian citizenship. The view of my Party at the time, and it remains the view of my Party, was that such people ought not to have the right to vote in State elections until such time—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: All the migrants?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No. Some migrants are British subjects—not only migrants from Britain but also migrants from other countries such as Canada—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Malta.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This is a situation that the Government of the day should keep before it. It can be said that discrimination exists because of the question of some migrants being British subjects and others not being British subjects. As I said a moment ago, it remains the policy of my Party that, at this stage, we do not intend to take any immediate action in the matter.

VALUATIONS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question on valuations to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: At the time that the last valuation notices were issued by the Valuer-General there was a great stir in the community, orchestrated and led by the then Opposition. In fact, it had become an annual event over many years. During that time, believing that they had no chance of finishing up in Government in the

foreseeable future, the then Opposition was prepared to make all sorts of irresponsible promises. It made many rash statements about how valuations should be arrived at, about how there should be a reassessment made, and about how there should be appeal panels. A number of other quite irresponsible suggestions were made. Therefore, does the Government intend to amend the Valuation Act; secondly, if it does, what amendments does it propose; and, thirdly, will it interfere with the statutory functions, powers and independence of the Valuer-General?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall refer those questions to the Minister of Lands.

POLICE FIREARMS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Can the Minister of Local Government, on behalf of the Chief Secretary, bring down replies to the following questions about police wearing exposed hand-guns: (1) Prior to the announcement by the Commissioner of Police was the Government informed of the decision of the Commissioner of Police to allow police officers to wear exposed hand-guns? (2) If so, who was informed? (3) Was the matter referred to, and/or discussed, in Cabinet? (4) Does the Government agree with that decision? (5) If so, what are the grounds for its agreement? (6) Does the Government believe that conditions in South Australia are so different to those in the United Kingdom to warrant that decision? (7) If so, what different conditions exist in South Australia? (8) Is this a matter solely a decision for the Commissioner of Police? (9) What are the present rules regarding the carrying of firearms by police officers? (10) Will the Government table the documents and the report on which this decision was based? (11) How many police officers' lives have been endangered in the last 12 months as a result of the current provision relating to the use of firearms? (12) What are the details of each incident where a police officer's life has been so endangered? (13) Is the Government prepared to review the decision and allow the public and any interested bodies to comment on it before the matter is proceeded with?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will forward those questions to the Chief Secretary and bring down his replies.

CRIME

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Attorney-General on the incidence of crime.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: During the recent election campaign some of us had to suffer the present Attorney-General appearing on the steps in front of Parliament House in a television commercial on behalf of the Liberal Party. I will not shout out that the Liberal Party won that election; we know that. The Attorney-General stood in front of this building, was quizzed by somebody from the news media, and proudly proclaimed that, if he and his colleagues became the Government of this State, crime would be reduced. The day after the Liberal Party assumed the right to office, Parliament House was broken into and a considerable number of costly items of electrical equipment were stolen from the House of Assembly, only a few feet from where the Attorney-General told the public four days before that he was going to reduce crime.

I also understand that a multi-national international agency has a card entry system into this building and into

the Festival Theatre car park. I have questioned this before and I intend to question it again. Members of the public have access to that car park and in some way or another have procured or acquired cards to operate the boom gates into the car park. On one occasion one person, using a card, entered this building. It could have come about after a member of the Liberal Party lost his card and admitted that he had printed on the back of it, "If found, please return to Parliament House." He was a real brain, but the Liberal Party are full of them, so I suppose that compliment will not go astray.

The PRESIDENT: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the time for questions has almost expired, but I will allow him to finish his question.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Attorney-General say what measures he will take to stop the high incidence of break-ins at Parliament House, which have increased 100 per cent since his Party took office, and will he ensure that there is not a recurrence? Will he also ask the Minister of Education what security measures will be taken against the ever-increasing crime of arson in public and private schools? Surely the Minister can answer those questions without procrastinating.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The security of Parliament House is a matter for you, Mr. President, and the Speaker in another place. If the honourable member wishes me to take up the matter formally with you and the Speaker, I will do that. Prior to the election I did not indicate—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, you did. You get the transcript and fetch it back here.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I did not indicate that this Government would substantially reduce crime. I drew attention to a problem in the community regarding violent crime and indicated measures that we would introduce in Government with a view to reducing that crime.

The question of arson is one of a whole area of offences that concerns this Government, as I imagine it concerned the previous Government. I will refer the question of security measures that will be adopted at schools and other facilities to the Minister of Education and bring down a reply.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and the Hons. F. T. Blevins, M. B. Dawkins, K. T. Griffin, and C. J. Sumner.

Library: The President and the Hons. F. T. Blevins, J. A. Carnie, and Anne Levy.

Printing: The Hons. G. L. Bruce, M. B. Cameron, L. H. Davis, R. J. Ritson, and Barbara Wiese.

Later:

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of sessional committees.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The House of Assembly intimated its appointment of four members to the Joint House Committee.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That, in accordance with section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, the Legislative Council members on the committee be the President and the Hons. C. W. Creedon, N. K. Foster, and R. J. Ritson.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That, in accordance with Standing Orders 19 to 31, the Legislative Council members on the committee be the Hons. J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, and N. K. Foster.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Hons. D. H. Laidlaw and Anne Levy be the members to represent the Legislative Council on the Council of the University of Adelaide.

Motion carried.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA COUNCIL

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That two members of the Legislative Council be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia as provided by the Flinders University of South Australia Act, 1966-1973.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, the Hons. L. H. Davis and Barbara Wiese were declared elected.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

In moving this motion, I am aware of the conventional references to the work and quality of past honourable members who are no longer in the Council but, because I am so newly elected, I feel it inappropriate to make exact references to people whom I perhaps did not know well and with whom I did not work. However, I would say that, coming newly elected to this Council, I have a deep sense of history and of reverence for the democratic processes which have evolved in this place and which, hopefully, are still evolving.

I declare my respect for all past members who have devoted their lives and careers to the service of South Australia in this place, and I thank particularly those honourable members on both sides of the Council who have offered to me gestures of welcome and friendship. I should like to make a pledge to you all: that, no matter how I may argue against an idea or notion in this Council, I will never vilify or attack a person or his reputation,

because such a behaviour demeans and diminishes the dignity of this Council and earns the disrespect of the South Australian electorate.

I thank His Excellency for his Opening Speech and I urge all honourable members to approve in general terms the bulk of such legislative programmes as may come before us in accordance with the wishes of the electors of South Australia.

When reading through His Excellency's address, searching for a main theme I came upon a small and inconspicuous sentence which made me wonder and worry about the issue of freedom. I thank Opposition members for paying more attention to me than the members of my own Party.

I am worried about the issues of freedom and over-regulation in this society. His Excellency's remarks about the Boating Act were fascinating, because this is a real example of the insidious erosion of people's freedoms for no purpose whatsoever. There will not be time for me, even though my time for this speech is unlimited, to analyse this matter. The absurdities in the Act are also unlimited, so I will mention just a couple of them.

The Act speaks of tenders. Anyone who has messed about in boats is aware that a tender is a little boat which has a parent boat and which exists only to serve that parent boat. The people that drafted this Act and these regulations obviously thought that, if they exempted tenders, people would take these little boats duck shooting or trout fishing in the Snowy Mountains. Thinking that they would have to restrict this, they decided to define a tender as a boat used for transport between a parent vessel and the shore and for no other purpose. Everyone with a tender knows that one sometimes ties it up to the side of a boat, sits in the tender and perhaps paints the side of the boat, or goes from one boat to another.

The plain words of the Act require that boat, when it is tied up alongside the parent boat, to be groaning under the full load of safety equipment, and, as soon as one casts off, the safety equipment can be ditched, and one can proceed ashore. Anyone who owns a motor boat must have a licence. There are some 60 000 licensed motor-boat drivers in this State. In electoral terms, that is about one quota for the election of a member to this Council. If the operator of one of those motor boats invites a guest who is a master mariner or a senior naval officer with destroyer command experience, but has no motor boat licence, to come boating with him, that person cannot touch the helm of the boat. If one has a young son whom one takes sailing when it is very calm and there is no ripple on the water, and the engine of the vessel starts, with the boat moving at about 3 m.p.h., the young son cannot touch the helm of that boat. However, if in Investigator Strait a storm blows up to a force-10 gale and the engine is switched off, the boy can be left on watch because the vessel is not a motor boat.

I could proceed through the Act to demonstrate the consequences of fixing a one-horsepower outboard on a racing-eight or scull and tell honourable members of the number of anchors required, etc. The requirements for carrying fresh water do not seem to be exempted for boats in the middle of Lake Alexandrina. The whole point of my opening up this area is that we will have to examine what South Australians are getting for all this humbug and, indeed, what effect it is having. I have had a brief look at the cost and consequences.

I refer, now, to the magnitude of the problem. It is not possible to get comparative statistics for drowning accidents from boats before the operation of the Boating Act. However, since the Act has been in operation the number of deaths has been nine, four, six and six

respectively each year, with no discernible trend up or down. The reported accident rate, from 35 accidents in 1975 to 49 in 1978-79, is rising a little disproportionately to the number of registered boats, as one would expect from an increased boating density; that is, it is rising as one would expect it to rise if the Act did not exist.

We are looking at these problems in relation to these few boating accidents. What would happen, however, if we looked at other sports and saw comparable accident rates? I refer, for example, to horse-riding. If someone could demonstrate an accident rate when riding horses (and I would not be surprised if a few deaths each year occurred in this respect), would we have a Horses' Act with horse licences and registration? Can one imagine an inspector, a lone ranger in his Skippy uniform, coming up alongside a horse-rider and saying, "Pull over, rider. Is this horse registered?" It is as ridiculous as that.

The department that administers the Boating Act seems to be one of the more profitable Government departments, having lost only \$10 000 in the past four years. The Act certainly does require that fees be reserved to defray the cost of administering it. Is \$10 000 all the department has lost? It has spent \$257 000 in the past financial year and, I would think, roughly a couple of million dollars since the Act's inception. It is no less a loss—the fact that it has spent boat owners' money to this extent—than if it had spent the general taxpayers' money. It has just taken that money and spent it to no purpose in an area which has always had about the same sort of accident rate as has horse-riding, bike-riding, or any other minor enjoyment of life left to the public of this State.

I turn now to the Firearms Act. I am deeply grieved that we have a contract (which, I am told, is unavoidable) to spend \$690 000 on a computer to store firearms licensing and registration details. What is the magnitude of the problem that we are trying to deal with? Everybody is instinctively afraid of guns, just as a lot of people are instinctively afraid of water. When somebody is shot, that gets a lot of publicity, and everybody is afraid. But what is the magnitude of that problem when compared to this very dull thing called the road toll? From 1968 to 1977 (10 years) the total number of homicides of all sorts averaged 18.9 per annum, of which approximately one-third, or 6.1 deaths per annum, were caused by gunshot. There is no discernible trend up or down in those figures. The figures were three in 1968, none in 1969, 11 in 1970, three in 1971, and eight in 1978. They go up and down within those parameters, and there is no worsening of the problem. If there were no guns at all, it is highly likely that more than half the people concerned would have chosen alternative weapons and then there would have been little change in the total homicide figure.

I guess the thing that we really have to operate upon is the accident rate. Again, with no discernible increases over 10 years, we have an accident rate of 4.6 deaths per annum in South Australia. If we discovered that 5.2 people per annum died from tripping over a bath mat, would we implement a Bath Mat Act? Are we going to register bath mats and fine people for having unlicensed bath mats? Will we spend \$750 000 on a computer to handle the paper work? That is the sort of idiocy that Governments go on with—over-regulating matters because of emotional reactions to a few letters to the Editor. They do this without understanding what is good for the State.

The people of South Australia are queuing up in the minor courts in their thousands to be fined a miserable few dollars for forgetting to register this and register that—dogs, motor cars, boats—and for parking in the wrong place, and they are all sick of it.

Major crime is a serious problem. We should turn to major crime and away from trivial matters. It is my belief that the physical and visible presence of the police has a lot to do with the prevention of major crimes and that the invisible presence of the police at computers has nothing to do with preventing crime (in fact, it is counter-productive). The time taken by every policeman who spends more time typing and delivering summonses because somebody did not register their blunderbuss than he does on patrol catching kids shooting holes in road signs and farmers' tanks is counter-productive.

There are other costs that I have not mentioned when speaking of boating licences. When one mentions \$257 000 a year, that is peanuts to a Government. The people engaged in that work are housed in a building, but I cannot find any mention in the Auditor-General's Report of the cost of housing the staff involved, or the capital value, or of the investment capital used to construct the building. Some library research revealed a figure of approximately \$4 600 000 for a new building. It seems strange to me that it was only after the Boating Act was enacted that the Marine and Harbors Department could suddenly no longer function in that lovely little building in Victoria Square that is currently being moved sideways and was compelled to erect a \$4 600 000 building at Port Adelaide. I think it must have been the Boating Act that caused it—it could not have been shipping, because shipping movements through Port Adelaide have fluctuated between 1 300 and 1 500 per annum for donkeys' years with no discernible trend upwards or downwards.

When the confusion in the Firearms Act is sorted out in a couple of years, somebody will want a whole new building for that new empire. We have these marvellous provisions for the policeman to visit a person's home and inspect his collection of blunderbusses, duelling pistols and muzzle-loading muskets. When was the last time that somebody took a muzzle-loader, put powder and a ball down the barrel, rammed it home with a ramrod and robbed a bank? It has not happened.

I do not want to bore honourable members utterly; I merely want to kick a few sacred cows and to ask honourable members to question the building of these minor statutory empires that are dealing with four deaths per annum (a figure which has perhaps been steady for 10 years) or six deaths per annum (a figure that may have been steady for five years). I do not think we have any right to do that to the people of South Australia.

In conclusion, I leave honourable members with the thought (and anybody who is seeking fame and fortune in this Council may wish to consider my remarks when a difficult piece of legislation comes before this Chamber) that there is the option of expanding a certain piece of legislation over, say, three or four more pages or of just crossing it out. Honourable members can solve the tender problem with the Boating Act by saying that boats of less than 10 feet in length are exempted from the Act. I do not think those accident figures will change, just as the figures will not change after the Firearms Act comes into full operation.

The first politician to devote his career to repealing much of this junk is in danger of having a glorious statue erected in his honour for having the courage to tackle this problem. These walls are thick and I stand far back in this Chamber; this is my first speech and it is not a great speech, but if what I have said is heard faintly in another place, and even a little out on North Terrace, I hope that people will urge honourable members to take action in this matter, and I hope honourable members will listen to those people. The people are over-regulated; we are wasting their money and damaging their spirit. Please help

them. Please repeal and simplify a lot of this junk as the years go by. I thank honourable members for their attention.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Ritson in support of the speech by His Excellency the Governor in opening Parliament. Also, I would like to commend the honourable member for his maiden speech, and I recall it was only a short time ago that I, too, made a maiden speech. I should like to reflect briefly on those members who have departed the Chamber since the last election. First, from my side of the Chamber, I refer to the Hon. Mr. Geddes, who gave this Council wonderful service over many years. He also gave wonderful service to the Liberal Party and its organisation, and served the State well.

On the Opposition side, I refer to the Hon. Mr. Casey and the Hon. Mr. Banfield, who were both Ministers and who served this State well and with distinction. I wish those three members a long and happy retirement. Also, I was most interested to see the new seating arrangements. Not only was it nice for me to change sides after such a short time in this Chamber but also it was interesting to see the seating arranged on the other side of the Chamber. All honourable members would welcome the Hon. Mr. Milne, who makes history by being the first Australian Democrat in this Chamber, and I am sure that all honourable members wish him well in his time in this Chamber.

I agree with what the Hon. Bob Ritson said, that this is a House of Review and a place where, hopefully, we can live up to our name of "honourable". I did want to say something about the seating of the other side of the Council. I thought that the Leader of the Labor Party had pulled off a master stroke by seating the Hon. Miss Wiese next to the Hon. Mr. Foster, thereby perhaps diverting his attention from interjections and from making the noise that we are so used to in this Chamber. Alas, it was not to be, because on the opening day of this session the Hon. Mr. Foster was hard at it again, and I am sorry that the Hon. Mr. Sumner was not successful in his efforts to quieten his fellow member.

I was interested to know why the term "honourable" applied to Legislative Council members. The title "honourable" was first granted to the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly in New South Wales by the Governor-General of New South Wales in 1856. At the same time the Governor-General sent a despatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies asking that the honour be extended to members of the Legislative Council. This was granted later in the year. The title was adopted by other State Legislatures and gradually extended to former Ministers, Premiers and members. At present, the title is continued to ex-members of the Legislative Council after 10 years continuous service and for life to former Ministers and Premiers who have been members of a Government for three years or head of a Government for one year.

It is interesting to reflect on that history, which leads us to be "honourable" members, yet members in another place are not known by the title "honourable".

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They are honourable members but they are not entitled to use the prefix "honourable".

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Yes, I take that point. I was interested to read in the Governor's Speech reference to two or three points to which I intend to refer. His Excellency said that the Government had initiated moves to stimulate industrial expansion, and would continue to promote industrial development. He also stated:

But my Government recognises that the prosperity and happiness of our community cannot rest wholly, or even

mainly, upon Government initiatives of a legislative or administrative nature. To achieve this, all sections of our community must arrive at a larger vision of the true welfare and purpose of our society . . .

Earlier this year a national firm of management consultants released details of a survey of profitability of 776 companies, 597 publicly listed companies and 179 unlisted public and proprietary companies for the 1977-78 financial year. All the companies involved had assets greater than \$5 000 000 and/or annual profits greater than \$500 000. The companies were located throughout all the Australian States.

The results of that survey are interesting. The median gross profit on total gross assets before tax and interest payments was only 10.2 per cent, although this is an improvement over the forgettable 1973-75 period of 9 per cent to 9.7 per cent. Net profit on shareholders' funds after tax and interest was 11 per cent, and these figures take no account of the impact of inflation on items such as the cost of restocking and replacement of assets.

Today I want to refer to the emotion and the misunderstanding associated with the word "profit". To many people "profit" is a dirty word that attracts an emotive cry from many people. If, for example one had a surplus of funds and wished to invest them, one would be able to attract an interest rate of at least 10.4 per cent with State Government guaranteed securities. With Commonwealth securities one would be able to attract an interest rate greater than 10 per cent.

Therefore, it is instructive to compare the figures that we have from returns on funds employed and invested in Australia in risk capital against the interest rates that one can earn without risk from funds invested in fixed interest securities. A Reserve Bank publication shows that in the 1977 calendar year Australian industry averaged a return on shareholders' funds of only 9.5 per cent. This is a key factor that honourable members should look at, not only in South Australia but throughout Australia: we should recognise the need and importance of profitability. Last month the important Committee for Economic Development in Australia (CEDA) printed a paper entitled "The Crucial Role of Profitability" and stated:

In a healthy growing economy it is important that the return on equity funds be greater than the return on fixed interest. From the investor's viewpoint there must be a premium for the additional risk. From the corporation's viewpoint the return on new equity funds must be higher than the corporate cost of capital.

As I have said, when one can take funds out of a business, as people in Australia have been tempted to do, and invest them without risk and earn more in fixed interest securities than that business is earning, there is no incentive for expansion.

Unemployment is a problem confronting all Western countries. Although it is not possible to compare unemployment figures directly between countries, it seems that at least amongst the O.E.C.D. countries Australia ranks as average in relation to unemployment. Honourable members often overlook, when discussing unemployment, that the Government cannot simply pump funds into schemes to support unemployed people in the hope that such action will provide a long-term solution because, over a long period, such assistance will not provide the underlying and necessary economic base for job creation. Instead, it merely sweeps the social and economic problems associated with unemployment under the political rug.

The problems of prosperity, productivity, profitability and employment are inexorably bound together. Put simply, unless corporations are prepared to see the

possibility of a return on investment better than the rate of return on fixed interest, there is little or no incentive to invest. It is frightening to note that in Australia since 1973-74 there has been no growth in new capital investment in Australia in real terms. In the period 1964-65 to 1972-73 Australia had an increase of 4.8 per cent per annum in real terms of private gross fixed capital expenditure. From 1973-74 to 1977-78 the rate of increase was minus 0.6 per cent per annum in real terms in the rate of new capital investment in Australia.

Fortunately, as is often said, the only significant thing about statistics in South Australia is the lack of them. It is indeed fortunate that we do not have precise figures for real capital expenditure in South Australia. I expect that the figures I have quoted would be very much worse in this State. In fact, there was some reference to the negative capital investment in South Australia by the employers in the three weeks before a certain event that occurred in mid-September. At that time some unions were pressing for higher wages, ignoring that they must be matched by an improvement in productivity. If there is an improvement in productivity that, in turn, will encourage and stimulate capital investment.

What is Australia's record in labour productivity? Unfortunately, the answer, according to the CEDA Report, is not good. Real unit labour costs are now 7 per cent higher than they were at the beginning of this decade; put simply, labour costs have exceeded the growth in labour productivity. In turn, this has minimised any improvement in profitability.

You cannot expect job creation if some trade unions fight for higher real wages, nor can you hope to reduce the pool of unemployed. In real terms increasing labour costs further accelerates the shift to capital intensive industries. Unfortunately, areas such as penalty rates in the tourist industry and catering at weekends erode that profitability and create further unemployment. The higher the productivity the more we can pay our workers and investors. If we cannot improve South Australia's profitability level, we cannot help to reduce the fall in employment. We should have no truck, as a House or as a Party, with profit rip-offs, nor should we agree with extortionate wage demands.

In Australia in recent years the profit share of the gross domestic profit has fallen below the traditional national level of about 17.5 per cent, which was maintained in the 1950's and 1960's. In fact, adjusting for inflation, company profits share of Australia's gross domestic profit in 1978 was only 6.9 per cent, compared with wages which was 62.8 per cent. Over the period 1970 to 1978 the change in the relative share of gross domestic product of wages has increased by 8 per cent, but company profit's share has fallen by 55 per cent.

I have discussed very briefly the nexus between profitability, capital investment and employment. However it is important to realise that we cannot look inwards, because Australia is part of the world community. We must recognise that Australia's prosperity is very closely linked with its ability to trade, and in that respect South Australia's economy is very important. In Australia, and indeed South Australia, we have three main thrusts to our export industries: primary industry, mining and manufacturing. Those three sectors will be of great importance to South Australia's recovery from being the Cinderella State of Australia. Primary industry has a good season ahead of it. There is tremendous potential and excitement about Roxby Downs, the continued development of the Cooper Basin and the discoveries of coal deposits in the South-East of South Australia. The importance that these discoveries had on South Australia's economy will in time

be reflected in royalty payments to the Government, which in turn will lessen the tax burden on individuals. These mining ventures will also help in job creation and the formation of ancillary industries.

South Australia has traditionally had a manufacturing base, which was developed in the late 1930's and was created largely through the foresight, drive and spirit of the Playford Government. It is easy to forget that this manufacturing base is still an integral part of South Australia's economy. Traditionally, it has centred on white goods and the car industry, but other industries have also been developed in South Australia.

The Government must re-establish the strength of private sector investment in South Australia. We must get away from the jokes that have been associated with the Frozen Food Factory and the other things that were a product of the previous Government. We must encourage further investment in South Australia, and in that regard we can be proud of companies such as Simpson Pope, F. H. Faulding, Hills Industries, John Shearers, Adelaide-Brighton Cement and Adelaide-Wallaroo, which are already established manufacturers in this State. Those companies have made a great contribution to South Australia in terms of job creation, profitability and investment in South Australia.

I hope that the words of John Uhrig, for example, the managing director of Simpson Pope will be noted. He is a great believer in the interaction between employer and employee and not in the high-powered approach envisaged by the Labor Government with worker participation on boards. He believes in employer/employee participation at all levels and through constant participation, encouragement, discussion and communication; all of those things will go a long way towards improving industrial relations and profitability in South Australia's industries.

We must also recognise that if we are going to succeed and sustain South Australia's manufacturing base we are no longer selling purely to the South Australian population, but that we are increasingly seeing the world as our market. We have to be competitive with our international competitors. That means we must keep our costs down and that we must be cognizant of what real wage increases can do to our ability to compete on the international market. Therefore, unions and employers must get together to ensure that we do not price ourselves out of the world market, otherwise it will have a dramatic effect on South Australia's economy.

Another thing which is important and which is certainly viewed by the Liberal Party as being a matter that should be reviewed concerns the Budget. When the Liberal Party was in Opposition reference was made to reviewing budget procedures. In private enterprise a budget is prepared on a yearly basis and if, for example, \$50 000 is allocated for travelling and only \$40 000 is spent in that year, the management would believe it has done well, and that it has saved \$10 000. Unfortunately, a tendency has developed in the Public Service over the years, at State and Federal level, for everything up to and including the last dollar of money allocated in the Budget to be spent wherever possible on whatever item. This is done out of a fear that if the money allocated is not spent in a fiscal year a claim for a similar or greater amount of money in the following year will be jeopardised.

That is a matter of great concern because it encourages a waste of public money. There is a growing realisation by the public that they have to get value for the dollars spent by the public sector, because ultimately it is their money that is being spent. I hope that this Government will encourage initiative within the public sector to recognise

efficiency in an attempt to encourage the retention of moneys that cannot be desirably spent in a fiscal year. For example, if it is found necessary to spend only \$40 000 out of \$50 000 it would be desirable for a credit to be allowed to be carried forth to the next year so that the money is not lost to that department.

Responsibility for the public accounts resource budgeting is something we are going to hear a lot more of, not only at a Federal level but also at a State level. Perhaps extending the traditional annual budget to a triennial budgeting system could be the answer. There has been much discussion on this, and I hope that in time this Chamber will have an opportunity to look at proposals along these lines.

I turn now to another point in His Excellency's Speech, regarding health. In our Anglo-Saxon culture there has been a growing view in the community that a hospital nearby is a symbol that the health system is working. We should also remember that health care starts at home. In the future it will be increasingly desirable that health care should focus more on the home and not just the hospital.

It is clear that people are recognising the tremendous cost involved in sustaining health services. If we can as a Government, and as His Excellency indicated in his Speech, pay attention to this and develop this aspect, it will benefit the community, not only in terms of their health and relationships with families and others, but also in terms of saving their dollars in taxation that have to be spent in this area. I commend the Governor's Speech to members of this Council, and I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.12 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 17 October at 2.15 p.m.