

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 30 October 1986

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read prayers.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

A petition signed by 961 residents of South Australia praying that the Council reject any legislation which proposes an expiation fee for marijuana offences was presented by the Hon. M.B. Cameron.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

Pursuant to Statute—
Dental Board of South Australia—Report, 1986.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HEPATITIS B

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): Since I am not allowed to be asked friendly questions from my back bench because that seems to upset the Opposition, I seek leave to make yet another statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I never upset my Leader. In March 1985 Cabinet approved proposals regarding hepatitis B immunisation in health units and the South Australian Health Commission subsequently developed guidelines for the distribution of the vaccine, which was to be made available in two areas. First, it was to be made available for urgent patient use such as to infants born to infected mothers, persons receiving wounds with potentially infected instruments and those in close contact with infected persons. Secondly, the vaccine was to be distributed to Government funded health units for administration to staff according to priorities set by the individual administrations.

Under the current guidelines, it is an employer's responsibility to assess the degree of risk of their workers. Under the guidelines, health units are charged with the introduction of safe working practices where blood taking and the use of sharp implements is concerned and to assess staff exposure to blood and hence rank them according to risk. In the last financial year the South Australian Health Commission spent about \$350 000 on a supply of the vaccine it purchased from the Commonwealth Serum Laboratory. About \$120 000 has been allocated this year. The lesser amount reflects the fact that many people who work in health units were vaccinated from the initial allocation.

I should point out that the vaccine is relatively new and has become available in Australia only since April 1983. It is derived entirely from human sources (from blood donations from carriers) and is very expensive to produce and to test for safety. One course of three injections costs about \$150, and the vaccine is thought to be effective for at least five years.

However, it has not been in use for long enough to know precisely how effective it is, as continued exposure to carriers can have a booster effect on people who have been

immunised, prolonging the effectiveness of the vaccine. It is also clear that some people who might be at imminent risk of infection could not afford the cost of the vaccine, and accordingly the Public Health Service sought to provide the product free of charge for their urgent use. These groups include people who have had sexual contact with a known case, and infants born into well-documented risk groups.

To my knowledge, and that of the Health Commission, South Australia currently offers the vaccine to a wider spectrum of clients than any other State. The question of the immunisation of medical and dental students has been raised with the Public Health Service by the students themselves directly. The students were asked to take the matter up with their faculties, which could then make formal approaches to the Minister and to the Health Commission.

The matter of immunising students has never been raised with me previously, and when the issue was canvassed publicly today I immediately contacted the head of the Communicable Disease Control Unit, Dr Scott Cameron. Dr Cameron informs me that an approach from the University of Adelaide Medical School is imminent, and that the matter will be raised today at a regular liaison meeting between the Australian Medical Association and the Health Commission.

Previously, students have not fallen within the guidelines approved by the commission or Cabinet because they are not directly employed by the health units (that is, the hospitals) in which they work. After discussions this morning with Dr Cameron, I have directed that the SAHC reallocate its vaccine stock so that students can be immunised in their senior clinical year. This will normally mean about the fourth year of their studies. It is planned that this extension to the program will commence in the year 1987-88.

QUESTIONS

MARIJUANA

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about marijuana.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: There has been unprecedented community reaction to the Government's move to introduce on-the-spot fines for marijuana possession. The response to radio programs confirms widespread community opposition. Liberal members of Parliament continue to be inundated by petitions from school councils throughout the State expressing total opposition to the move. This morning I understand that the Police Association has come out strongly against it. I have also been informed that petitions are now being drawn up asking His Excellency the Governor to withhold his assent to the Bill.

The Opposition has not orchestrated this reaction—it is quite spontaneous and shows that the Government has introduced legislation which the public abhors. It also proves that the Minister and his Government were wrong in their judgment, having brought in legislation which is quite contrary to the wishes of the electors. There was no warning of this given before the last election, so the Government did not have any mandate from the public.

Will the Minister now take a submission to the Premier admitting he was wrong in introducing the legislation, admitting he has damaged the standing of the Government and the Parliament in the minds of the public, and requesting that the Government reconsider immediately its intention to introduce on-the-spot fines for marijuana possession?

Or, at the very least, will the Minister request that the on-the-spot fines not be introduced into this State through this legislation until this Parliament has had an opportunity to reconsider the matter through a private member's Bill, which will be introduced at the first available opportunity by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly, the Hon. John Olsen?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The short answer is 'No' and I would say that and sit down had there not been the request for me to admit that I was wrong. I do not believe that I was wrong. That legislation was introduced after very careful consideration. I am not a middle-aged middle-class trendy. It was certainly not introduced in that spirit at all—it was introduced after I had studied the drug control programs interstate and overseas.

We are very active in the process of developing in this State the most comprehensive strategy in this country. It is based on many things. One important part of our strategy, of course, is the use of the criminal law. The criminal law can be used significantly to control the supply of illicit drugs, but it is not the sole answer. I wish that it were, because it would make things much easier. As I said during the course of lengthy debate in this Chamber, if it were the simple answer then, of course, there would not be 180 000 narcotic addicts in the City of New York. No country in the world has used the criminal law more vigorously over a very long period than has the United States of America and no country in the world has a drug problem of the same magnitude of the United States of America, so I think that we must learn from their experiences.

So we use the criminal law intelligently as a significant part of the strategy. It was because of that, of course, that penalties were significantly increased: life imprisonment, \$500 000, and confiscation of assets for possession of commercial quantities of hard drugs; and 25 years imprisonment, \$500 000 fine and confiscation of assets for possession of commercial quantities of marijuana. There can be no suggestion by any responsible person or organisation that we are other than very tough on the criminal black market element that operates around the illicit drug trade.

But, as I have said, the criminal law is only one facet, albeit a very important facet of the continuing war against illegal drug abuse. One has to get behind the whole scene and look at the reasons why adolescents and youth are increasingly alienated, why they are increasingly depressed and why they have turned in this decade and in this generation to abuse of illegal drugs and legal drugs, particularly alcohol, more than at any other time this century.

As I have said, numerous things are involved. The very real fear of nuclear war is well documented in that age group; the desperation; the deep concern; the depression that they experience when they contemplate their future; and the lack of employment opportunities, to name but a few. So we have to improve and increase their prospects. We have to give them genuinely better prospects for their future. That is the way that we will ultimately overcome significantly the problems of drug abuse. It is because of that that this Government is currently developing a social justice strategy, social health policies, and comprehensive social welfare strategies and why we are giving great attention to the spectrum of both human services and economic development in any way that we possibly and reasonably can.

That is the underlying cause. Then we look at protective and preventive education. We have in place, and are expanding, drug education programs from reception to year 12, right across the spectrum of our schools. We have the Learning About Life program, the Learn To Choose pro-

gram in primary schools, and the Free To Choose program in secondary schools, so we are teaching children from the age of five years about how well their bodies function, and about the effects that substance abuse and unhealthy lifestyles will have on those wonderfully unique bodies in later life if they do not have the knowledge, power and the will to resist substances when they are offered.

So, that is the education part. Of course then there is the early intervention aspect. We are developing a network of adolescent health services. We have already established the Second Story which is financed principally from the additional funds that were made available under the national campaign against drug abuse. We can detect young people who are experimenting and can thus intervene at the earliest possible stage if professional evidence is that through that experimentation a young person is exposed to the danger of going further.

Finally, there is the very significant upgrading that is currently occurring of treatment and rehabilitation services. We have an appeal presently before the Planning Appeal Tribunal concerning a property at Ashbourne, where we hope to establish a large drug free therapeutic community for up to 24 people and, where appropriate, members of their family. We are completely redeveloping Osmond Terrace clinic at a cost of some \$600 000.

That facility will accommodate 10 inpatients and provide outpatient services and day patient services. It will be dedicated specifically for the first time to the treatment of people with drug dependency problems. Further, we are moving clientele out of Family Living at Joslin. They are being relocated in community housing. The work that that facility has done previously will be subsumed in the drug free therapeutic community at Ashbourne. Joslin is being redeveloped specifically as a dedicated facility for the treatment and rehabilitation of people with alcohol problems.

So, we either have in place or will have in place during the course of 1987 the most comprehensive strategy to tackle the very real problem of substance abuse, of drug abuse—both legal and illegal drug abuse—that has ever been in place in this State. We will spend significantly more money on it in real terms than has ever been spent before in the history of South Australia. Further, we will spend significantly more money on law enforcement in the area of policing illicit drug trading than has ever occurred before in the history of South Australia.

That is the background and the strategy that the South Australian Government has developed. I have been personally responsible for a significant amount of that, including the legislation. That has been introduced, after many years of very deep thought and consideration, after taking a great deal of advice and after studying, on two occasions, the problem internationally, the most recent occasion being in 1984 when I visited the United States and Canada. I am proud to be able to say that it is my passionately held belief that this strategy is the best that we could have possibly developed.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BRANCH

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the Public Libraries Branch.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Public Libraries Branch of the State Library is located at 121 The Parade, Norwood. In addition to the offices located on The Parade, the branch has considerable warehouse space in nearby Edward Street

and Orange Lane. The branch services 129 public libraries in the State and selects, orders, acquires and catalogues an enormous number of books. The warehouse space was used not only for this purpose but also for regular sales of discarded library books. These sales were most popular and raised about \$50 000 per annum.

For three years the Libraries Board has been under pressure to sell part of its Norwood warehouse space, which is a well sited 1 570 square metre space located at the corner of Edward Street and Orange Lane. The pressure came from the local member of Parliament, the Labor member for Norwood, the Hon. Greg Crafter. He wanted the Libraries Board to sell it to the Norwood Club, which has its club rooms at 137 The Parade, just east of the Public Libraries office. It should be made clear that the Norwood Club is a traditional working man's club. Mr Crafter told the Libraries Board that the Norwood Club wanted the space for community purposes. Clearly, such a large space could be used for many purposes—as a gymnasium for calisthenics, or as a meeting place. The understanding was that it would be used for sporting and community purposes.

This pressure to sell was maintained over a three year period. Finally, the Libraries Board relented and agreed that the State Government could sell the property to the Norwood Club. Mr Crafter introduced the Norwood Club as a buyer and in fact helped to negotiate the deal which was finally concluded in September 1986. However, the Libraries Board only agreed to sell on the clear understanding that the sale of the warehouse in Edward Street would facilitate the commencement of building of the second floor of the State Library and, also, to refurbish the Public Libraries property at The Parade. There was a clear and unequivocal commitment to that *quid pro quo*. What has happened following the sale? There is a 'For Lease' notice on the Edward Street warehouse which was sold. The sign advises that 1 570 square metres of warehouse space is for lease and that it is commercially zoned and is suitable for many uses.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Norwood Club. I have made inquiries of the agent who advised that a three year lease is available with an option to renegotiate for a further three years. The annual rental being asked is \$42 000 plus outgoings, but that is not the end of it. The Government has done nothing to fulfil its promise of upgrading the Public Libraries Branch premises at Norwood. There are no signs of work on the second floor at the State Library. As a result of the sale of the Edward Street warehouse, the South Australian Museum and the History Trust have had to relocate materials which they previously stored there.

The public book sales previously held in the very accessible Edward Street warehouse will now have to be held in a less obvious location. It is highly likely that they will not raise the \$50 000 annually as is now the case. There is a sense of outrage among professional librarians, including members of the Libraries Board. On several occasions I have raised in this Council examples of the shoddy treatment of libraries in South Australia and the Minister's seeming lack of interest in libraries. This latest fiasco has been described as a disgraceful double-cross. The Libraries Board was persuaded, by pressure from the local member—a Labor Government Minister—to sell to a working man's club for community purposes. It is now clear that the property is available for commercial lease.

More importantly, the promise of the State Government to refurbish public library premises at The Parade and to commence building the second floor at North Terrace has not been fulfilled and there appears to be little prospect of

that happening in the near future. My questions to the Minister are as follows: first, is the Minister, as the Minister responsible for libraries, aware of this fiasco; does she support what has happened and, if not, what has she done about it or, if she knows about it, what will she do if she has only just found out about it; secondly, does she believe that that property at Edward Street should have been auctioned rather than sold privately to the Norwood Club when it transpired that it would be used for commercial purposes and not for community purposes; and, thirdly, is she aware that there is a growing number of key professional librarians in this State who no longer have confidence in her as the Minister responsible for the administration and development of libraries in South Australia?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will ignore the last in a series of insults that are usually traded across this Chamber by the Hon. Mr Davis with no supporting evidence whatsoever to back up his statements. With respect to the property at Norwood, I am aware of the latest developments concerning that part of the Libraries Board property which was sold to the Norwood Club. During the past couple of days that matter was brought to my attention and I have asked for further information about it in order to ascertain what has transpired since the sale of the land took place.

It was certainly my understanding at the time of the sale of the land which was occupied by the Public Libraries Branch that the property that was to be sold to the Norwood Club would be used for community purposes, so I was quite concerned to hear that it was being advertised for lease. I sought a report on that so that I could find out exactly what happened.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: You could find out by the local member.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: That was a most outrageous statement for the honourable member to make. In fact, members of the Norwood Club approached the Government, I understand, some years ago: they certainly did not approach me since I was not a Minister at that time. It was my understanding that members of the Norwood Club made their own approaches to the Government and also certainly enlisted the support and the good offices of their local member to speak with the appropriate people within State Government to ascertain whether or not that land could be sold to them. To suggest that this whole thing has come about because the local member is solely responsible is quite inaccurate and unfair.

I want to correct another inaccuracy in relation to the claims that have been made about an extra floor for the current State Library building. When these matters were being discussed with me last year, the possibility of building an extra floor on the State Library was certainly one of the options discussed. It then transpired that certain issues which might have affected a decision about whether or not that extra floor was needed were under review by the Libraries Review Committee. Members would be aware that for some time they have been talking about the future needs of the libraries services in South Australia following the drawing to a close of the development of the community libraries program and the impact on our central library services.

One of the issues that was being discussed by the Libraries Review Committee was the nature of the delivery of the lending services that are currently located on North Terrace. There were discussions about whether or not it would be necessary to have that space or whether there might be other options. It was the view of the people to whom I spoke on the Libraries Board that it may not after all be necessary to build an extra floor on the North Terrace

building, but they certainly desired an undertaking from the Government about having access to equivalent space to that at the Norwood premises, should that be required. Certainly, I indicated to the Libraries Board at that time that it would be my intention to take up those issues when it became clear what the Libraries Board requirements might be following the release and consideration of the Libraries Review Committee report. That is the current situation.

When the Libraries Review Committee report has been considered by the Government and we have a clear policy direction as to where the central library services should be heading, further consideration will be given to exactly what space is needed by the Public Libraries Branch and appropriate decisions will be taken about that matter.

EDUCATION CUTS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Education, a question about Education Department cuts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: There is considerable concern in South Australian Education circles following the cuts in the recent State budget. The South Australian Education system is recognised as being one of the best in the country. The reason why it leads has been pointed out by numerous educationists:

1. There has been a very high standard of curriculum guidelines published for teacher use—material which is well researched and developed by people employed for that task and published in practical usable formats.
2. Teachers and senior staff have been well supported by advisers and other support staff who provide advice about all areas of subject related curriculum and general classroom and organisational methodology. Advisers are experienced and knowledgeable in their field and are able to conduct professional development activities to which most school personnel have access.
3. Technological developments are widely used in this State. Audiovisual materials and tape services are of high quality and supplement classroom curricula.
4. All school staff and their advisers have access to a highly competent and efficient information base, provided through the Education Centre Library. This enables people to keep up to date with changes which affect the knowledge taught and the methodologies to be used.

As a result of the latest budget, all of these services have been so reduced that it appears that the quality of the education in this State cannot be maintained. There will be a cut of 230 teacher positions as of February 1987 and a reallocation of a significant proportion of administrative resources to schools.

Despite the assurances at the last State election that there would not be a cut in teacher positions, there is to be a loss of 177 classroom teachers, 25 release time scholarships and 28 advisory positions. The loss of the scholarships will lead to teacher knowledge becoming stagnant. I would have expected, if anything, that there would be an increase in the number of scholarships, not a decrease. About 67 positions are being slashed in important administration areas.

The central publishing function of the department will cease. Not only did this provide a valuable service but also it ran at a profit. The Educational Technology Centre will be disbanded. There will be a loss of five deputy directors and five assistant directors in areas. The positions of Chief

Guidance Officer, Chief Speech Pathologist and Chief Social Worker will be affected. Eight curriculum development areas will be lost. At the Angle Park Computing Centre, the music branch and the physical education centres will be reconstituted as schools but, most importantly, nine positions will be cut. That will very effectively neuter them.

The 70 senior positions under review are merely being shuffled from one Government area to another. Very few of these will be back in the schools and most will be further removed from assisting education than initially. Furthermore, they will retain their current salaries, so saving no money. Non classroom teachers, otherwise known as advisers, already spend a fair bit of their time in schools assisting teachers—certainly more than one day a week, as currently proposed by the Minister. All advisers will spend one day a week assisting teachers and, in conjunction with the 20 per cent reduction in the number of advisers, this means that the number of advisory staff will be slashed significantly. Some schools will lose their second languages section due to displacement. I am greatly concerned that the situation in relation to the availability of temporary relieving staff is so bad that some teachers are taking sick leave to go to conferences. That is very bad in an industrial sense as well as from an educational point of view. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. How can the Minister assure us and the parents of children attending government and other schools, who freely use these services, that the quality of education provided will be maintained at its current high level?

2. If all of the documented services which have enabled us to take the lead in education are removed, or so cut that they are inefficient, how will the Minister ensure that we do not, in a short time, have the worst education system in the country?

3. The Minister is quoted as saying, 'As children go back to school in 1987, we will see that commitments to quality education in our schools is not only maintained, but in key areas improved'. How will the Minister ensure that?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

LOLLIES

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about door knocking and the selling of lollies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: A constituent living in Gawler has drawn my attention to the fact that an intensive door knocking campaign is being conducted in the area, with children being transported in cars and descending on the area selling bags of lollies. Children are doing the door-knock. It appears that the claim is that the money goes to charity but the children are unable to say to what charities or what percentage of money goes to those charities. I understand that the children are aged 12 to 13 years and there are a percentage of girls and some boys. I understand that some boys have been operating even into the evening. My constituent had the dubious pleasure of being door-knocked twice within a fortnight, the more recent occasion being last Saturday afternoon. With the explanation that there are no pamphlets giving details of the charities or what amount of money goes to the charities, I ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs the following question: has the Minister or his department any knowledge or details of the company called A to Z Munchies peddling lollies in the Gawler area, and what assurance is there that a percentage of money goes to the charity?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not have any personal knowledge of this organisation or the activities in which it is involved. Concern has been expressed in the past about the practice of using young children to sell door to door: in particular, the question of selling stationery was raised in the past. It does not always raise issues of consumer affairs, although it may raise issues involving the employment of children. Obviously, if there is some difficulty with regard to representations being made about a charity, that would also raise other issues. I will examine the question asked by the honourable member with the accompanying explanation and bring back a reply.

WORK FOR THE DOLE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about work for the dole.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On 6 October last year the former Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. Mr Crafter) outlined his support for a scheme involving young unemployed people working for unemployment benefits. He indicated at the time that he would be asking the Department for Community Welfare to look into details of the scheme and prepare a submission to the Federal Government. Since that time the Prime Minister indicated in his economic statement to the nation last June that he would be providing a scheme which 'would provide an opportunity particularly for young recipients of the unemployment benefit to undertake some community work for that benefit'. Does the Minister, like the Minister before him, accept that the payment of the unemployment benefit should be restructured to require jobless young people to undertake some work for the community? Secondly, as consultations are currently in progress with community groups, local government and State Governments on the implementation of the scheme as proposed by the Prime Minister, has the State Government made a submission or does it plan to make a submission to the Commonwealth Government on work for the dole?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The expression 'work for the dole' is not one that I find attractive—it is very negative. I make clear what is my position as Minister of Community Welfare. I said earlier that if we are to get at the underlying causes of substance abuse, disillusionment and widespread depression evident in our young people, adolescents and those in their late teens, of course we have to give them better hopes and aspirations. We have to get back to the situation that existed in past generations when they literally had a choice of which career they would follow upon leaving school. It is my firm belief that ideally no person under the age of 18 should be classified as unemployed.

It is also my firm belief that, perhaps subject to means testing, all young people of 16 or 17 years should be paid some sort of allowance. I stress 'subject to means testing'. In that way we could ensure, to the extent possible, equality of opportunity. So, the question arises of what happens then to 16 and 17 year olds. It is, in my submission, highly desirable that they have one of three alternatives. At 16 or 17 years they should be, first, still at school; secondly, in training (prevocational, post secondary or tertiary); or, thirdly, at work. That idea has been put to the Federal Government on a number of occasions. The question has been seriously examined by the appropriate Ministers on a number of occasions. It has also, of course, been costed.

One of the grave difficulties at this time is that in the short run it is relatively very expensive. As Minister of

Community Welfare I believe that in the medium to long term it would be a splendid investment. It would be very much to the credit of this country if we were to have a situation develop whereby no person under the age of 18 would be unemployed: they would be at school, in training or at work.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I ask a supplementary question. The Minister indicated that 16 or 17 year olds should have three options. He did not mention community work. Does he not agree with the former Minister of Community Welfare or the present Prime Minister that community work should be one of the options for 16 and 17 year olds?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I said that one of the options would be that those young people should be at work, for which they should be paid. I have no disagreement with Bob Hawke or Greg Crafter.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question on agricultural chemicals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: During a recent conference in Canberra of the Agricultural Chemical Association of Australia it was frequently claimed that differing agricultural and veterinary registration requirements between States have become a bureaucratic nightmare costly to farmers. This \$500 million farm chemical industry in Australia brought benefits to farmers valued at \$2 000 million. Farm chemical costs would be less if States could get their act together and standardise and simplify registration procedures. A related matter in this area is that of product labelling. First, does the Government believe it should move towards a standardised and simplified registration and labelling procedure with all States and the Commonwealth? Secondly, what is this State doing in moving towards the standardising of agricultural chemicals and in seeking positively to bring down farm costs?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will be pleased to refer those questions to the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

MARIJUANA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about marijuana.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Honourable members will be aware of the widespread community outrage this morning at the Minister's initiation of the decriminalisation of marijuana use for certain offences. Much concern has been expressed around Parliament House amongst marginal seat members of the Government Party about their future electoral prospects as a result of the Minister's actions. Those particular members are suggesting the need for a coordinated selling campaign of what they see as their problem by senior members of the Government.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: I hope it won't cost as much as the fringe benefits tax.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This is what we will find out. Can the Minister say whether there will be a coordinated marketing and/or advertising campaign by senior members

of the Government on the Controlled Substances Bill, and if the answer to that question is 'Yes', where will such a campaign be conducted? If it is to include an advertising campaign, what will be the estimated cost to taxpayers?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We have this great outrage being expressed in this Council today.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I wonder—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Listen to the people.

The PRESIDENT: Order! And that includes the Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I wonder, Ms President, when we can expect a Bill to be brought forward by the Opposition to criminalise alcohol. There is no question that by far the greatest problem for teenagers—and this is very well documented in both of my portfolio areas—in this State at the moment, is alcohol abuse by under age drinkers.

If anybody has the slightest doubt about that, look at all the surveys. Just as importantly, take a walk down Hindley Street any night. Look at places where young people gather, and there is not the slightest doubt that we do indeed have a big drug problem and that particular drug is alcohol. I do not hear people opposite getting up and railing about that. I do not hear any demands for additional restrictions on the sale of alcohol, let alone suggestions that certain sales ought to be criminal offences. That will clearly be left as an initiative for the Government.

Specifically, with regard to this furphy that the Hon. Mr Lucas is trying to create that public funds will be expended to specifically, as he puts it, sell the Controlled Substances Bill, the simple answer is 'No'. With regard to the ongoing and developing community education campaigns about substance abuse, I am very pleased to tell the Council that next week I will be launching in a shopping centre a display which will be staffed by members of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council. That will be a community information program. One of the specific displays will concern marijuana. It will make very clear that it is by no means a safe drug. That is consistent, and I have said that all along—it is by no means a safe drug, as it has a number of harmful effects.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: The penalties under this Bill aren't going to be much less, if any less, than those imposed by the Courts now.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is perfectly true.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: This has been planned for months. Does the Hon. Mr Elliott suggest we should not have ongoing community education programs about the dangers of drug abuse? It will quite specifically include information about the harmful effects of marijuana. It will most certainly not be some sort of one off but will be part of the ongoing community education program that will be conducted continuously over the course of the next several years until we can be reasonably confident that we are winning the war with the current drug problem. We will continue community education programs; they will not be based on generating hysteria; they will not be irresponsibly based for short term political expediency; they will be about genuine community information for parents, their children and members of the community at large.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have a supplementary question. Will the Minister give the Council the costs of the ongoing community education program, to use his words, for this financial year, to solve the Government's problem with this matter? Secondly, in which electorate or shopping centre will this launch be conducted next week?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I was given a briefing and shown the projected display yesterday morning. We had to search through my diary to find a time when I was available. We actually deferred other appointments so that I could do it, I think, at lunch time on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week immediately prior to my departure for the next national Ministerial Committee on Drug Strategy (MCDS) meeting in Canberra. At that time we discussed a number of possible venues, and that has not been finalised.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Come on—in a marginal Labor electorate.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: There aren't any marginal Liberal electorates—we couldn't find one.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.T. Sumner: There are more drug problems in the Liberal electorates, apparently.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Presumably. With regard to the cost, it is all in the budget and the honourable member can do his own homework.

FROST DAMAGED CROPS

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a question on frost damaged crops. Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: It has become very apparent in the past couple of days that there has been quite a disaster in the central Eyre Peninsula region regarding frost damage to crops. I have received phone calls this morning from several farmers informing me that they have had rather dramatic crop losses. In fact, one farmer rang me and said he thinks he has lost 100 per cent of his crop from frost damage. He was emotionally upset at the time because he owes a rather large sum of money on his property, and he suggested he may have to walk down the road with just his shirt on his back.

That is not the case right across the board, but there is severe damage. I have been informed that the damage is much more severe than in any other recorded year. There has been a problem with the crops open in atthesis—that is, flowering—with the flowers being frozen. The frost has been so severe it has burst a lot of the grain and frozen the stems so that they are beginning to look like they have been cut for hay.

The extent of the damage will probably not be known until harvest but there certainly will be a certain amount of pinched grain. The area affected is approximately 110 kilometres long and about 80 kilometres wide. I do not know the number of properties in that area, and not all have been affected, but a great number have been. This morning one farmer indicated to me that 600 acres of his crop had been affected, another said that 1 400 acres had been affected, and another referred to 1 000 acres. They were not all totally destroyed, but the figure is at least as high as 80 per cent. If one considers that for every acre they get a return of about \$100, for a property of 1 400 acres, a farmer can lose about \$140 000. They have loans to service and at the moment the average interest rates are 19.5 per cent for up to \$100 000 and 19.75 per cent for amounts of over \$100 000. My questions relate to financial assistance to those people, when it has been ascertained how big their losses are. My questions are:

1. Will the Minister make available as soon as possible to those farmers whose crops have been severely affected by frost damage, funds through the Rural Assistance Branch

of the Department of Agriculture, such funds having a reasonable interest component?

2. Will the Minister consider declaring the area to be in an emergency situation so that Federal funds will be made available—at even greater concessional interest rates?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will be pleased to refer those questions to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister for Environment and Planning, a question on the Aboriginal Heritage Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: We have been functioning under the present Aboriginal Heritage Act since 1965. An Act was passed in 1979 but it was never proclaimed, and two attempts were made, in 1982 and 1984, to amend that Act, but neither passed the Parliament before the end of the Parliamentary session. Aboriginal groups throughout South Australia have apparently been consulted about a proposed new Act, and some assurance was given that there would be further consultation prior to its introduction. They are becoming very concerned that there has been no further communication for a considerable time, and they fear that the Government intends to consult no further. This is perhaps not surprising when we consider the paternalistic attitude sometimes displayed by the European population of Australia. Aborigines, having suggested that the proposed Aboriginal Heritage Act of 1979 gave the Minister too much control and involved few Aborigines in the administration of the Act, in short, felt that the Act expressed in a veiled sense the same kind of paternalistic control and discrimination. I ask the following questions on this matter:

1. Can the Minister provide some assurance that further discussion with Aboriginal groups will occur prior to the introduction of the proposed Aboriginal Heritage Act?

2. Does the Minister agree that the 1979 Act involved heavy Ministerial control and minimal involvement by Aborigines in the administration of the Act?

3. If not, why not?

4. Are significant changes intended in these two areas?

5. Is there anything in the proposed Heritage Act that pertains to this Government taking some control of the land rights issues in South Australia?

6. When will the new Act be brought forward?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health on the subject of termination of pregnancy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The working party report on the adequacy of existing services for the termination of pregnancy in South Australia refers to the definition in the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act of a child not born alive. The definition is as follows:

'Child not born alive' means a child whose heart has not beaten after its complete expulsion or extraction from its mother and who is either—

(a) where the period of gestation is reliably ascertainable, a child of not less than 20 weeks gestation;

or
(b) in any case a child not weighing less than 400 grams at birth.

The recommendation made in regard to this matter (recommendation 43 at page 103 of the working party report) is that section 5 of the Birth, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act should be excluded from the definition of child a foetus expelled or extracted as a result of a lawful termination of pregnancy. Does the Minister intend to implement that recommendation and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That report has now been in public circulation for some months. Central to the report is a series of recommendations concerning pregnancy advisory centres. The report looked at, in the first instance, as one of its terms of reference, the adequacy or otherwise of existing services for the termination of pregnancy. The working party made a number of wide ranging recommendations in relation not only to services for termination of pregnancy but also to alternatives and counselling pre and post termination as well as counselling and the exploration of options and alternatives. As you would know very well Ms President, in these matters quick, adequate and timely access to expert advice and services must be readily available. That was at the heart of the report. The report further recommends that those pregnancy advisory services, which would include termination, should be separate from the existing obstetrics and gynaecology departments in the hospitals where terminations are conducted.

The report has been disseminated widely in the community for discussion and responses. The responses are still coming in and are still being collated. I would like very much to have begun to implement some of the recommendations, at least, in this financial year. However, there is virtually no financial allocation this year so it is unlikely that any significant part of the recommendations, whether they are with regard to the legislation, administration or clinical services will be implemented in this financial year. That is not to say that I do not regard the report in general terms as being a very valuable one. After we have had all the responses from individuals and groups in the community, I will give a number of the recommendations in the report a high priority for decision and implementation or otherwise in the 1987-88 financial year.

POLICE INQUIRIES IN SCHOOLS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I understand that the Attorney-General has an answer to a question on the matter of police inquiries in schools that I asked on 27 August.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to have the reply to the question inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. Leave granted.

The *Education Gazette* is the official document for promulgation of instructions and advice to teachers concerning their professional duties. It is published on the authority of the Minister of Education but obviously it is impractical for the Minister to personally sign every proposed item. Authority for publication has therefore been delegated. Provision also exists for the production of the Administrative Instructions and Guidelines which amplify Government/Department policy.

The *Gazette* notice regarding police interviews in schools resulted from the acknowledgement that there were deficiencies in two former passages in the Administrative Instructions and Guidelines entitled 'Cooperation with Government officers' and 'Police action and interviews at schools' (Section 3, paragraphs 84.3 and 84.6). This led to a series of discussions with the Education Department's

Child Abuse Steering Committee, officers of the Community Welfare and Police Department, and officers of the Crown Solicitor's Office, which culminated in the production and publication of the notice in question.

It seems that attention has focused on the reference to interviews being conducted without parents present, and the right of a student above the age of 10 years to request that his/her parents not be present in certain circumstances, subject to the Principal being satisfied that the student is capable of mature judgement consistent with his/her best interests. The general rule is that parents be present at interviews. However, the concept that this need not necessarily occur is nothing new, and is mentioned in the passages referred to above. In practice, there are very few instances of police interviews at schools. However, occasions do arise when it is deemed to be in the child's best interests (such as in cases of suspected child abuse where the offender is alleged to be a parent) for interviews to be conducted as a matter of urgency and without parental presence. In such cases parental involvement may be prejudicial to the student's best interests and/or subsequent criminal investigations.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I understand that the Attorney-General has a reply to a question on the cost of the Education Department reorganisation that I asked on 20 August.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to have the reply to the question inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. Leave granted.

1. The question relating to the Premier's comments at a public meeting is based on third hand recollection. The Premier cannot recall having made any specific statement at such a meeting on the cost of the Education Department reorganisation that began in 1983. While there has been some media reporting of costs around the \$47m., it does not bear any relationship to the financial analysis in reports the Premier received about the Education Department budget. No additional funds were allocated to the Department to effect the reorganisation.

2. The progress of the reorganisation has been mentioned in discussions between the Treasurer and the Minister of Education at various intervals since the reorganisation was commenced in 1983.

3. See 1. above.

4. The most recent written progress report the Premier has received on the reorganisation was a copy of that prepared in June 1986 for the Public Accounts Committee. That report indicates that, over the past three years, the reorganisation has realised tangible benefits.

MARIJUANA

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I understand that the Attorney-General has an answer to a question that I asked on 22 October in relation to drug offence penalties.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I seek leave to have the reply to the question inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. Leave granted.

The penalties referred to were considered by the Acting Crown Prosecutor at the time they were imposed. He was of the opinion that it was inappropriate to institute a Crown appeal in the light of the guidelines as such appeals expressed by the Chief Justice. These penalties were an isolated example of extreme leniency being extended by an experienced

judge to an offender because of factors personal to the particular offenders' financial position. Heavier fines, whilst normally appropriate, in the judge's opinion would have resulted inevitably in imprisonment because of his inability to pay. The penalties in no way reflect the general standard of penalties being imposed by the courts for these types of offences.

STATE PROMOTION

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Has the Minister of Tourism a reply to a question which I asked on 21 October?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to have the reply inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

I have made inquiries with my colleague the Minister of State Development and have been advised that the opal which was purchased by Neiman Marcus for their Australian Fortnight was purchased from three separate wholesalers in Sydney—one supplying black opal, one white opal and the other supplying a range of different types of Australian opal. The Neiman Marcus representative based in Sydney was advised by each of these wholesalers that a major portion of their supplies came from South Australia. In fact, a number of Adelaide based opal dealers were introduced to the Neiman Marcus buyers and executives when in Adelaide. These included :

- Opal Field Gem
- Opal Craft
- Olympic Opals
- The Opal Mine

Ultimately, in accordance with normal commercial practice Neiman Marcus made its own judgments about the companies and wholesalers from which it purchased opal and all other products in Australia.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

STATE STATISTICAL PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Who are the members of the State Statistical Priorities Committee?

2. (a) Was the proposal to spend \$150 000 on a major market research study into tourism referred to the State Statistical Priorities Committee prior to the awarding of the contract?

(b) If yes, on what date?

(c) Did the proposal include the written brief to be given to the consultants with all relevant details of timing, cost, methodology and form of report?

(d) What was the advice of the Statistical Priorities Committee?

3. (a) Were final proposals obtained from at least three appropriately qualified and experienced individuals or firms?

(b) If not, did the Director of the Department of Tourism give approval together with stating reasons for not doing so?

(c) If so, on what date?

4. (a) Has Research International Australia Pty Ltd provided a copy of the questionnaire to be used in the survey before the survey was conducted?

(b) If so, on what date?

5. (a) Will this study be completed by the end of October 1986, as stipulated in the original advertisement for the contract?

(b) If not, what is the expected date of completion?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr M. Smith, Director, Economics Unit, Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Mr G. Sims, Deputy Commonwealth Statistician.

Mr M. Bell, Manager, Forecasting and Land Monitoring Unit, Department of Environment and Planning.

Mr L. Oxlad, Transport Planning Engineer, Department of Transport.

Mr P. Bradley, Senior Research Officer, Department of Community Welfare.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) 7 April 1986.

(c) Yes.

(d) Advice was given to proceed, with the requirement that the questionnaires to be used in the sample-survey stage of the study be referred to the committee for consideration prior to the commencement of field work.

3. (a) Yes.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Not applicable.

4. (a) Yes.

(b) Adelaide Residents' Survey—1 October 1986. Interstate Residents' Survey—2 October 1986.

5. (a) No—both the start and finish dates for the study were subsequently amended.

(b) November or December 1986.

REGIONAL TOURISM

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What studies have been commissioned or are to be commissioned by the Department of Tourism into regional areas of South Australia?

2. What are the terms of reference for each study?

3. Which companies have been successful?

4. What are the expected dates of completion?

5. (a) For each study, did the Minister ensure the guidelines outlined by the Premier in his press release of 1 May 1984 were complied with?

(b) If not, why not?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Since 1 July 1985, three consultancy studies into regional areas have been or are to be commissioned by the Department of Tourism. They are:

1. Flinders Ranges Tourism Development Study.

2. South Australian South Coast Tourism Strategy Task Force (Pacific Area Tourist Association).

3. Barossa Tourism Strategy Plan.

The details requested are as follows:

Flinders Ranges Tourism Development Study

2. Terms of reference have been provided to the honourable member.

3. Cameron McNamara.

4. Date of completion is before the end of 1986.

5. This study is a development strategy study, not a market research study. Therefore, the guidelines are not applicable.

South Australian South Coast Tourism Strategy Task Force (Pacific Area Tourist Association)

1. Terms of reference have been provided to the honourable member.

2. Does not apply.

4. Completed. Publication imminent.

5. The guidelines were not applicable as this was a Tourism Development Study. Competitive bids were not invited since PATA provided the task force team members' expertise in accord with the association's practice. The Department of Tourism paid expenses of the project.

Barossa Tourism Strategy Plan

The Minister has announced the Department of Tourism will undertake this study in 1987.

2. To be determined.

3. To be determined.

4. Not applicable.

5. Not applicable.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1503.)

Clause 26—'Direction by Director-General that child be enrolled in particular school.'

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 5, lines 10 and 11—Leave out 'after consulting the parents of a child if satisfied that the child' and insert 'if satisfied that a child'.

I will give a progress report on the issue which caused us to report progress on the last occasion. I refer to the definition of 'parent' as it occurs in clause 3. The Hon. Mr Lucas raised the question as to whether the current definition might cause some problems either for parents, for the Education Department or for principals of schools when considering whether or not a child should be placed in a special school. At that time we agreed that the issues that were raised were serious ones which should be given further consideration and, for that reason, the Committee reported progress.

In the meantime, Parliamentary Counsel has examined the definition of 'parent' and has suggested a new definition. I presume that at a later stage I will move that amendment and I will seek your advice, Ms Chair, as to how to recommend clause 3 at the conclusion of the debate on the provisions of this Bill. There will be a debate on this issue at that time. I point out that the original clause did not take into account the situation where a parent might wish to take the initiative and apply to the Director-General for a child to be enrolled in a special school. This is now clarified by the amendment.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the Minister for that explanation. The new definition can be discussed later, but it is an integral part of clause 26. The new definition of 'parent' meets virtually all the criticisms and problems raised when the matter was last discussed. In particular, it will get rid of the phrase 'actual custody'—whatever that meant. It is replaced with the more familiar terminology that the parent of a child includes a person who has legal custody or guardianship of the child. Extending that definition, it includes, under paragraph (b), a person standing *in loco parentis* in relation to the child. But even with the different definition of 'parent', there is now a slightly different amendment which addresses one of the questions I raised. New subsection 75a (3) would provide:

The Director-General may give a direction under this section, or vary or revoke a direction under this section—

(a) on the application of a parent of the child;

or

- (b) at the Director-General's initiative, but, in either case, after taking reasonable steps to consult each parent of the child.

The first amendment that was to be moved by the Government referred to the application of the 'parents'—plural. That would mean that, where the mother and father shared joint legal custody of the child but the mother lived with the child and the father lived in, say, Tarcoola or Sydney, and was not in residence with the mother and child, under the Government's originally suggested amendment both parents would have to be consulted prior to any application to the Director-General to send the child to a special school, for example. Under the revised amendment, the mother can make application to the Director-General, but the Director-General must still take reasonable steps to consult the father of the child (and obviously he would have already consulted the mother) whether the father be in Sydney, Tarcoola or anywhere else.

The other circumstance that Parliamentary Counsel has outlined to me is that the mother and father may well be on extended vacation in Europe, for example, and the grandmother may be living in, looking after the child. In those circumstances if, for whatever reason, the grandmother was to apply to the Director-General for the child to be sent to a special school, the Director-General would be required to take reasonable steps not only to have discussions with the grandmother but also to consult with the mother and father who are on extended vacation in Europe. Knowing the Director-General, I am sure that he would attempt to do that before taking such a significant step in the education of that child.

The original amendment involved the Director-General's initiative after consulting the 'parents'—plural. The revised amendment provides more flexibility because it provides, once again, that after taking reasonable steps to consult each parent of the child, the Director-General may decide. There may well be a circumstance, as we envisaged a day or two ago, where one of the parents just cannot be found. Clearly, under the original amendment the Director-General would have been in a difficult position, given that this Bill also provides appeal rights to an aggrieved party against decisions that might be taken by the Director-General or the Minister.

In general, the amendment now meets the criticisms that were raised. I cannot see that it creates too many more problems than perhaps were envisaged. If it does, I hope that the commonsense of the Director-General and the Minister will ensure the easy operation of this provision. I support the revised amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 5, after line 17—Insert subclause as follows:

(3) The Director-General may give a direction under this section, or vary or revoke a direction under this section—

(a) on the application of a parent of the child;

or

(b) at the Director-General's initiative, but, in either case, after taking reasonable steps to consult each parent of the child.

The arguments for this amendment have already been canvassed by members of the Committee. I take this opportunity to thank the Hon. Mr Lucas for raising the issue that has led to the revised provisions.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: For the reasons already outlined, the Opposition supports this amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I move:

Page 5, line 18—After 'may,' insert 'subject to the regulations.'

The reasons I gave for the insertion of similar words in line 10 also stand true for those in line 18.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: For the reasons I outlined on the previous amendment the Government will accept this amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 5, line 18—Leave out 'consulting the parents' and insert 'taking reasonable steps to consult each parent'.

This amendment follows on from the previous two amendments that I have moved concerning consultation with parents.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Opposition supports this amendment. We have moved away from children with disabilities or learning difficulties and we are now looking at children with behavioural problems. The amendment being moved by the Minister to this clause, for the same reasons I indicated on the previous clause, is one that the Opposition will support as it provides greater flexibility for the Minister on this occasion because it may not be possible for the Minister to consult both parents of the child, for example, as one parent might well have disappeared from the face of the earth. In those circumstances and for that reason it is sensible to provide flexibility to allow the Minister to take reasonable steps to consult each parent. There will always be, under the next clause we discuss, the right of appeal by an aggrieved parent against decisions taken by the Director-General or Minister under new sections 75a and 75b. For those reasons the Opposition supports the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 5, lines 23 to 27—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause as follows:

(2) The Minister shall not give a direction under subsection (1) in respect of a child of compulsory school age unless the child is afforded the right to participate in a program established by the Minister for the education of children outside the ordinary Government school system.

This amendment clearly places the onus on the Minister to establish a learning program for children who are precluded from enrolment in Government schools. It would be envisaged that this would be a supervised alternative learning program determined by teachers in a school but administered or taught to a child perhaps at home or at least away from the school environment.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I raised this matter during the second reading debate and the Opposition clearly supports the amendment. I place on the record a quote from a submission I received recently from the South Australian Special Schools Councils Association. The President, Ms P. Bannan, states:

This section is fraught with problems as it allows the Minister, via guidance officers and school principals, the opportunity to opt out from taking responsibility for educating children whom they may see as too difficult.

The submission goes on, but that summarises the original clause succinctly. Under the amendment now moved by the Government, the Minister of Education on behalf of the Government takes responsibility for providing some form of education for children of compulsory school age between 6 and 15 years. That is as it should be. It is the responsibility of the Government and the Minister of Education to educate children. Because there might be children with difficult behavioural problems that do not fit into the normal squares and circles of our education system, there should be no possibility of hands being washed of the education of those children. I am pleased to see the Government's support through this amendment for that proposition and I am happy to support it.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 5, lines 30 to 33—Leave out subclause (4) and insert new subclauses as follows:

(4) Where a direction is given under subsection (1) in respect of a child of compulsory school age, the participation of the child in an educational program of the kind referred to in subsection (2) shall have the same effect for the purposes of section 75 as if the child were enrolled at a Government school.

(5) The Minister may revoke a direction under this Section—

(a) on the application of a parent of the child;

or

(b) at the Minister's initiative,

but, in either case, after taking reasonable steps to consult each parent of the child.

I point out that the amended clause 4 now limits the requirement to provide an alternative program to children of compulsory school age. The new clause 5 provides a mechanism for the review of the direction given by the Minister on the initiative of either the Minister or the child's parents. This amendment has been brought about by issues raised with the Minister following the introduction of this Bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: For reasons outlined earlier, the Opposition supports these amendments.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 5, lines 34 to 37—Leave out subclause (1) and insert subclauses as follows:

(1) A parent of a child may, if aggrieved—

(a) by a direction of the Director-General or the Minister given in respect of the child under sections 75a and 75b;

or

(b) by decision of the Director-General or the Minister on an application by the parent under section 75a or section 75b,

appeal to a local court of full jurisdiction against the direction or decision.

This amendment is consequent on the change made through new section 75a in part III.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 5—

Line 39—After 'direction' insert 'or decision'.

Line 45—After 'direction' insert 'or decision'.

These amendments appear to clarify the intention of these provisions by adding the words 'or decision' in each case; they make the provisions more comprehensive.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Page 6, after line 3—Insert subclause as follows:

(4) No order for costs shall be made against the appellant unless the court is satisfied that the appeal is frivolous or vexatious.

This was one of the matters I raised in the second reading debate. Again I want to quote from the submission, which was one of many received, from the Special Schools Councils Association regarding new section 75c as follows:

We fully support the provision of parents being able to appeal against the above decision in the Local Court of Full Jurisdiction. However, the cost of mounting such an appeal is most surely a deterrent as parents would have to weigh up whether financially they could afford the legal costs.

As members would appreciate, parents of children with disabilities, particularly those parents of children with severe handicaps, really have a very tough lot in life in trying to ensure a proper education for their children.

Obviously, their home environment and their whole living circumstance is difficult. It is not only difficult but also very costly for those parents with children with severe disabilities. As the Chairperson of the Special Schools Councils Association, the Parents for Special Education group to which I have also spoken, and individual parents of children with disabilities have pointed out to me, whilst they all support—as I do—the new right of appeal against decisions by the Director-General and the Minister, what they say is

that for many of them the legal costs involved will be a deterrent against their being able to take such action.

With the good sense of the Director-General of Education, as I know will exist in this particular matter, and the Director-General's representatives in various areas, I do not envisage that we are likely to see hundreds or thousands of appeals against decisions of the Director-General or the Minister. Clearly, if there was to be such a circumstance, it would involve a quite extraordinary cost for Government and we could not countenance it. If we did have hundreds of thousands of appeals against decisions of the Director-General and the Minister, I think that the Minister would be wanting to look at the Director-General and various representatives in the department, anyway.

I am sure, as I have said, that that is not likely to be the case. In the end, with common sense on both sides, there will probably not be an inordinately large number of appeals against decisions of the Minister and the Director-General. My amendment does not give open slather to parents to make frivolous or vexatious appeals against the Director-General or the Minister. Clearly, if we were to provide for the coverage of legal costs for a parent to run off at every whim and appeal against a decision of the Director-General or the Minister, that would not be a workable situation for any Government.

My amendment says that no order for costs shall be made against the appellant unless the court is satisfied that the appeal is frivolous or vexatious. I am advised by Parliamentary Counsel that there are similar provisions in other statutes in South Australia. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act is the one example that springs most readily to mind. Ms Chair, I have moved this amendment with some feeling.

I know that the Hon. Mr Elliott has received similar representations. He has raised the problem with respect to this provision. I know that he supports it, but he has raised the problems that I have raised of the long delays in getting some cases before the courts. He has used a figure of 14 months, and if one looks at the compulsory school years of roughly 10 years and take 14 months out of that 10 years, one can see that potentially there is another serious problem in relation to this matter as well.

I think that parents of children with disabilities, and particularly those parents of children with severe disabilities, have enough on their shoulders already without having to worry too much about the costs involved in their disagreeing with a decision of the Director-General or the Minister which they as parents see as being contrary or counter to the good education of their children. Whilst I applaud the common sense of the Director-General and of public servants with the Education Department, all wisdom and knowledge does not reside with either politicians or departmental bureaucrats.

A lot of research available nationally and internationally at the moment indicates that parents have an important role to play in the education of their children and, in some cases, are better able to make judgments about the appropriate courses of education that should be provided to their children than are politicians or departmental public servants.

I do not argue that that is not always the case, but in some cases parents are better able to make those judgments. For those reasons and with some feeling, I have moved this amendment hoping that the Government will accept it or that the Democrats, through the auspices of the Hon. Mr Elliott, will accept it.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I will most certainly be supporting this amendment because it gets at the sorts of fears

that I expressed earlier about this clause. I think that few cases will ever end up in court. The fact that the Government will be obliged to pick up the cost is a further guarantee that the Education Department will be absolutely certain of any decision before it is made. It is most likely that the appeals that occur will be frivolous or vexatious, but we cannot assume they will be and those that are not should not be expected to bear the cost.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Government is prepared to agree to this amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: During the Committee stage on Tuesday, I asked a question, which has not yet been answered, concerning the waiting time for the hearing of a court case. I have been told by one informant that it could be as long as 14 months. Another person suggested that the time might be much shorter and that there may be special provisions within the courts system to speed cases up. Has the Minister an answer to that question, as I think that it is important?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Unfortunately, I do not have an answer to that question. That is information that I can supply to the honourable member after the debate, if he agrees.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Yes, but it is unfortunate we did not have a chance to consider the answer while considering the clause in case there was a necessity for a minor amendment.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have been able to ascertain that it is true that the average waiting time on the civil list for an appeal to be heard is 14 months. However, it is possible for appeals of an administrative nature to take precedence. An appellant can make a special application to have an early hearing of such an appeal. So, in that case the time can be shortened considerably. It is not possible for me to give an average period of time for cases of that kind. However, they are considerably shorter than the amount of time ordinary civil list appeals would take.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: When one considers that even a month of missed education could affect the results for a whole year, one certainly hopes that it would be the case that any application would successfully achieve speedy determination. I would request that, since this Bill has to go back to the House of Assembly, this question be addressed so that we do have some certainty as to the way in which these cases will be handled in the courts.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I give an undertaking that we will supply as much information as is available to the honourable member prior to the Bill's being passed by Parliament.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 27 to 36 passed.

Title passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation'—reconsidered.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I move:

Page 1, line 19—After 'amended' insert:

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) the definition of 'parent' and substituting the following definition:

'parent' of a child includes—

(a) a person who has legal custody or guardianship of the child;

and

(b) a person standing *in loco parentis* in relation to the child,

but does not include a parent of the child where another parent or person has legal custody or guardianship of the child to the exclusion of that parent;

The amendment is the result of questions that were raised by the Hon. Mr Lucas when we last considered this Bill. The amendment rephrases the definition of 'parent' in the

Act, to take into account both the legal and *de facto* arrangements which are possible in terms of the care and responsibility of children. The first part of the definition refers to the legal situation of natural parents and any orders which may be made by a court to award responsibility for a child's care to one specific parent or to a legal guardian or to the Minister of Community Welfare.

The second part of the definition, which uses the phrase '*in loco parentis*', is necessary to cover circumstances where a child is living with a relative or boarding with a person outside the family. While it may appear that this complicates the interpretation of 'parent' in clause 26, it is necessary to have this provision for the purposes of implementing section 76 of the original Act, which imposes sanctions where a child of compulsory school age does not attend school. In those cases it is the primary responsibility of the person with whom the child resides to ensure that the child attends school. The phrase '*in loco parentis*' has been preferred to the original statement 'with whom the child resides'.

With respect to clause 26 of the Bill, the definition imposes a requirement for each person subsumed under the definition to be consulted. While this may seem somewhat cumbersome, Education Department officers do not envisage its presenting any problems in its implementation. I point out that the department has a set of guidelines for principals and teachers to follow in dealing with cases where there are circumstances other than a traditional two parent family in a 'normal' relationship. I note that the Community Welfare Act section for definitions of terms merely states that "'parent" includes an adoptive parent'. Although the proposed definition seems cumbersome, I believe it will cover both the various requirements of the original Act and the amendments proposed in this Bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I indicate my support for the new definition, cumbersome though it might be. However, I accept the reasons for that. I question its effect on other parts of the Act. The Minister referred to its interpretation and effect in relation to compulsory attendance. Section 76 (3) of the Act provides:

Where a child fails to attend school as required by subsection (1) each parent of the child shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding [what will now be \$200].

With this new definition of 'parent', in the circumstance of the mother and father being on an extended holiday in Europe and with the grandmother looking after the child, if the child does not attend school, would each of those people be considered as 'parents' of the child and accordingly be fined \$200 each?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The answer to that question is 'Yes'.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I presume the answer to my next question is also 'Yes', but I refer to the circumstance where the mother and father live apart, where the mother has the child and is therefore, I suppose, technically responsible for the child and where the child does not attend school: I take it that the father, who might be living in Sydney or Tarcoola, gets hit with a \$200 fine as well, does he?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes, if prosecuted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Is the Minister suggesting that in certain circumstances prosecutions by the department might not proceed?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am suggesting that there is a discretionary power here to be exercised in some cases. Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16—'The Teachers Registration Board'—reconsidered.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Before the Hon. Mr Elliott speaks to this clause, I point out that there is a matter that

I want to clarify in respect of it. In particular, I refer to statements which I made when we last considered this clause, because since then I have learned that information that I had at the time might have been incorrect. I may have given the wrong impression to the Committee regarding the views of the South Australian Institute of Teachers about the composition of this board. I now clarify that position. It is the view of SAIT, as I understand it, that it would like to have its representation on this board increased, but it has accepted that at this time the Minister does not wish to make amendments to the composition of the board, because it is his intention to review the board at a later stage. The Institute of Teachers is not happy about this arrangement but, for the time being, it has accepted it.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I am pleased to hear that I was not misinformed or uninformed. I believe that another Minister made a similar mistake yesterday on another matter when I was accused of not knowing what I was talking about, but time will tell on that matter also. The reason I wanted this clause recommitted was that I did not know whether or not people voted on information given which, in fact, was incorrect. I still question one part of the information that we now have and I also questioned it the other day. I refer to the word 'accepted'. When it is said that SAIT 'accepts', I think that that word is open to several different interpretations: one 'accept' is to accept graciously and everything is fine; another 'accept' is, 'We believe that the Government will do this anyway and we accept that the Government will do it.' In that regard it is more in the tone of voice than anything else. I did not detect anything one way or the other from the tone of voice. After talking with SAIT today, it is my understanding that it is very keen to proceed and I do not think that, by saying it accepts that the numbers should stay at six, it would be a correct use of the word 'accepts' because it is open to misinterpretation. I shall be guided by the Chair. Is it possible for me to move the amendment which I previously moved?

The CHAIRPERSON: You can.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I move:

Page 3, after line 21—Insert paragraph as follows:

(aa) by striking out from paragraph (c) of subsection (2) the word 'six' and substituting the word 'seven'.

The evidence is somewhat different now and, as SAIT supports this move, I hope that—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: This is from the President?

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Yes—members might reconsider their decision if that were an important part of their decision-making process in the first place.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Government opposes this amendment for the reasons that I outlined when we last discussed this issue. The Government does not wish to change the composition of the board at this time, because it is the intention of the Minister to review the nature, functions and composition of the board in the near future. He believes that it would be more appropriate to consider the representation on that board fully at that time and that it would be premature at this stage to consider one interest group's representation on the board in isolation while considering this Bill. For that reason we oppose the amendment.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: While I have the greatest respect for Bob Jackson as President of SAIT, I sometimes disagree with him and, evidently, if that is his view, I disagree again on this occasion. When we last considered this matter my vote did not hinge on whether or not SAIT has one particular view. I gave the reasons why I and the Opposition opposed his amendment and, for those reasons, we will be consistent with the view that we put two days ago and oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1479.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I support this Bill. The budget papers prepared by the Treasury show that, as a result of a deterioration in world prices of mineral and agricultural commodities upon which Australia relies heavily for export income, the effects on Australia's and South Australia's economy have been quite marked. It has demonstrated our imbalanced reliance on minerals and agricultural revenue and it is now coming home hard to haunt us.

The fact that we have not developed an adequate manufacturing import replacement strategy is clearly shown in the figures and it has shown that Australia's post-war export experience has been characterised by dramatic changes in the composition of exports and that exports of agricultural commodities, for example, accounted for 70 per cent of export earnings in the 1950s but, by 1982-83, rural exports accounted for about 40 per cent of export earnings. This decline has been matched, however, by strong growth in exports of minerals and fuels which now account for about 40 per cent of export earnings.

While the share of manufacturing commodities and exports has remained roughly constant over the two decades to the early 1980s, the proportion of export earnings accounted for by manufacturers has displayed some short-term cyclical fluctuations around this level. The low proportion of manufactured products in Australia's exports is unique amongst developed economies. Most economies are more balanced, using manufacturing as a stable base, and they do not rely so heavily on mining or agricultural trade.

Manufacturing usually involves 75 per cent of the exports of the developed economies. Policies designed to rectify our imbalance must be targeted towards lifting a number of internal and external constraints on manufacturing, particularly metals and engineering export expansion. We are caught in a battle between the USA and Europe, which are unfairly robbing us of market opportunities, driving down our commodity prices and exacerbating our balance of payments problems. With little chance of projected growth in the developing countries, we must aggressively pursue an industry development policy and chase new manufacturing and agricultural markets with vigour. It appears that we have no chance to develop further markets for our mining commodities. If we wait until the effects of lower volumes and commodity prices hit, it will be far too late.

Unemployment, which has dogged Western countries since 1973, will be of disastrous proportions—and it is bad now. Unemployment is not caused by strikes or high wages, penalty rates or annual leave loading. Women do not necessarily take men's jobs, young people are not dole bludgers or cheats. Most people without work would like an opportunity for full-time or part-time work. Unemployment has the ability to threaten the structure of today's society. Many of the peripheral issues debated in this Parliament that cause so much heartburn to members on both sides of the Council have their roots in unemployment.

Problems associated with youth unemployment—that is, people aged between 15 and 19 years and who make up about 35 per cent of the jobless—start with family conflict; homelessness; alcohol and drug abuse; poor diet and health; reduced self-worth; a feeling of hopelessness and loss of

ambition; and, in some cases, suicide or nervous collapse. The Minister of Community Welfare said earlier that the State and Federal Governments are targeting special projects to support young people, and they are now starting to target middle-aged unemployed people in some of the programs. Hopefully, they will provide some support as we move into the projected area of part-time education training and retraining for all people under the age of 18 years.

The community was conditioned by the dole bludger image: it was a typical case of 'blame the victim'. In fact, the 1975 election was basically won on a false premise that was pursued in the week preceding the election with a photograph appearing in all the Murdoch press of the 'dole dollies' sitting around a swimming pool, kicking their legs in the water and laughing. The photograph was accompanied by the following story:

Luxury life on the dole—two homes, a car and private pool. Six dole cheques every week have made life a ball for six young girls in Brisbane. On their combined weekly income of \$232.50, the girls have been able to rent a four bedroom home with a swimming pool, run a late model car, and save about \$40 a week.

Comments attributed to the 'girls' said they had been living like queens on the dole, and that most of their day was spent around the pool. The caption over the photograph read, 'Dole dollies Wendy, Dixie, Helen, Veronica, Jose and Roslyn, enjoy a splash in the swimming pool of their luxury rented home.' By the time the truth had been established—that the young women had been tricked into posing and that only two of the young women were unemployed, three had jobs and one did not even live in the house but had been visiting the day the photograph was taken—it did not interfere with the big lie that was pursued by the Opposition in its fight for power. Attitudes have altered somewhat, because many people who held those conservative views on unemployment have had contact with unemployed people who are trying to get work. We now have training schemes aimed at helping the unemployed. We have many support programs in place to protect the unemployed from the more debilitating aspects of unemployment, but we have not developed a national perspective for eliminating the disease.

There are many different formulas for coming to terms with unemployment, most of them being superfluous to the real question of structural unemployment through the lack of policy initiatives generally over the past 30 years. There is no structured manufacturing policy. There have been rapid changes in trading groupings, which have left the agricultural commodity prices in a mess, with rural unemployment starting to increase, signalling the start of a real problem in rural areas. If the suggestions being made by the Copemans and the Hayes about real wages, penalty rates and annual leave loading are accepted as being the problem, we will never find the solution. It only simplifies the community debate and allows battle lines to be drawn, but to have a national and State understanding across Party lines of industry and tourism development is beyond any section of the community. They are the parameters for debate.

The State Labor Government has a supportive attitude in developing an industry policy through Technology Park and encouraging high technology industries to settle in South Australia. A lot of work is being done to attract the submarine project: it would bring huge benefits to the State in high technology and heavy engineering. Tourism is taking off in this State, and having a marked effect on the employment of young people. The tourism industry is conducive to the employment of young people. Young people enjoy their work, and they like meeting people. Employers say that they are particularly suited to tourism and recreation employment.

State and Federal Governments are putting into place building blocks, despite the knockers, despite the Copemans and the Elliots, who are confronting the community and putting forward proposals that are not really solutions but are formulas for further disaster. Unemployed people have been the scapegoats for our ills for the past decade, allowing the media debate to be carried on by the dirty diggers of the business section, as some have been called, who, after making huge profits in Australia during the good days, are now making and taking their digital dollars offshore. If that was not bad enough (and leaving aside the insults that are ringing in the ears of those people who have made that money for them), John Elliott has been blaming every aspect of the Australian way of life from his goldplated Lear-jet as he takes off to distribute his dollars internationally. He has no regard for Australia's economy but sees the globe as his playground.

In general, both the workers and management have been blamed for Australia's ills but, if we consider the present levels of investment in the manufacturing industry, we find that most of the problems we now face—a massive trade deficit and no import replacement investment in sight—can only become worse.

Fair minded people from all walks of life are now going to examine more closely how the national cake is created and cut up. They will then demand a greater say in how it is to be more equitably distributed. I guess there are some fair minded people on the Opposition benches and amongst the Democrats who would agree that what I am saying has a ring of truth about it, but unfortunately there will be pressures on both the Democrats and the Opposition to fall to some of the simplified arguments put forward that, if you reduce wages generally across the board, Australia's manufacturing problems will go away and we will become more competitive and not need an import replacement program but will just have a competitive position with our Asian neighbours.

If the process of consultation through representative organisations recognises that structured debt problems, through trade imbalances, need to be corrected through national manufacturing restructure, then hopefully we can motivate the Australian psyche to work positively towards achievable goals. Let us hope that those on the Opposition benches offer constructive alternatives for alleviating our balance of trade problems without cheap political point scoring publicly to try to win back power whilst the Opposition allows the media debate to be centred on those issues that are not going to do anything about our present problems. We would all agree that the alternatives being espoused by some of the more extreme elements in society have influences within the major Parties—not particularly in the Labor Party but in the major Opposition Parties. I would hope everyone here would agree that those elements do nothing to unify Australia and do not overcome its problems but rather further exacerbate them.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I have listened with interest to the Hon. Terry Roberts this afternoon. He identifies a number of areas of concern. I put to him that he must finish off his job and his observations by using his influence to force this Government and his Federal Government friends to change direction and do something about those things that he does identify today. I will answer, in what I have to say about what he said about Elliott and others and the investment capital not going into Australian business and, more importantly, not going into South Australian business.

No debate on the South Australian budget can be held without some regard to what is happening in the Federal

financial area. It is fair to say that the major financial decisions are Federal. The great bulk of tax and excise is collected federally and most of it is distributed by various formulas to the States. The major decisions on wages and conditions are Federal and, of course, affect this State. These two factors alone have great impact on this State's 1986-87 budget. The decisions made on wages, conditions and on-costs affect unemployment and of course the area of social security and welfare. We are not winning in these areas federally or in this State.

The South Australian budget figures show that in 13 key economic areas South Australia is the worst in Australia in nine and second worst in four. These factors echo the sentiments expressed by my colleague, the Hon. Legh Davis, in his contribution. If the Federal Minister of State, Mick Young, ever turned his attention to his own State he could criticise this State for its poor performance instead of showering all his hatred on Queensland. It is interesting to note the Federal Government's attack on Queensland because it just happens to be election time. This Council should note the Federal Government's so-called attack on cronyism and the absence of tendering on some projects. Mr Wran's old mate, the former Chairman of the New South Wales State Rail Authority, gets the job at the ABC without any call for applications. Also, you cannot kid me that the golden handshakes given to Mr Whitehead, and the former chief of the bicentenary were not rorts of the worst kind.

The people in this State were conned in December last year into believing that this State was up and running. What the people were not told by this Government was that they were up and running, downhill in the wrong direction. I think the people in this State are starting to see that now. At this time the Federal Government and the trade union movement are struggling to come to grips with wages and employment—not unemployment. Its way of dealing with unemployment and the whole resulting welfare system is to acknowledge that it is there, to acknowledge that it will get worse and then to tax the productive into oblivion to pay for it. The State taxes and charges system just adds to that burden. The Federal Government pays scant regard to the productive sector's need for incentive. It has to go on being productive to pay Government bills. It pays scant regard to the productive sector's need to have any ability left to invest in Australia or in their own businesses in order to be productive and competitive with the rest of the world.

The Federal Government and the union movement are trying to design the Accord mark 3, having been dragged screaming to the conclusion and reality that Accord mark 2 and Accord mark 1 were and are patently damaging the country. I say once again that any accord, whatever mark it is, between the Federal Government and the union movement, which fails to admit the unemployed, small business (including farmers), welfare providers, women at home etc., is doomed. Whether Accord mark 10 is reached before this sinks in remains to be seen, although I doubt that this Federal Government will last beyond Accord mark 3.

The message has to be clear that Governments must, after wide consultation, make decisions. The Federal Government allows everyone to compromise in order to find consensus, thus always leaving a much less than ideal situation. The South Australian people should be reminded of the economic damage that the Hawke Government has done to Australia by sticking stubbornly and against all evidence to its policy of full indexation of wages. At a time when the whole system is under review and when there is great public demand for reform, the Federal Government is not leading or giving the directions it should but is stumbling around from one knee jerk reaction to another. The Hawke Gov-

ernment recklessly adopted a policy of full wage indexation in the very terms of the Accord mark 1, which said that the objective of wage fixation was to ensure that wage increases did not give added impetus to inflation and unemployment. It was going to achieve that lofty objective by setting in concrete a formula which was to establish that 'a system of full cost-of-living adjustments will be strongly supported'. This was reckless policy and the proof is now plain for all to see because the chickens that the Hawke Government set loose in 1983 have now come home to roost. We have the results of what the Government started in 1983, namely, higher inflation—the very thing that the Government was warned about.

The September quarter figures show an annual inflation rate of almost 9 per cent. Unemployment figures in South Australia are now running at 9.5 per cent, a rise from 8.7 per cent in August. The highest rate in Australia. I remind members that we have had the advantages in the last year of a Grand Prix and a casino which has been open for 11 months, yet we still have a rise in the unemployment rate. We are now behind Queensland in every key economic indicator. As I and the Hon. Legh Davis have stated, we are the worst State in Australia in nine key indicators and second worst in four.

Queensland, the State that Labor politicians love to hate, is the best State in the Commonwealth in four key indicators, second best in four key indicators and second worst to South Australia in three key areas. In the other two, Queensland is in the middle of the field. The September quarterly figures also show that we have negative employment growth. Comparative inflation figures show that South Australia is second worst of all the States, standing at 26.8 per cent since Labor came to power in South Australia. This is three percentage points worse than the best performed State, Western Australia.

The Leader of the Federal Opposition warned the Federal Government in March 1984, more than 2½ years ago, as follows:

At a time of high inflation and low competitiveness it is quite irresponsible for the Government to be blazing the trail of full wage indexation and advocating wage increases that are greater than the economy can bear.

I repeat that this was 2½ years ago, not yesterday. The Federal Government took a long time to learn. As all the statistics piled up against it, and all the signs emerged of how we were going down the drain compared with other countries, it pushed on for Accord mark 2 which, like Accord mark 1, in plain terms says that wage rates will be fully adjusted in accordance with movements in prices. As if that were not enough, the Federal Government piled on top of our wage cost structure an extra 3 per cent for superannuation. Now we see in yesterday's paper that employment Minister Willis is deeply concerned over superannuation and the level of industrial action since the Government let the Arbitration Commission make a ruling in June—55 000 working days lost over this cause alone. Who said the accord was supposed to stop strikes? That is a nonsense, because it does not. Official statistics do not record strikes of fewer than 10 days, so the pattern of strikes changed from large scale strikes to guerilla tactics of work-to-rule campaigns, work bans and other divisive tactics. No wonder investors move away in droves. Accord mark 2 says:

This agreement is designed to reduce the level of inflation.

After sending the country into an inflationary spiral and an economic suicide dive, the Government has said, 'All right, we will abandon wage indexation.' The Government is marching toward Accord mark 3 and, horror of horrors,

that will include big business and might be known as the Tricord, or perhaps it is the lost chord, or the last chord.

Thank heavens for some of those people in big business who are at last prepared to stand up and fight the work practices, 3 per cent superannuation and other oncosts like the 'Farewell Bob' tax, which are on their production costs. If they are going to be dubbed the New Right I would rather have them than what is emerging now, known as the New Left.

We have been hearing and reading about those recently. I have been Right for 30 years, which is hardly new, and I follow the same philosophies that Menzies put down in founding the Party that I represent, and there is nothing new about that. Labor, of course, is paranoid about any threat. Only two months ago in his budget speech the Federal Treasurer said about the Accord mark 2:

The Government reaffirms its confidence in the prices and income accord.

At the same time the Prime Minister said:

This is hardly the time to be abandoning so well tried and successful a system of wage indexation.

It was at about this time that the famous 'banana republic' remark was made.

Because of the impact of Federal decisions on this State, it must get its act together. It has already shown in many areas that it cannot get its act together, so we wait nervously for decisions. Part of the State getting its act together must involve coming to grips with the increasing deficits that are showing up and hardening in the statutory authority areas, namely, the State Transport Authority, third party insurance and many others. These should not be totally viewed as a service to the public area. The users must be made to pay for what they get. The system is abused enough now, and will be abused more as time goes on.

Let us hope that the Federal Government will indeed embrace the complete policy of the Federal Opposition—a process it has already started, believe it or not! We said that indexation should be abandoned and that has been accepted. We said that Australia should accept the need for flexibility, and that has been accepted. We said restrictive work practices should be removed by agreement between employees and employers; that also has been accepted. We proposed some employees sharing in companies in which they work, and that has been accepted by the Prime Minister at least. We say that the fringe benefit tax must go and now we see the Federal Government lurching about and trying to sort that mess out.

What about the impact on this State's budget? The Premier said at one stage that he could not even calculate this State's responsibilities and liabilities under the fringe benefits tax rules on the 1986-87 State budget. It is stupefying to see Europe selling subsidised wheat to Russia at a price well below our cost of production while at the same time we have the fringe benefits tax adding to the cost of primary production in this country.

Before I complete the saga of the accords let me put to rest one of the myths that the Labor movement has been peddling about the achievement of the accords and wage indexation. The Government has kept saying that the accords have produced wage restraint. First, the Federal budget papers tell us exactly the opposite; they say that, under the present policy, we will have wage increases of over 6 per cent in Australia this year. The countries we will trade with have 4½ per cent.

Secondly, the accord has not brought down labour costs in Australia. The Government tells us that our labour costs have fallen 7 per cent since 1982, but it does not tell us that 5 per cent of that 7 per cent reduction occurred in

1983-84 as a result of the Coalition's wage pause. If we look at nominal labour costs, which is the only real test on unit labour costs, we see that our costs have risen by 4 per cent each year—four times the average of our major trading partners.

Let us look at another area that impacts on this country and this State—the area of private investment. According to Simon Crean, the Australian business community has been letting the country down by not investing more in Australia. While it is true that the profit share of GDP has risen substantially, investment decisions by business are not made on the basis of the share of GDP. The two main considerations in making investments—first, expected future returns and, secondly, returns on alternative uses of the funds—are not reflected in the profit share of GDP.

With such a complex of matters as wage indexation, union run superannuation, the Arbitration Commission's termination charge and redundancy decision, new production taxes such as FBT and capital gains tax, the Prices Surveillance Authority, legislation on occupational health and safety, affirmative action and industrial democracy—with all these threats hanging over their heads it is little wonder that business is showing some nervousness about investing at home.

The attractiveness of alternatives has also dampened investment in industry. One alternative is Government paper. The return here is close to a historic high and more than 2½ times the level of the late 1960s. The average return on business investments is currently better than it was in most of the 1970s, but still substantially below the level of the 1960s. There is no need to remind the Council that unemployment during the 1960s was close to 3 per cent. More importantly, the margin for risky investment in business over riskless Government paper has in recent years been less than half what it was in the 1960s and early 1970s. Until the gap between the return on business investment and alternative investment widens to something like the gap in the 1960s it may be difficult to get substantial increases in business investment in Australia.

May I give the Council a brief explanation of the profit gap to which I refer. In 1966-67 gross returns on assets invested in business returned 25 per cent. Interest on 10 year Government loans or bonds returned 5 per cent. Therefore, the gap was 20 per cent. In 1973-74 that gap was 14 per cent. In 1981-82 it was nil, and in 1984-85 the gap was 9 per cent. The alternatives to business investment in Australia are not all to be found in the public sector.

John Elliott and others have been saying this publicly recently. They have been clobbered for saying that investment overseas is increasingly popular. While overseas investment is small in total, it is growing. It was virtually nothing in 1977-78; it was at \$5 000 million in 1984-85 and, in 1986, \$6 916 million. However, some reports that I have seen recently have put the figure at something in excess of \$12 billion.

While for some people it is seen as unpatriotic to invest or to suggest investment overseas, I hope that people think twice before trying to stop it or tax it out of existence. If a private company has nothing left over after paying wages and on-costs, Federal and State taxation and charges, as well as dividends, it cannot invest in its own future or in new machinery or in whatever is required to make new products to compete on the domestic or world markets. If the redistribution of wealth through higher and higher wages and on-costs diminishes the ability to pay dividends or if overseas dividends provide the investor with a better return than do investments here, there will be no investors in Australia.

I do not think that the message in the profit gap example can be put any more clearly than that. In the 1960s and the early 1970s, there was little unemployment. Business had a 25 per cent return on assets and were reinvesting in business. That was 20 years ago, and a lot has changed since then. The difference between 10 year Government bonds and returns on assets invested in property and private business was somewhere around 19 per cent, average. Government bonds were not competing with big business in any great way for the investment dollar. Government bonds would be used mainly for servicing public demand, and there was not a great demand at that time.

In 1982-83, Government 10 year bonds got to an interest rate of about 17 per cent. They are now around 13 per cent and still competing for investment funds to fuel the Government machine. To me, the message is simple: the greater the company profits, the less unemployment and welfare there is, while more Government intervention means more unemployment, taxes and welfare. Further, it should not be forgotten that our uncompetitiveness overseas in farm and manufacturing products cost us \$5 000 million in 1985-86 or \$300 for every Australian. The J curve cannot work with a low dollar and a high interest rate. The vitriolic reaction to comments made by John Elliott and others about investment in Australia is a depressing indication of just how much trouble we are really in. It shows that as a country we have hardly even begun to understand the desperate nature of the problem, let alone embark on the necessarily painful solution.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: A gain in commodity prices had nothing to do with it, I suppose.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Of course commodity prices have something to do with it, but the enormous cost of producing the commodity also has something to do with it. The painful solutions do not lie in the fairy floss popular entertainment things that this Government plans for South Australia. Coming from the painful decisions must be products that we can sell here and overseas. We cannot continue running around in circles with the gambling and entertainment dollar. Here we are in South Australia with a legal and illegal gambling turnover in excess of \$1 billion annually, with profits going to the Government, to fund more Government activity, and to be used to pick up the pieces of individuals and families ruined by their own excesses.

I add to this argument by referring to one of a number of excellent articles written recently by Matthew Abraham. In his article entitled 'Dream Machine Grinds on', he states:

If you can't give the voters bricks and mortar, give them dreams instead . . . In his 1985 policy speech, Premier Bannon said, 'Last week I announced the go-ahead for a world class entertainment and sports centre at a site in Hindmarsh.' He skipped over the next line in the draft of his speech: 'No longer will South Australians have to put up with second best for major concerts and international sporting events.' A handy omission, because the Premier knew then, as he knows now, that South Australians will have to put up with second best for much, much longer. Mr Bannon knew then, as he knows very well now, that his Government cannot afford to build an entertainment centre. It can afford even less to run one, if and when the centre is built. In at least two conversations, the Premier has candidly said it is highly unlikely the centre will operate at a profit and, therefore, will be a burden on State finances.

And there are so many other burdens that are on the State. The article continues:

So why build it? Mr Bannon maintains there is an expectation in the community that the Government should deliver such a centre, and, despite the Budget problems, that places an onus on the Government to respond to the need.

But is there not also a Government responsibility to expose the electorate to some of the realities of the times? Now, much of the expectation about an entertainment centre has been generated not by the electorate, but by the Government and by the media.

The issue is a recognition of what can be termed the SA•FM vote—the dynamic political punch of the youth vote, represented in its most basic terms by the on-air lobbying by SA•FM announcers for a large rock concert venue.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Olsen put ads on SA•FM promoting the entertainment centre.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I do not mind what he did, but he intended to finance it with private money, not Government money. The article continues:

Premier Bannon is not about to trample the dreams of the youth vote, but he may have to recycle them for a while.

On ABC radio yesterday morning, the Director of Tourism, Mr Graham Inns, admitted the Government could not afford the centre, but the plans were needed to allow the concept to be brought into focus.

When asked whether the 1990 elections might bring it into sharper focus, Mr Inns agreed, with a chuckle, that he supposed they just might.

Dream on voters, the laugh's on you.

I agree that people need dreams—the drug induced dreamers will always escape reality, and that is why they take the stuff. The great majority of ordinary dreamers, however, have to wake up to reality sometime. It is bad enough that some State Premiers totally misinterpret people such as Mr Elliott and attack their comments as examples of big business, and of being selfish and un-Australian. In summary, this is what Mr Elliott, for instance, said:

Anyone investing in Australia—that is building factories—would be doing so for merely sentimental reasons because Australia's high taxes and interest rate suggest that this would be the last place in which anyone would want to invest.

He went on to say that Australia's high interest rates and taxes meant that in Australia a gross return of 25 per cent was required on investment, compared with about 15 per cent in Hong Kong, 16 per cent in the United States and 18 per cent in Britain. These are brutal and irrevocable laws of arithmetic. They are the unavoidable consequences of our levels of interest rates. The lowest level at which the banks will lend to their bluest of blue chip customers is around 18 per cent. In the United States of America it is closer to 8 per cent. In Australia the corporate tax rate has just been raised to 49 per cent, and in the United States it is about to be lowered to 35 per cent.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Does that include the fringe benefits tax?

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: That is added on. The simple arithmetical fact is that business in Australia has to generate a much higher return in order to cover the interest charges and to pay higher company tax. If we need further proof of what is happening, let me state that National Mutual Life recently announced that its overseas equity investments had returned 107 per cent. The biggest life fund, AMP, has between 25 per cent and 35 per cent of its pension funds invested overseas, National Mutual has 25 per cent, and CML has up to 40 per cent offshore. Other companies like Brambles, Boral and Dunlop have overseas interests which produced 30 per cent to 40 per cent of their earnings. That is another aspect to overseas investment; those are earnings coming back into the country from overseas.

As politicians we should begin to realise that we live in a real world. We cannot keep producing yo-yos, for instance, for \$10 if they are being made in another country like the United States for \$4. More importantly, no-one will invest \$100 million in order to build a new yo-yo factory if its product cannot compete with the United States or any other country. Clearly, if business in South Australia could clear the sort of gross margin generated in the United States, when here they have had to pay double the interest rates and 14 per cent higher company tax (not including the iniquitous fringe benefits tax), they would pour money into new factories. Clearly, they are not.

The South Australian Government must work harder to persuade the Federal Government to improve the investment climate in Australia, and confidence must be restored by Governments addressing the problems. If we want a real example of what is happening, let us look at General Motors-Holdens, which is so vital along with other car manufacturers to the South Australian economic scene. General Motors-Holdens' investment in Australian manufacturing since 1980 has been \$688 million. It is the largest exporter of manufactured goods, amounting to \$1 million a day. It is the largest private employer in South Australia. At Elizabeth, one of its factories is one of the most modern of its kind in the world. It has just made another \$150 million investment at Elizabeth. The General Motors-Holdens Corporation of the United States has just baled out its Australian subsidiary to the tune of \$782 million, which was accumulated over the past six years. That bale out was announced just after GMH had been credit rated in the lowest 2 per cent of Australia's 300 top companies.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It's private enterprise.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: But it is being throttled by union movement demands. In the proper circumstances, private enterprise would expand.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. B.C. Chatterton): Order! The Hon. Mr Irwin has the floor.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I repeat that GMH was credit rated in the lowest 2 per cent of the 300 top companies and, in commercial terms, it could almost be construed as insolvent. What is happening in Australia today? A total of 5 500 people were stood down in the car industry following a strike created by 29 people. Whatever anyone thinks of the car manufacturing industry in South Australia, what do we do when it is decided elsewhere that no-one will bale GMH out in Australia any more? There is no doubt that the people of South Australia are adopting a mentality that someone will bale us out. I mention the Youth Music Festival and the Three Day Event.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: They did it under your guidance.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It was private enterprise.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: It was not proper private enterprise. It was done under the guidance of the Government. I do not mind who did it. It is this bale out mentality that, if one gets into trouble, someone (usually the Labor Government) will bale that person out.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Do you suggest that we should have left Mr Fricker with the debts?

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Some years ago that probably would have been the gentlemanly thing to do, but these events pale into insignificance when compared with the swimming centre project which was approved at a cost of \$3 million and the final cost was close to \$10 million. There is also the ASER development, which I think was approved at a cost of \$180 million, but it will probably finish costing close to double that; I hope that it is not more than double. There is then the daddy of them all, the Federal Parliament building which was approved for about \$200 million—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It's a Fraser building.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I'm not arguing who approved it: I am making a point, if you will listen, Attorney.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Don't blame us for the Federal Parliament building.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I'm fair: I'm taking both sides. The building was approved by the Parliament for about \$200 million and it will finish costing over \$1 000 million. In most of the cases the Government does the baling out. If members of Parliament had known the final costs, they

may not have approved those projects and they may have got their priorities right. That is the point I am trying to make. Will some other industries magically spring up and employ all those who GMH would retrench if that company is told to leave the country? The answer to that is that they will not. Tom Playford's vision, innovation and action in the State produced perhaps the best period that this State has ever known. Will we really just sit here and let industry leave this State and this country, because investment has had a gutful of the conditions imposed on them as outlined by me elsewhere? Every business annual general meeting report that I read says the same thing as Mr Elliott: this State Government and the Federal Government cannot ignore it any longer.

I make brief reference to an analysis of the 1929 Depression. If we omit the Marxist view that ups and downs of the business cycle are episodes of the demise of capitalism, there remains a loose consensus among some other analysts. The neo-classical school has it that the 1929 Depression was prolonged in almost every Western country by regulated practices which prevented business from adjusting to deflation. All schools of thought see the Great Depression as a crisis caused by Government interfering with capitalism. Without doubt the Depression was a crisis for capitalism and the point I make (and one from which we must learn) is that in Australia during the Depression all the State Governments, in varying degrees, had bankrupted themselves by excessive expenditure and irresponsible borrowing.

Is that what is happening in 1986 in Australia and South Australia? I am appalled by the level of borrowing in South Australia by this Government, local government, small business and, increasingly, the people whom I know best, the primary producers of this State. With all that is said about the Federal Government policy and the accord, I have to say once again that the emphasis is on those who are employed. We do not care a damn about reducing unemployment to what would be an acceptable level of 3 per cent. People have a right to expect employment, as they demand a right to free education, free health care and everything else. But there is no escaping the fact that wages must come down to allow for an unemployment level of 3 per cent. This is the best way to help reduce the number of welfare beneficiaries and the poverty traps.

There is no escaping the fact that, unfortunately, lower wages will mean a lower standard of living. If company and personal taxation, both Federal and State, was greatly reduced, this would surely help—in many ways. Wealth is being redistributed in Australia today, but the system is not working as ordinary people, particularly those on welfare, want it to work. When will we treat the causes of welfare instead of spending blood, sweat, tears and an enormous amount of energy arguing, sometimes in this place, and bawling over limited resources to cover an ever increasing Government induced need? Cannot Governments get it through their thick collective skulls that high taxing and high charging is creating the need for more welfare, not reducing it? If I am wrong in that assumption, I hope that someone in this place will prove it.

The Government is creating new wealth and more poor. Moreover, it is creating a whole new breed of tax cheats embracing almost every citizen in this State. As Australia wobbles over an Argentinian razor edge, Mr Keating's fanciful claims do not dispel the gravity of the \$1.45 billion September trade deficit. His monument is the FBT. Australia's trade crisis has now increased our foreign debt to more than \$90 billion—a 31 per cent increase over 1984-85. Labor will learn a lot about the human dimension of minimum wages as the recession deepens, and this will have

an effect in South Australia. In fact, we will be at the forefront.

The two tier wage fixing system that is proposed by the ACTU is meddling nonsense. Its overall thrust is destructive. It condemns people to unemployment and, therefore, to the welfare system. We know from yesterday's news that the FBT has now been substantially altered to the tune of \$70 million. It has at last been amended to take out some of the most bizarre tax liabilities. It will not make any difference, however, to the State Government's fringe benefits tax liability. Let us hope that the Federal Court challenge initiated by New South Wales, Queensland and other States will wipe out that tax if others will not do it.

Small business, including farmers, will undoubtedly vent their considerable feeling on the Federal Government. This highly productive, hard working and important sector of the South Australian and Australian community must be encouraged to get through this low spot in world commodity trade, because we need the farmers and small business to get us going, to serve us and to feed us. If the Federal and State Governments can take giant steps towards mending the fences that they have broken and reverse the undesirable trends to which I have referred (and many who are better than me have referred to them) not only the farmers but all people will be better off.

I wanted to comment on a number of matters under the budget lines, but I confess to being slightly lost in this my first attempt to understand the complexities of a State budget. I note with interest that accompanying both the Federal and State budgets, I believe for the first time, was a document called 'The 1986-87 Budget and its Impact on Women'. I cannot recall seeing anything in the press or indeed in the *Hansard* explaining just why this was done, and I guess that it is plain and simple politicking, because the Government perceives that it has the women's vote and this action is designed as one way of keeping that vote. However, I assure the Government that it will have to do more to keep this important sector of the voting community. I note from that document that there are a number of areas where men predominate in the employment arena and other areas where women predominate. I would hope that in the fullness of time these two areas will truly come together, because we are being educated to believe that no employment area is sacred to one or the other of the sexes. I hope that this Government will go one step further in the future and publish documents on the budgetary impact on other specific areas, such as the family, men, farmers, small business and large manufacturing business; otherwise, this will be seen as misleading the people.

I guess it is easy to be negative, and what I have said today could in no way be seen as a glowing account of our present or future in South Australia. Nor can what I have said be discounted as being less than the truth of the economic position. But what I can say, which is not negative, is that South Australia, with a proven track record of innovation and progressiveness going back to the founding of this State, can go on leading Australia by getting things moving, as Canberra cannot do. And what better year to start than our Jubilee year—150 years of existence.

If we can move to free up the market for potatoes and eggs—and I guess that the Government did not do that to benefit the potato growers, and it will not do it to benefit many other producers—will the Government, in fairness, for the benefit of everyone, move to free up the labour market, to greatly reduce State taxes and charges? If they can do it for one sector, they can do it for others. If the Government has the courage to do some of these things, it

just may get South Australia off the bottom rung of the ladder of the States.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: May I congratulate the Hon. Mr Irwin on his contribution, which reflects a great deal of research and knowledge about his subject matter.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I suggest that the Hon. Mr Bruce read the speech in written form: he might learn something from it. Parliament is debating this budget at a time when the State's economy is in a very serious position. There is no doubt about that, and I believe it is only proper for Parliament to fully appreciate the problems that are facing Australia. Almost daily, if not weekly, and it goes back month by month, there are indicators and announcements emphasising the economic plight through which South Australia is passing at present. In a budget debate of this kind it is the duty of all parliamentarians on both sides to try to make some contribution to assist the Government of the day to rectify this economic plight so that the people of South Australia can enjoy better economic times than they are facing at present.

For example, only yesterday I noticed in the *Advertiser* an article dealing with vehicle sales in which it was indicated that these sales were the lowest for 10 years. It was a Canberra article written by Dennis Atkins and stated:

Motor vehicle sales are the lowest in almost a decade and the industry is predicting the worst year since the late 1960s.

New motor vehicle registrations in September fell to 42 766—the lowest monthly figure since April 1977.

The result, given by the Australian Statistician yesterday, is a dramatic slump from the record high of 61 682 new registrations recorded last November.

Industry sources said a combination of economic and tax factors will cause the loss of about 100 000 new car sales this year.

The sales slump was costing the industry about \$1 000 million in turnover this year.

People from all over Australia no doubt read that article issued from Canberra, but it has a special meaning of course to the people of South Australia because we know that the motor industry is a large component of the overall secondary industrial scene in South Australia. In fact, the Hon. Mr Irwin indicated that General Motors-Holden, just one of the operators here, was the largest private employer of labour in this State. So, the position here is bad and, unless the Government is most careful in its economic strategy, it can only worsen.

I commend the Hon. Legh Davis for producing the figures he did in his speech the other day on this same Bill to highlight key economic indicators which without any doubt show the very grim situation in which South Australia is placed. I want to repeat some of those figures because, although it is repetition, it is extremely important that we all contribute in helping the South Australian position. However, we must be realistic and try to work from the correct and proper economic base that does exist.

The figures were taken from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, from industry statistics and Government departments and show that our population growth was the worst in Australia for the year to 30 June 1985. The growth here was 0.66 per cent against an Australian average of 1.26 per cent. Our net migration gain from overseas and interstate for the year ended 30 June 1985 was the worst in Australia. Indeed, it was minus 0.04 per cent against an Australian average of 0.44 per cent. Our employment growth in South Australia for the year July 1985 to July 1986 was the worst in Australia. It was only 2.6 per cent against an Australian average of 4.3 per cent.

On the subject of overtime worked, we had the worst record of any State. Our figure was minus 21.6 per cent

against an Australian average of 0.1 per cent. Our unemployment rate (and these were not the figures given the other day as they are more recent than that) in September 1986 was the worst in Australia at 9.5 per cent as against an Australian average of 8.3 per cent. With building approvals we had the worst record in Australia for the six months to 30 June 1986 compared with the same period for 1985. We had minus 36.1 per cent downturn in building approvals against an Australian average of minus 21.5 per cent. With new private capital expenditure we ran second worst to Queensland at 3 per cent against an Australian average of a remarkable 28 per cent.

New vehicle registrations showed us as the second lowest in Australia, a negative figure again of minus 26 per cent against an Australian average of minus 22 per cent. In motorcycle registrations we had the worst record in Australia for the six months to 30 June 1986 compared with the same period in 1985. We ran down to a negative figure of minus 34.8 per cent against an Australian average of minus 30.2 per cent.

Our retail sales were second worst in Australia, increasing over the six month period to June 1986 (compared with the same period for 1985) to 8.2 per cent against an Australian average of 10.8 per cent. In connection with bankruptcies, we had the highest increase for 1985-86 at 39.3 per cent against an Australian average of 18.3 per cent. With inflation, the movement in the consumer price index figures since the Labor Government came to office in this State in 1982 puts us, with 26.8 per cent, at second worst with Victoria worst at 27.1 per cent. Our figure was set against an Australian average of 25.5 per cent. Finally, in the important area of State taxation we had the highest increase in Australia if we look at the years from 1981-82 through to 1985-86. That 68.5 per cent must be looked upon against an Australian average of 54.5 per cent.

I make no apology for once again reading into *Hansard* those figures as they are extremely important. One of the measures the Government has taken to try to get the South Australian economy going and to try to assist this unfortunate serious plight in which the State is placed is to increase its borrowings. The Government can quite legitimately claim that this situation is being forced upon it, but it has absorbed the borrowing potential that this State enjoyed compared with other States up until this financial year. One might say this really was the last reserve upon which we had to call to try to keep up public employment to reasonable levels. The Government is living in hope, having let this reserve potential go by this new and expanded borrowing, that the situation will rectify itself this financial year. One can only support that hope because, if it does not, the Government will not have anything to fall back on next year and will be forced to take more drastic measures than it has taken this time.

As I read the budget papers, I believe that this is the main thrust of the Government's plan to assist this State this financial year. The Premier has referred to this matter in his Financial Statement on page 8, as follows:

Our immediate objective is to avoid a sudden change in the size of the program, so as to not damage the private sector. However, largely as a consequence of reduced funds from the Commonwealth and from Loan Council, the achievement of this objective will necessitate a considerable increase in State borrowings for capital works in the forthcoming year.

The Government's continued ability to borrow at such levels and to service the debt commitments arising from those borrowings will depend to a marked extent on how quickly the national economy improves.

In the planning of the 1986-87 works program, the Government has placed considerable emphasis on the ensuing commitment level into future years, with a view to adjusting the pattern of future capital expenditures as circumstances dictate.

I comment on this important aspect of the budget before us. It is a great pity that the State has had to resort to this extra borrowing. This State enjoyed a borrowing pattern which was far more attractive than that of other States but, of course, that pattern has been shattered by this extra loan borrowing this year, and one can only hope that better times will come so that measures of this kind, and even more drastic measures, will not have to be resorted to in future.

What the Government should have looked at very closely instead of resorting to this action, was to take the bold step of trying to further decrease the outgoings and expenditures of the State. The simple business principles and facts are that when any business gets into bother the first thing it should look at is whether or not it can reduce its outgoings. When business gets into bother, if it takes the first course—as the Government has done on this occasion—of borrowing further, it can well be faced with bankruptcy before very long.

I have grave doubts that the Government has looked at this question of outgoings as closely as it should have done. For example, I tried to find some figures to see whether any genuine effort was being made to reduce the labour force employed by the Government. In other words, has the Government really tried to reduce the Public Service? I see again in this Financial Statement by the Treasurer the following paragraph:

In drawing up the budget for 1986-87, the Government expects that total employment in Public Service departments (excluding the Health Commission) will be stabilised, so that planned employment levels for June 1987 will be virtually the same as at June 1986.

In some areas such as welfare, correctional services, ancillary staffing in schools, police and consumer protection there will be growth in employment. I will comment on these areas later.

Specific programs designed to generate savings through slower growth in staff numbers are also being undertaken in relation to the executive and administrative officer levels of the Public Service. The Government's aim is to reduce overheads and thus increase our capacity to improve the delivery of services. Similarly, action is being taken to reduce management services officer positions within departments.

That means that, overall, there will not be an aggregate reduction in the Government's labour force. I cannot see the Government's problems improving until that business-like approach is undertaken and the question of expenditure tackled.

Of special interest to me is the public works area. I submit that money is not being spent with caution and with extreme care in this area. There are examples of unnecessary expenditure, and if this continues our reserves—and I am again referring to that borrowing capacity—will be expended this year and then great danger will follow. I want to give two examples of where I believe the Government has not exercised sufficient care in these times of great economic stringency.

First, I refer to the Mobilong medium security male prison which, as members know, is under construction at present. Its original cost was estimated in July 1985 at \$18.5 million; it was then estimated that the cost on completion in October 1987 would be \$21.25 million. The running and amortisation costs against consolidated revenue are estimated at \$6 million per annum. I mention those figures because I think that that justifies a claim that that is quite a major public work. The design and general layout of the project is that there are four units, each of which will house 40 prisoners; in other words, 160 medium security male prisoners will be housed in the new gaol. I will refer to some of the specifications and details of this prison to make the point concerning what I consider to be extravagance which should be avoided in times such as these.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Did you oppose it on the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: As a matter of fact I did.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Did you vote against it?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: It is a long story. I was not present at the time the vote was taken, but I wrote a letter expressing my opposition.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You weren't there and now you come along and complain. You should have been there, if you were that concerned.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I was out of the State, as I recall. I would have been there had I been able to be there.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You could have put it off.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Attorney is always keen to have a shot at the Public Works Committee, but there is far more to this subject than that. What are some of the plans and specifications for this prison? Dealing with prisoner accommodation, this is what the Government is spending its money on. Each of four units is to house 40 prisoners. The report states:

Each unit will contain the following:

- TV viewing lounge
- Dining/recreation area
- Storage area for daily crockery and cutlery
- Washing up area for crockery and cutlery
- Waste disposal device
- Hot drink preparation area
- Refrigerator for storing cool drinks, milk and basic foodstuffs
- Storage space for cleaning materials
- Storage space for sporting equipment
- Storage space for linen and prisoner issue clothing
- Sally-port entrance
- Officers station.

Each cell will contain a bed, desk, wardrobe, shower, W.C., and handbasin and will be well ventilated and a comfortable temperature maintained. Each cell will provide storage space for prisoners' personal possessions such as radio, TV, books and other minor personal effects. The cell will be lockable by the prisoner. Each cell will have a TV antenna CO-AX outlet, cable video, cell intercom and emergency call button.

Cells in the cell block will be so arranged that supervision is easily maintained from a central control point in each block and will provide a dining/recreational area large enough for a pool-table, card playing and outside recreational area for quiet activities. The design, layout size and finish of prisoner cells are such that a non-institutional appearance will be achieved while at the same time providing for the needs of good surveillance and medium security.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: Tell us what is surplus or luxurious in that? What would you abolish?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: It is all right if the State can afford it. I could go through some of those items, if you want me to. However, I shall continue. I refer to the outdoor recreational facilities that the Government in this year of loan stringency is spending funds on. There will be a running or jogging track, a cricket or football oval, a swimming pool and sheltered areas for passive recreations, and then for good measure there will be tennis courts. In relation to indoor recreation, an indoor multi-purpose recreation hall will be provided to accommodate volleyball, basketball, and weight training. A prisoners' canteen and canteen manager's office will be provided, as will a barber's shop, prisoners' and visitors' changing rooms, with internal and external access, storage areas, and a prisoners' laundry.

In relation to medical services that are to be catered for, there will be a six bed infirmary, including one single bed observation ward and a single bed ward. There will be a dental surgery, including dental X-ray equipment, two doctors' consulting rooms, one room for the use of physiotherapists, and another for the use of paramedical staff on a visiting basis. There will be a treatment room, a records and dispensary room, with secure storage for dangerous drugs, a nurses' station, staff toilets, tea making facilities,

waiting areas, storage space, and a closed courtyard for patients.

In relation to psychological services, it is stated by the Government that psychological therapy is indispensable to the systematic care and resocialisation of prisoners. In accordance with that, interview rooms and office accommodation will be provided for the psychologist. Further, social workers will have separate rooms and there will be an office for family consulting or small group work.

In relation to education, a large classroom will be provided and will be divided into separate areas, if required. Included in that area will be four soundproof booths for small tutorials and individual study. There will be a library for educational and general library services, and office space for clerical staff, lecturing and custodial staff. There will be a lunch room and tea making facilities for prisoners and staff. Further, general workshop and craft/hobbies areas and storage space will be provided.

The point I am making is that when the State is using up the last real reserve that it has within its budgetary arrangements by absorbing that capacity to borrow and, in fact, borrowing, in an effort to keep the wheels turning, surely, extreme care should be taken as to how that money should be spent. If this State was in affluent times, it could well afford this, but at present it cannot.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: Tell us what you'd cut.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The honourable member should be able to imagine how that could be pruned to provide fair and reasonable gaol accommodation with provision for expansion and extensions when money becomes available; I do not think he needs any help from me. He should consider some of the items, for example, such as the football oval, the tennis courts and the jogging track.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: Do you want to lock them in cells all day? What will they do?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The first thing I would want them to do is to build those facilities themselves. Scores of clubs in this State have provided ovals for the communities in country towns, and so forth. In those cases volunteers from the towns have turned out and built those facilities. But here the money provided for this facility is that of the taxpayer—the Hon. Mr Bruce's money and mine. Do not let us forget that; all these public loans are public money. But the Government does not consider details of that kind in these stringent times. It lets the prisoners stand by while we build them a jogging track, a tennis court and a swimming pool.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I will not be side tracked by the Hon. Mr Bruce. My point stands: when the economic situation is difficult and the Government places itself and the State at risk by extremely high borrowing under its budget, and when the State is forced therefore to borrow extra funds to keep its programs going, there is no place for extravagance and a tight and lean program must be adhered to.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. HILL: If the Hon. Mr Bruce is unhappy about that, I wonder what he thinks about my next example.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: You haven't told us the life expectancy of Mobilong prison? How long do you expect it to be an active prison?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: It will be there for a long time; there is no doubt about that.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: Don't you want it to start right?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: It can be started right if you have the money, but other factors must be considered in times of heavy borrowing.

My other example concerns the Noarlunga Downs Primary School. I quote now from the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. This is a public report—it has been laid on the table of both Houses, and was ordered by the House of Assembly on 14 August 1986 to be printed. I want to place on record the findings of the committee in regard to this capital expenditure item of \$3.407 million—the estimated cost now. We all know about the increases in costs that occur by the time these projects have been completed. I refer to the findings of the committee set out in the report. I hope that after I have read this the Hon. Mr Sumner will say that the committee has done a good job, as he is always having a shot at the committee. Paragraph 8 of the report is as follows:

The findings of the committee are as follows:

1. Whilst the site selected is in an exposed location it is relatively level and suitable for school purposes.
2. When the domestic housing is erected as planned in the Noarlunga Downs area there will be the need for a primary school and community facilities.
3. Whilst there are about 70 houses mainly on the periphery of the school catchment area there is no housing in the immediate vicinity of the school site at present nor is there any subdivisional development taking place.
4. The Housing Trust recognises Noarlunga Downs as an area having high priority for the development of domestic housing and its plans envisage that completed houses will become available as from 1988.
5. The neighbouring primary schools of Hackham West and Hackham South are under pressure from rising student enrolments but the Christies Beach Primary School to the west would have student places available in the short term.
6. Whilst departmental officers insist that the department is now erecting schools more economically than previously the committee can only observe that the unit cost and area indicators for this school are of the order of the highest that have come before it.
7. The committee is stressing that where the cost and area per student is high and the teaching area coefficient is low one is forced to the conclusion that a more spacious approach is being adopted and naturally a cost factor is involved.
8. A further worrying factor is that the unit indicators are displaying bad trends at the same time that departmental labour is proposed to be used on this project.
9. Even the siteworks expense involved with this project is disturbingly high.
10. The committee can only repeat the advice it has given about other recently planned schools, which is that, if a more generous approach is adopted with each school, there will be less schools built out of the proposed budget allocation.

The committee then recommends that the proposed public work be proceeded with. There we have a situation where (and again I repeat), in these difficult times, a school is to be erected when the houses have not yet been built. A school is to be erected when the children are not there.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That's what you call forward planning.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Forward planning! It is poor planning and that is what you should be explaining.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Forward planning, proper planning for the future for the kids.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: You have so much money for public works that you can forward plan and construct in that way when you are putting the State at risk in this budget.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: No.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Yes, you are: your main thrust in this budget is that, in regard to the borrowing capacity which this State has had in reserve for years and which it has not absorbed, this year you have borrowed accordingly and taken up that slack.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What would you want to do if you were in Government? I know what you did when you were there.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: If I were in Government and that happened in economic times such as this, I would put a rocket under my planners of capital works expenditure—I really would. Of course, I could go off on a tangent and ask about the dozens of established schools which for years have been crying out for capital works but cannot get any money to build the extra classroom or the playground that is so required, but that is not the point with which I am concerned here. I am concerned with the fact that the Government is not exercising care and caution in regard to its public works expenditure when we have situations like the two examples that I quoted. I hope that the Attorney-General and the Government look upon this as an endeavour in which they can be constructive. It should not happen. We all have an obligation to try to assist the economic position of the Government if we can. There is a weakness somewhere if, in these times, a new school is permitted to be built when the houses that are planned to surround it have not been erected.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: If they do not build a school there and in 12 months time the kids haven't got anywhere to go to school, you'll be complaining about lack of planning.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The honourable member is getting a bit silly, because the hour is getting late. The Government should therefore fine tune its capital expenditure and projects to develop programs and works in keeping with standards that the State can afford. If that had occurred over the past financial year there would not have been the need for this forced borrowing. There should be no room for standards that we cannot afford or for extravagance and waste. I hope that the Government looks at this question and does something about it.

In relation to the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, in the past few months I have been concerned when people have made representations to me and talked to me at various functions in which migrant communities are involved about what is really happening with the Ethnic Affairs Commission. None seems to know what it is doing.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What do you mean?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: We have not seen one press release from the commission this current year. I want to know whether the Minister is fully satisfied with it. What really happened when the Hon. Mr Sumner moved into the portfolio in 1982 was that he took the attitude that there was not enough happening there and he instigated a very large inquiry. He brought his friend, Dr Totaro, over from Sydney and he wanted to stir things up. As a result, he did stir it up and it took a lot more money to stir it up. I notice that this year the expenditure will be \$1.759 million, which is a slight increase of \$49 000 over last year's figure.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Are you saying it is too much?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I am saying it is too much for what the communities are getting out of it.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: The former shadow Minister of Ethnic Affairs says that ethnic affairs gets too much.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: You know I did not say that. What I am saying is that the Minister said, 'I will have an inquiry. We will shake it up.' He very carefully selected Dr Totaro, who said that it had to build its image and that it had to project itself as an active body. He said that it had to be really upfront amongst the ethnic community. The Minister accepted that recommendation and increased the size of the commission when sections and departments were set up. A huge expenditure of \$1.7 million was involved last year but, from the point of view of servicing the people, there has been no change. The Minister is happy that there is no controversy so, on the one hand, he says, 'We will

make it an active body. We will project it into the community. We will cause it to be the leader amongst these associations that administer ethnic affairs,' but, on the other hand, he says, 'Look, we don't want too much fuss, because there is always another point of view and it is a very sensitive area.'

Despite the increased cost, and so forth, what has really happened is that the private bodies (and I suppose it is a question of private enterprise being so superior) such as the United Ethnic Communities Council—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They've got funding.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Yes, I know that they pressured you into that. There is also the Ethnic Communities Council of Australia, South Australian Division, which is now upfront. It is doing the job and servicing its people very well indeed. I want to know whether the commission now has implemented all the recommendations that his inquiry brought down.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Pretty well.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: We might go into more detail in relation to that by way of questions later. Has the Minister implemented all the recommendations of that report which he hailed as being a means of saving the commission from stagnation? What are they doing? Could the Minister give some sort of explanation? I can assure the Minister that I am not alone in my concern. A lot of my friends from the migrant communities ask, 'What has happened to your commission?' I hasten to explain to them that, while I was responsible for its establishment, it has been under the administration of Mr Sumner for the past four years and they accept that. They then ask, 'What about the commission?' and they are very dissatisfied. The other matter involves the Minister of Health. During this budget debate, if this Government had any respect at all for Parliament, it would have its three Ministers in the Council whenever the budget is referred to.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I'm the Minister in charge of the Bill.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: No, you are not. There are questions that are asked of other Ministers and you know that.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I represent the Treasurer.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: We know how good you are, but you cannot do everything. It is a very poor show when the Government treats Parliament with contempt and treats this matter as if it were just another Bill. This is the most important Bill for 12 months and all Ministers should be jotting down the queries and should be ready to answer questions in the Committee stage.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: This is not an Estimates Committee.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: This is the budget paper. What has Dr Cornwall done about a query that I raised and an undertaking that he gave on the floor of the Council on 5 March? It was to do with procedures of the Public Works Standing Committee.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: I have consulted with the Minister and he will not change the rules.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: You sit down and listen. I am very pleased that the Minister is here. I asked the Minister—

... to give me an undertaking that some kind of investigation in the Department of Housing and Construction will be undertaken, at the top level, more particularly at the Director-General level, with a view to bringing all inefficient and outmoded practices up to date. That is not too much to ask.

I do not want to hold up the Council. Dr Cornwall replied:

It seems an anachronism that each member of the committee, when the committee visits areas such as Mount Gambier or other areas of the State, pays accounts individually, so there would be seven members of the committee and, of course, their support

staff (anything up to a dozen people) booking out of a motel at about the same time in the morning.

It would appear to be far more convenient if the motel was to send the account directly to the Secretary of the committee and the Minister arranged some way of checking the account and then authorising payment.

He then said:

I give the Hon. Mr Hill a personal undertaking—

and it was an undertaking given under the Westminster system, I remind the Minister, and if such undertakings are not honoured then the Minister should move to the back bench—

that this matter will be drawn to the attention of the Minister of Public Works. I believe that those matters of administration that would lead to better efficiency and perhaps in the long run economy could be instituted.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What was the date?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: It was 5 March 1986. I pursued the matter again in Committee, and the Hon. Dr Cornwall said:

... I did specifically address the matters raised earlier by the Hon. Mr Hill concerning the current inefficiencies involved in the payment of travelling costs and expenses of members of the Public Works Standing Committee and support staff. I even specifically referred to the fact that it got down to individual costs for individual meals in individual motels and the subsequent drawing of individual cheques. On occasion this has been known to cause a little friction amongst members of the committee. Therefore, the sooner this is put to rights, the better. I have given a personal undertaking that I will discuss the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Housing and Construction.

Towards the end of the second reading debate and in Committee I asked the Minister to inform me whether he had honoured that undertaking and, if so, would he kindly let me know the considered reply of the Minister. So many matters raise their head in the Public Works Standing Committee that the sooner a new broom is swept through the system, the better. If I might digress for a moment, I wonder whether members in this Council realise that, if the committee goes into the country as part of its work, if members stay at a hotel overnight and if a member of that committee has a glass of beer with his meal, that member must pay for the glass of beer, the cost of the meal being borne by the committee. By this antiquated method, each member brings back his little chits, passing them in so that a clerical officer in the Department of Housing and Construction has to deal with 12 individual meal reimbursement cheques.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: I think it's a pretty funny committee if you can't get your act together.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: To be quite frank about it, the Minister must get off his bottom and do something about it.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Which one?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Minister of Housing and Construction. If the system whereby committee members have to pay for their own glass of beer and are reimbursed the cost of the food is not antiquated, I do not know what is.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Why don't you get the Chairman to sign for it?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: That system is in dispute.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: It is a funny committee.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Hon. Dr Cornwall says that it is a funny committee. While I do not reflect on any members of the committee, and no doubt the Minister is—

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: I mean collectively.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Shall we say that the system under which the members operate is very peculiar indeed. In conclusion, I come back to the constructive part of my address. I urge the Government to ensure that, while the present economic climate prevails, its public works pro-

grams are limited to essential, cost-effective projects incorporating basic requirements and forgoing some of the high standard features that would normally be part of such projects in more affluent times.

The **Hon. R.J. RITSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 4 November at 2.15 p.m.