

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 18 August 1987

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

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

QUESTION ON NOTICE

WOMEN'S BULLETIN

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW (on notice) asked the Attorney-General:

In relation to the South Australian Women's Bulletin—

- (a) How much did it cost in 1986-87 to prepare, publish and post the magazine?
- (b) Was this cost met fully by the Women's Adviser's Office, Premier's Department?
- (c) If not, did the Government Printer meet the publishing and/or postage costs and what was this amount?
- (d) How many copies are published per issue?
- (e) What are the names of all the organisations and individuals on the mailing list?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The replies are as follows:

- (a) The total cost of preparation, publishing and posting the South Australian Women's Bulletin in 1986-87 was \$5 603.59.
- (b) The cost was met fully by the Women's Adviser's Office, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.
- (c) The Government Printer holds the mailing list and mails each issue out, charging the Women's Adviser's Office accordingly.
- (d) Each issue comprises 2 000 copies.
- (e) The mailing list contains some 1 800 names of Government and non-government organisations, community groups and interested individuals from South Australia and interstate. The remainder of each issue is distributed through points such as the Women's Information Switchboard and the Working Women's Centre. The mailing list continues to grow as interested people notify the Women's Adviser's Office of their wish to subscribe.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—
 Supreme Court Act 1935—Regulations—Supreme Court Document Fees.
 Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Regulations—Local Court Document Fees.
 Justices Act 1921—Rules—Document Fees.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
 Highways Department—Approvals to Lease Departmental Property, 1986-87.
 Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
 Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery—Licences (Amendment).
 General Fishery—Restricted Netting (Port Pirie) and Razor Fish.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—
 Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1986.
 Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Fees and Yarding of Livestock.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WELFARE OFFICERS

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In the Council last Thursday, 13 August, officers of the Department for Community Welfare were subjected to an extraordinary attack by the Hon. Dr Ritson. It was a premeditated, vicious and cowardly performance. The focal point of abuse was Ms Sue Vardon, Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Community Welfare. Dr Ritson accused Ms Vardon of attempting to pervert the course of justice and, as he put it, of 'fiddling the evidence' in a Family Court custody case and of conducting, again as he put it, 'abusive warfare' in the courts. Members should be in no doubt about the seriousness of the charge levelled by Dr Ritson. A person convicted of attempting to pervert the course of justice faces a maximum sentence of seven years imprisonment. The accusation that a senior public servant was guilty of a criminal offence was made under parliamentary privilege. It was made by a member who knew full well that he was presenting less than half the story to the Parliament and to the people of South Australia. In presenting a concocted and poisonous version of events, Dr Ritson himself perverted the truth. It was an affront to common decency.

Nobody who knows her would have been surprised by Ms Vardon's immediate response. She totally rejected the charges and invited Dr Ritson to test the truth of his remarks by repeating them outside the Parliament. Without the protection of the privilege he enjoys as a member of the Parliament, Dr Ritson would immediately be sued for defamation. Ms Vardon has asked me to inform the Council today that she categorically denies the allegations made against her and officers of the department.

As Minister of Community Welfare, I wish to place on record my support for Ms Vardon and the departmental officers who have been so shabbily treated by Dr Ritson. It is extremely regrettable that proceedings in the Family Court have been raised in the Legislative Council for what can only be described as base political purposes. I regret—and I regret sincerely—that it will now be necessary to canvass publicly further details of the case in order to set the record straight. Dr Ritson, however, has left me with no alternative but to set out the facts—and the opinions of independent authorities—which demonstrate the falsity of his position. When I have done so, I will call upon him to withdraw and apologise.

The Family Court hearing cited by Dr Ritson involved an application by a man he identified as 'Mr X' for sole guardianship and custody of his two children and an application by his former wife to suspend X's access to the children. According to Dr Ritson, when the husband and wife met on the occasions that he was to have access 'the husband, more than the wife, precipitated the most dreadful quarrels in front of the child'. The following is part of the version Dr Ritson gave the Council:

The quarrels upset the child and the wife sought help from various sources, such as the Department for Community Welfare concerning the method of handover at access time. She made a very big mistake, apparently; she telephoned the Women's Information Switchboard and spoke to a lady called Miss Caroline Woodman. Miss Woodman took it upon herself to ask a few questions on the telephone about the upset child and informed the wife that the child must be sexually abused—that was a very skilful telephone diagnosis. I do not know anyone else who can make a diagnosis like that. Furthermore, Miss Woodman was able to diagnose that it was the husband and not anyone else who had had access to the child.

This is a major distortion of the truth by Dr Ritson, Ms President, who we know was in possession of a judgment

handed down by the learned judge of the Family Court on 23 June 1987. At page 7 and again at page 12 the judge said Miss Caroline Woodman diagnosed that the child may have been sexually abused by the husband. In the interests of accuracy I should also point out that Miss Woodman was not employed by the Women's Information Switchboard at the time she took the telephone call from the woman seeking help or at any other time. In fact, it was while she was working at a women's shelter that she received the call.

Members should be aware that, as an employee of a non-government agency, under section 91 of the Community Welfare Act Amendment Act 1981, Miss Woodman was obliged to report any reasonable suspicion that a child may have been abused.

The claim that the allegation of child sexual abuse stemmed from a determination by the Department for Community Welfare to pursue X without regard to his rights is without foundation. Miss Woodman has advised my office that, when speaking to any mother concerning an upset child, it is normal and proper for a social worker to ask questions about the child. She has asked me to state that she did not then, or at any later time, inform the mother that the child must have been sexually abused, as alleged by Dr Ritson. As required by law she reported her concerns in good faith and in confidence to the Department for Community Welfare. The department, after investigating further and obtaining reports from medical practitioners and police, decided upon action to protect the child. The decision to prosecute Mr X over the alleged offence was then made by the police and not by the department.

Similarly, the decision not to proceed with the charge was not made by the department. It was the decision of officers charged with law enforcement who took the view that it was unlikely to succeed. No adverse reflection can be made against the department because it investigated the notification, because medical practitioners gave opinions supporting the allegations or because a charge was laid and then withdrawn. Any suggestion that South Australian children can only be protected by the department or their cases can only be investigated when the guaranteed outcome is a conviction of the alleged abuser is patently ridiculous. Where would we be if one extended that sort of reasoning, Ms President, to questions of rape, for example? Dr Ritson is well aware of this but deliberately maligns the department and its officers with the totally unsubstantiated charge of bias.

The main thrust of Dr Ritson's allegation of reprehensible action on the part of Ms Vardon relates to a confidential memorandum she wrote to me on 24 April 1986. Solicitors for Mr X had written to me on 16 April in my capacity as temporary guardian of the two children of the marriage. They sought my consent for the child to be interviewed by Dr Keith Le Page, whose name incidentally was revealed by Dr Ritson in the Council. I would not in other circumstances be naming Dr Le Page. Ms Vardon advised me that in her view there should be no further access by Mr X or his father at that stage and that assessment by Dr Le Page was inappropriate and in fact harmful to the child. This is what she wrote, as quoted by Dr Ritson:

I have not been able to find in the area of child psychiatry or DCW any person who has any regard for Dr Le Page's assessments. He is not seen as having any particular skills or abilities in child psychiatry or assessment. As well, he is already prejudiced. It is considered that if further assessment must occur (we should be careful not to expose these children to professional abuse—they have already been interviewed by DCW, the police, SARC, ACH and Dr Y)—

whose name I have deliberately deleted (indeed, I think Dr Ritson may have deleted it)—

then it should be a person who is acceptable to all parties. For this reason, I am suggesting Dr A, Dr B, or Dr C, as alternatives to Dr Le Page. None of them are employed by the department and should be seen as neutral.

That was the advice given to me. This passage has been used by Dr Ritson in an attempt to justify his allegations that Ms Vardon attempted to pervert the course of justice. Pointing out that the Minister was on the verge of intervening as a party to the dispute, he invented the line that justice was being obstructed because, in his contrived dialogue: 'We are not going to let your witnesses have access to the evidence. We are going to choose your witnesses. We will tell you which witnesses you can have.' There is nothing to justify the invention of this dialogue. Most hypocritical of all, Dr Ritson then went on to say that this meant Ms Vardon had defamed a witness. It should be remembered that the only publicity given to the memorandum is by Dr Ritson, who read Dr Le Page's name into the record together with extracts from the document.

It is ludicrous to suggest defamation when these matters were canvassed in a confidential memorandum to me. If Dr Le Page has been defamed, then it is by Dr Ritson, who read his name into the record together with extracts from the memorandum. The memorandum, which I am advised attracts qualified privilege, constituted advice to me that the Chief Executive Officer believed that no more assessments of the children should occur and that no access should be given to the father or the grandfather. The advice was that, if the Minister felt further independent assessment was warranted, that should not be by Dr Le Page. In view of the exposure of the contents of the memorandum by Mr X and Dr Ritson, Ms Vardon has now further explained to me why she felt that Dr Le Page should not interview the child and why the department believed he was, as she put it, 'already prejudiced'.

In the first place, Dr Le Page was not a child psychiatrist and was not regarded by any of the people whom the Chief Executive Officer consulted as being an expert in the area. Secondly, in April 1986, when the department first intervened to seek an interim guardianship order in the Children's Court, counsel for Mr X sought leave for Dr Le Page, who was then present, to give evidence as to why a guardianship order would not be in the children's best interests. Dr Le Page had not at that time interviewed the children, and the court ruled against his appearance. An interim guardianship order was made. Ms Vardon's view was that it was reasonable to assume that Dr Le Page had already formed an opinion since it was proposed that he should appear in the Children's Court, claiming to know the best interests of the children, before he had even interviewed them; that is, Dr Le Page's capacity to provide fully independent evidence with respect to the children was at least open to doubt in that he might be thought to have identified himself with the case of the father.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: That will not stand up.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Ms President, this was the complex background to a long and bitter dispute between two parents which Dr Ritson sought to dissect in order to mount an attack against the department and to try to destroy the career of its Chief Executive Officer. The Hon. Mr Burdett, a lawyer, interjects and says that that will not stand up. Apparently he supports what the Hon. Dr Ritson did.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: Indeed I have just—

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Indeed he does, he says. I am pleased that that is on the record from the former undistinguished Minister of Community Welfare. It was Ms Vardon's clear duty—and mine as Minister—to act in the best interests of the children. As even Dr Ritson concedes, their interests are paramount. Ms Vardon was concerned

about the impact of further assessment on the children, the expertise in child psychiatry of the doctor nominated and the impartiality of the advice that he might give. She acted with total propriety in giving confidential advice to her Minister. In any event, the final decision rested with the Children's Court judge who decided on 9 May 1986 that assessment by Dr Le Page seemed fair in the circumstances. The judge intimated that he would not be inclined to grant a further interim guardianship order unless the department agreed to to that assessment. After a short adjournment, counsel for the department and counsel for Mr X agreed to that course, although counsel for the mother continued to oppose. The judge granted a further interim order and, as the evidence in the Family Court shows, the assessment by Dr Le Page went ahead accordingly.

Dr Ritson based his allegations on the flimsiest of pretexts. Worse, in painting the picture of a distraught husband in dispute, facing an unwarranted charge of sexual abuse of his own daughter and hounded by a senior public servant prepared to pervert the course of justice in order to deny him access to his children—this is the Ritson version—Dr Ritson ignored crucial comments made by the Family Court judge who dismissed the husband's application for sole guardianship and custody of the children.

The judge pointed out that the wife applied to suspend her former husband's access to the children because of his conduct at changeover periods and the consequent effect that such conduct was having on the children. Quite naturally, she (the wife) included the allegation of sexual abuse levelled against Mr X by the Department for Community Welfare as a major part of her case for suspension of access. The husband saw the actions of the wife and the Department for Community Welfare as a conspiracy to deprive him of his lawful access to his children. At page 22 the judge commented that counsel for the husband had argued that a doctor at the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, who examined the child and gave an opinion that sexual abuse had taken place, was part of a conspiracy with the Department for Community Welfare and the wife to blacken the husband's character. This is what the judge said in his judgment:

I do not accept this at all. I believe that Dr Y (name deleted) is a hard working, conscientious and dedicated doctor, but that the methodology used by her in this case and the bases for her conclusions are such that I cannot rely upon her evidence that the child was sexually abused by the husband.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: That is the nub of it, that the methodology is wrong.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The nub of it, Dr Ritson, is that you have defamed my Chief Executive Officer in the most dreadful, reprehensible and disgraceful way. You have abused the form of this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I continue to quote from the judgment as follows:

The report which she wrote was misleading in that it stated that the child made affirmative allegations, whereas cross-examination revealed that this was not so. The child merely assented, sometimes by only a nod, to suggestions put to her in a leading manner by Dr Y. I find that the child did not whisper a description of what the husband was supposed to have done to her at all. Dr Y thereby misled anybody reading her report including, I suspect, counsel for the wife and the Minister.

At page 36 the judge said:

I have previously indicated that I exonerate the wife from any conspiracy with the officers of the Department for Community Welfare or anyone else. I see no reason at all and there has been no evidence which has been put before me which satisfies me that there are any grounds at all for varying the existing order for guardianship and custody of the children in favour of the

wife, and the husband's application in that behalf will be dismissed.

Mr X, the judge said, had an unjustified hatred of his former wife's new husband, who played no part in the marriage breakup and could not control himself in the presence of the new husband. The judge also said that the husband had conducted a form of persecution of the wife and her new husband by following her in his motor vehicle, by telephone calls and by threatening to purchase a house in the immediate vicinity of their house and thereby be a visible presence to them at all times. As honourable members can see from this further information, Dr Ritson has grossly distorted the proceedings of the Family Court.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will repeat that, because he does not learn. He presumably is amoral. Dr Ritson has grossly distorted the proceedings in the Family Court in order to portray Ms Vardon and her staff in an unfavourable light. I deeply regret the need to read into the record further extracts from the Family Court judgment. However, since a calculated attempt has been made to destroy the career of a senior officer of the South Australian Public Service by a member who persistently refuses that officer the opportunity to defend herself through a defamation action in the Supreme Court, I am compelled to throw some more light upon this case.

If Dr Ritson is so confident in what he said the other day, let him repeat it outside. At a Family Court custody hearing in September 1985, following evidence of his previous behaviour, Mr X was granted access on condition that access be taken and given in the foyer of police headquarters in Angas Street, Adelaide.

In the June 1987 judgment selectively quoted by Dr Ritson, the Family Court judge said that, unfortunately, although this should have served as some sort of warning to the husband that the manner in which he had behaved towards the wife in the presence of the children was simply not appropriate and certainly could not be seen to be in the interests of the children, who were present, that behaviour had continued. Dr Le Page gave evidence that, in addition to the husband's pathological jealousy, 'he had reinforced intense anger towards all parties involved in the matter and that he will need therapy to overcome that anger'. The judge said the husband's conduct justified such conclusions. He had no doubt that the husband's anger had been reinforced by the unjustified allegations of sexual abuse levelled at him.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I didn't quote selectively, you see. I didn't quote selectively like the dishonourable Dr Ritson. He also said he had little doubt that the constellation of symptoms described by the wife over the period of time that the husband took access to the child was a direct result of the husband's 'appalling conduct' towards the wife and her new husband at access changeover times.

As I have said, these statements contradict the arguments put forward by Dr Ritson to support his case that officers of the department were prepared to fiddle evidence and puff up evidence. The simple truth is that Ms Vardon and her staff have been subjected to a campaign of denigration and abuse by an obsessive and bitter man. Mr X has been abusive to Department for Community Welfare staff over a long period of time. Departmental documents record officers' complaints that he has been difficult and threatening. In addition, he has lodged complaints against police officers and medical practitioners. The public ventilation of matters concerning his marriage breakdown, the emotional abuse of his children, the harassment of his wife and the pursuit of public servants doing no more than their duty must be laid

squarably at the door of Mr X himself. He swore that he would 'get' senior officers of the department. On another occasion, a departmental observer's report of a meeting with Mr X indicates he stated he had a list of every person who had any involvement in his case and would make sure that he got everyone of them back in return for the emotional pain and anguish he had suffered.

In Dr Ritson, Mr X found a willing and unprincipled ally. Another independent opinion concerning the complaints touted around Adelaide by Mr X comes from the Ombudsman in a letter dated 6 March 1987.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I have said nothing in this place today that I wouldn't be happy to repeat outside.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You always say that!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: They're complaining on the one hand, you see, that I have the courage to say things outside the Chamber while trying to defend their unprincipled and cowardly colleague.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will call Dr Ritson a cowardly and unprincipled person any time, on the strength of what he did the other day. Mr Biganovsky wrote to Ms Vardon and to Mr X concerning the full investigation he had made into a complaint lodged by Mr X against two departmental officers with regard to their conduct during a supervised access session at the department's Port Adelaide offices on 24 December 1986. The Ombudsman said the officers had given him a frank, honest and truthful account. This is what he wrote:

They did impress me as being professional persons of sufficient experience, administrative excellence and good sense to conduct themselves in an exemplary manner during circumstances when others less stable or faint hearted may have succumbed to the obvious defiance and hostility which the complainant so plainly bore to the department throughout the incident concerned.

Indeed, had I at the outset had the benefit of such full and frank account and all the facts and circumstances pertaining to the incident, I would have had no hesitation in finding the complainant's complaint to be frivolous, vexatious and not made in good faith, within the meaning of section 17 (2) (b) of the Ombudsman Act 1972.

As it transpired, I have spent some considerable time investigating serious allegations which have no substance. There is absolutely no act of maladministration on the part of the department or the two officers, and not only is there a complete lack of evidence to suggest any breach of duty or misconduct on the part of the officers, the evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates the reasonableness, fairness and professional patience on the part of the officers in dealing with a complainant who sought, for reasons best known to himself, the opportunity to cause disruption and confrontation during a supervised access arrangement.

There were other matters raised by Dr Ritson during his unfortunate address. It has been necessary for me, on this occasion, to concentrate on the basis of his attack on Ms Vardon, Ms Woodman and the other officers. I have repudiated the claims he made and demonstrated the falsity of the position he adopted. The words of the Family Court judge and the Ombudsman give the lie to Dr Ritson's allegations. There is not a scintilla of evidence to support the charge that Ms Vardon, any other officer, or any doctor or police officer has attempted to pervert the course of justice in relation to these matters. On a previous occasion when the Leader of the Opposition in the Council, Mr Martin Cameron, and his colleagues maliciously defamed Health Commission officers (when independent authorities found that there was no truth in the allegations) they behaved dishonourably and refused to withdraw and apologise. I now call on Dr Ritson to withdraw the charges he so recklessly made and to apologise to Ms Vardon and the others. Surely, in the name of common decency, he can do no less,

if he ignores the challenge to repeat his statements outside coward's castle.

This abuse of parliamentary privilege is most regrettable. The Opposition should realise that now is not the time to behave so irresponsibly and unfairly. The community must face problems of custody, child protection and child abuse, including child sexual abuse, rationally and constructively. It is a time for calm debate on a number of extremely difficult and sensitive issues. We have been wrestling with these issues as a community and devoting substantial intellectual and physical resources to resolving these most serious problems. The fundamental requirement is for objective analysis and sensible decision making. I appeal to Opposition members to commit themselves to this process and to abandon the spiteful and destructive role they have adopted in the past.

QUESTIONS

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: An article in today's *advertiser* drew attention to a situation which occurred in the Far North at the weekend regarding emergency medical services. The article says that two young men were hurt in a road accident near Kingoonya and lay without medical help for more than eight hours. One of those who was instrumental in eventually getting emergency help to the men was Mrs Barbara Read of Wirraminna Station near Glendambo. However, she had enormous problems trying to do this.

She said today she first rang the Port Augusta Hospital and asked for contact with the Royal Flying Doctor Service. She was told that the doctor was out on an evacuation and that there was no other contact doctor available in the hospital. She then asked a second time to speak to a doctor in the hospital and was told again that there was none available, so she asked to be put through to the Royal Flying Doctor Service base where she spoke to the Director of that service who confirmed the service was out on an evacuation. The Director suggested she try the Woomera ambulance service. After three unsuccessful attempts at getting through to Woomera as the phone lines in that area are most unreliable she eventually rang the Port Augusta Hospital again and insisted on speaking to a doctor. After 10 minutes of waiting she was eventually put through to a doctor in outpatients who gave her permission to use an emergency medical kit and to administer pain-killing drugs and who also contacted ambulances. The woman was not allowed to open the medical kit until she had contacted a doctor as that is part of the requirement relating to those kits being available on stations. She also later spoke to a doctor at Woomera who was most helpful.

Mrs Read said she was appalled that there was no resident doctor at the Port Augusta Hospital and that no-one was available to give her immediate assistance in the case of an emergency. The problem was that she had to ring continually from an area where it is difficult to get through as there is a limited number of lines in the north.

It seems extraordinary that the person who took the call at the hospital did not offer to find a doctor to arrange for ambulances to be sent immediately she rang instead of her having to make a number of calls. What instructions are issued at the Port Augusta Hospital regarding emergency

calls in the Far North? Why was Mrs Read told there was no doctor available when clearly there was, because eventually she was put through to a doctor in casualty? There may be an explanation for that, but I cannot think of one that would fit. Will the Minister hold an immediate and urgent inquiry into this incident?

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: A Royal Commission?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: There is no need to do that. The Minister is very quick with inquiries normally, so it would not be any trouble to him. If he is being facetious about this matter, then he should settle back. If he is being flippant that would be of concern as this is a serious matter, and I trust that the Minister will treat it seriously. This young person had his arm almost ripped off and was in severe pain for a number of hours. This is not an occasion to be facetious; I think that the Minister had better think seriously about his position.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Just listen to the question and sit back for a minute. Will the Minister ensure that instructions are issued regarding emergency calls to the hospital and ensure that, if the Royal Flying Doctor Service is out on a call, the necessary backup is available to advise people at the accident scene of instructions from a doctor? Will the Minister also ensure that it is not necessary for a person to have to make more than one phone call to the Port Augusta Hospital in a case of emergency, as this is almost impossible in the Far North where phone connections are unreliable and limited?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We were contacted this morning, naturally, following that article in the *Advertiser*. Doctors are very unhappy about the erroneous version of events that appeared. It is most regrettable that Mr Cameron appears intent on compounding those errors without any attempt to get to the truth of the matter. The Royal Flying Doctor Service has advised that the statement in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 18 August 1987, which states that the backup provided by private doctors in Port Augusta to the RFDS has been withdrawn because of Medicare rebate changes, is incorrect. The medical practitioner who is employed on the staff of the RFDS has an arrangement with a general practitioner in Port Augusta that, in the event that he needs to be absent from Port Augusta for personal reasons, the general practitioner stands in for the Flying Doctor. No money changes hands and it is a reciprocal arrangement that is of benefit to the general practitioner when he also has a need to be absent from Port Augusta. The RFDS does not have a formal pecuniary arrangement with the private doctors in Port Augusta.

The RFDS is tasked to provide a 24-hour emergency service which consists of one aircraft, doctor, sister and pilot after hours and weekends. That has been the situation for a long time. On Saturday, when a resident of Glendambo contacted the RFDS, the Flying Doctor and the aircraft were responding to another emergency call in the Flinders Ranges. The Flinders Ranges emergency involved a motor vehicle accident where two elderly ladies had been severely injured and there was difficulty in removing them from the motor vehicle. It is understood that the Glendambo resident contacted the Port Augusta Hospital for the purpose of communicating with a medical practitioner who could authorise the removal of pharmaceuticals from the local RFDS medicine cabinet so that they could be administered to the young men who were injured in the road accident near Kingoonya. Apparently, the Glendambo resident, after contacting the hospital, obtained the name of the duty doctor who was contacted and the required authorisation was obtained.

In the event that the RFDS aircraft and doctor is not available because the service is responding to another emergency, it is normal for the persons involved with the second emergency to seek alternative arrangements. In this case, Woomera, which has a hospital, two doctors and an ambulance approximately one hour's driving time from Glendambo, was contacted. In due course, the Woomera ambulance responded.

Recently the RFDS purchased a Kingair turbo prop aircraft—a multi-million dollar aircraft, fully pressurised, very fast and sophisticated—and this aircraft will be commissioned during September 1987. This is a high performance aircraft which has the capacity to back up the Port Augusta-based aircraft. In the event of a similar occurrence, this aircraft has the capacity to fly from Adelaide to Glendambo and return and takes 30 minutes less flying time than the existing aircraft.

In summary, the article in the *Advertiser* does not reflect accurately the medical service arrangements of the RFDS, as it does not have a formal backup arrangement with the private doctors of Port Augusta. When the Flying Doctor is responding to an emergency, people making subsequent requests for emergency help are required to consider other alternatives for assistance, as occurred in the Glendambo case.

There is no doubt that in this country and in this State we have the best aero-medical retrieval service in the world; and that is not just my opinion. When I was in the United States just a few short weeks ago the American College of Surgeons was conducting a nationwide campaign for the establishment of trauma centres. Among other things it was complaining about the level and quality of aero-medical services in the United States. I watched a half-hour documentary involving a very senior official from the American College of Surgeons in which he stated, quite clearly, that it was a great pity that in the United States—the richest country in the world—they did not have aero-medical services comparable to those we are fortunate to have in Australia, and South Australia in particular.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I have a supplementary question. The questions that I asked the Minister have not been answered. They are, first, why it was necessary for this person to make more than one phone call in relation to the emergency in the outback where, as I said previously, telephones are very limited and difficult to use. Secondly, will the Minister give the necessary instructions regarding emergency calls to the hospital to ensure that if the RFDS is out on call, the necessary backup is available to advise people at the accident scene on instructions from a doctor—in other words, that a doctor is on duty at the hospital and is able to give them that necessary permission?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I believe that I answered the first question in a quite comprehensive response. As to my issuing the necessary instructions to the Port Augusta doctors as to how they should conduct their affairs—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: I said 'hospital'.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Well, that means issuing an instruction to the doctors.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: If the person on duty at the hospital cannot find a doctor—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The old desperado himself in full flight. What a remarkably irresponsible creature he is. The situation is that the RFDS has operated very successfully and with great credit from Port Augusta under the existing arrangements for a long time. It would be unwise and, might I suggest, foolish of me to blunder in, on Mr

Cameron's instructions, and tell the doctors and the personnel involved with the RFDS how they should conduct their affairs. I am not about to intervene because, on all the advice that I have been given and on the report I have received, there is not one jot of evidence, to suggest that anybody failed to respond in other than the appropriate way.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT VOTING

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about compulsory voting at local government elections.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Minister would be aware that after the May council elections the Local Government Association commissioned a survey on the attitude of the public to compulsory voting. The survey of 400 people conducted by McGregor Marketing showed that 58 per cent of respondents opposed compulsory voting and opposition was strongest in the 18 to 24 year old age group, with 74 per cent of males and 64 per cent of females in that age group being against compulsory voting. This morning the *Advertiser* carried a story suggesting that the Federated Storemen and Packers Union of Australia, at the State ALP conference later this month, will move a motion recommending the introduction of compulsory voting at local government elections.

Will the Minister of Local Government at the State ALP conference in a few days time support any move to introduce compulsory voting at local government elections—yes or no? If the Minister is supporting compulsory voting, does she accept that she is thumbing her nose at local public opinion, as reflected in the recent Local Government Association survey, and also at world opinion, given that Australia is one of the few remaining countries in the world that still supports compulsory voting?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Indeed I am aware of the survey which was conducted by the Local Government Association on this matter. In fact, I have made public statements about my attitude at this time on the issue of compulsory voting. As members would be aware, when the electoral provisions revision regulation was being debated by Parliament in 1984 my predecessor, the Hon. Gavin Keneally, gave an undertaking to the local government community that compulsory voting would not be introduced as a measure into this Parliament until there had been an opportunity for two local government elections to be held and that those elections would be accompanied by publicity campaigns.

In fact, publicity campaigns in the form of the 'Have a say' campaign have been conducted in conjunction with the LGA prior to the 1985 and 1987 local government elections. I intend to conduct a review of the electoral procedures and the elections themselves following this round of 1987 elections, as occurred after the 1985 council elections. With the agreement of the LGA a committee will be established, probably some time next month, to commence that review.

The voter turnout for the last round of local government elections needs full analysis before any decisions can be taken about the need for compulsory voting, and there are a number of factors which, I think, have had some impact on voter turnout this year. For example, there was very inclement weather on voting day, and I am sure that this had some impact on the ability or desire of people to turn out to vote. I understand, for example, that football crowds

on that day were down by about 40 per cent. So that is a significant factor. In addition to that, there was no lord mayoralty contest this year.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: That's an important consideration.

The Hon. BABRARA WIESE: It is a very important consideration because, in the past, when there has been a lord mayoralty contest it has provided the opportunity for a great deal of media attention to be drawn to local government elections. That was absent this time. There was a further factor which I think had some impact on voter turnout, or the average turnout, for the State, and that included the fact that elections were suspended in 12 council areas in this State, namely, in the Mid North, where amalgamation proposals were under review. That happens to be an area of the State where there is normally a very high voter turnout, and the fact that no elections were conducted in those 12 council areas must, I think, have been a contributing factor to the percentage of voter turnout for the State.

These are some of the issues which will need to be analysed in the quest for deciding whether or not compulsory voting should be introduced for local government elections. It is well known that the policy of the Labor Party is for compulsory voting to be introduced for local government elections. However, the parliamentary Party has been given the power to decide when particular parts of the Party's platform should be implemented.

I would certainly urge my Party colleagues to allow a proper analysis of the most recent local government elections, as well as a proper analysis of the impact of compulsory voting on local government elections, to be undertaken. We will have to await the outcome of the debate at the ALP convention, and I shall be interested to hear what my Party colleagues have to say about it.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about the Family Court/Department for Community Welfare Working Party on Child Abuse.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In April 1986, the establishment of a joint working party of Family Court members and officers and representatives from the Department for Community Welfare was announced. This followed public allegations by the Department for Community Welfare that the Family Court was a court where incest was not a crime and that children alleged to have been sexually abused were being put at risk by court orders granting access to the suspected parent. Those allegations were subsequently publicly withdrawn by the department.

The circumstances which led to the establishment of the joint working party also saw the Minister of Community Welfare at odds over the allegations against the Family Court—the Minister of Community Welfare saying it was true and the Attorney-General saying that it was not. I asked the Minister of Community Welfare in August 1986 some questions about the progress of the working party, and the Minister said that it was expected to report by 15 September 1986. It did not do so.

Again, in February 1987 I asked the Minister when the working party was expected to report on the resolution of the conflict between the Family Court and the Department for Community Welfare. He then said, 'As soon as is reasonably practicable.' In his ministerial statement last Thurs-

day, the Minister said that the working party has met on a regular basis and 'has identified and agreed upon formalised procedures. The benefits of the working party have been to facilitate communication between the Family Court and the department in dealing with complex child protection issues'. He then went on to say that it was organising a workshop in October, and I must say that that is a good move.

Among the terms of reference which the working party originally had was one to make recommendations for improvements to ensure that the children concerned are fully protected. From the Minister's recent statement it appears that the terms of reference of the working party may have changed from making recommendations on the resolution of conflicts to a continuing forum for discussion on the way in which allegations of child abuse will be handled. Therefore, my questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Have the terms of reference of the working party changed and, if they have, what are the changes?
2. Is the working party now required to report and to make any recommendations to the Minister and, if it is, when will that occur?
3. What are the 'identified and agreed' formalised procedures referred to in the Minister's statement last Thursday?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The answer to the first question is 'No'. As to the others, it became apparent during the life of the working party that many issues raised for discussion had arisen through the lack of knowledge and understanding that each department has of the other. Formerly, this has bred distrust and ill feeling amongst workers involved in child sexual abuse cases. In the light of this, the overall objective of the working party has been to ensure the protection of children who have been allegedly sexually abused while acknowledging the constraints placed on the Family Court by the adversarial nature of its proceedings and all that that implies. Despite the hard work of the working party, it is clear that there will continue to be some conflicts between DCW and the Family Court, as it is presently structured at least, stemming from the fundamental differences in their jurisdictions and responsibilities. I am sure the honourable member would appreciate that.

However, what is also clear is that without communication and cooperation between these departments the children would continue to suffer the fallout. As to revised terms of reference, that has not been done, but I will explain the major areas of discussion: first, the initial exchange of information between the Department for Community Welfare and the Family Court; secondly, investigation of the allegation or notification; thirdly, the disclosure of proceedings in other courts; fourthly, the obligation of Family Court counsellors to report suspected child abuse to the DCW; fifthly, report formats; and sixthly, the collection of data.

During the life of the working party several similar groups have been working to resolve similar problems in other States as well as the committee of the Family Law Council. So what was started in South Australia literally became a nation-wide movement. While each State has a slightly different child protection Act, they all face certain problems in coordinating the requirements of these Acts with those of the Family Law Act. Thus, in all States the committees are attempting to solve similar problems. In fact, I do not anticipate that the working party will report formally as such and say, 'Here are all of the solutions to all of the problems.' It became apparent during its discussions that that was not a realistic goal.

What has come out of it is a definition of the problems, a series of arrangements whereby the parties—particularly

in DCW and in the Family Court jurisdiction—talk to each other at the earliest possible time and, as a result, the situation is continually improving. However, at this point it is by no means perfect. After correspondence and discussions with the Chief Judge of the Family Court, Judge Elizabeth Evatt, and arising out of the conduct of the working party, it has been decided to hold a national workshop in Adelaide between 15 and 17 October 1987. This workshop will be attended by judges, lawyers, social workers and other professionals involved in child protection. The aim will be to pool information and work towards agreement on procedures and/or amendments to legislation that will improve the protection of children who are the subject of custody and access orders. The details of the agenda are yet to be decided.

I believe that the support for this national workshop, expressed from all sides, is a very encouraging sign that there is a wide determination to overcome the many difficulties which were initially apparent. I am hopeful that the solid three day workshop of dedicated professionals from the Family Court and the DCW working party will provide the means for tying up the loose ends which remain at this time and they will ensure that children and families have better protection from all the systems that they encounter in a family breakdown.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I desire to ask a supplementary question. In the light of the Minister's answer, is he able to tell the Council what are the identified and agreed formalised procedures to which he referred in his ministerial statement last Thursday?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I do not have those details immediately at my fingertips, nor even in my head. Therefore, I would not attempt to try and lay them out formally. I would be quite pleased to ask the department or the working party to respond through me to that question and I will bring back the details in the fullness of time.

CHILD SEX ABUSE

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about child sex abuse.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: We shall soon be debating new legislation on child sex abuse which will offer an opportunity for all future cases to be handled in such a manner to ensure as far as possible that justice is done in a compassionate manner. I have been lobbied by people on both sides of the argument and among them there are people who have brought to my attention matters which could be of great concern. There is one particular matter that I will air now. I have been given a copy of a transcript of evidence relating to a particular case, and I shall read a short extract because it raises some concerns, at least in my mind. The transcript deals with the cross-examination of a teacher who interviewed a six year old child in a classroom after school. A tape of the interview was transcribed and she was using that transcription when giving her evidence. The transcript reads:

I said—

that is, the teacher—

'So if anything else happens now you know who you can tell, don't you? I met [a lady] last night. She is a lovely lady isn't she'—

that is, a lady working within the Department for Community Welfare—

'She said 'She's a person who helps me.' I said 'She's nice.' She said 'She's like a police woman. And do you know that time I

was away, well, I went to a park. She brought me new shoes because I told this other police woman all about it and because I was so good she gave me some money, a new pair of shoes, some money, more money'.

It has been suggested to me that that might be open to a number of interpretations. One interpretation is the possibility that it could be emotional coercion or bribery.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: When you have a grandmother or a parent come to you crying their eyes out, and I have had a number of people doing that, there is compassion on both sides of the argument. It is extremely unfair for the honourable member to say such a thing. There is compassion for the child. The honourable member should wait until the Bill is debated before making judgments about other people.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: She shouldn't be interjecting, anyway.

The PRESIDENT: Under Standing Orders it is repeated interjections that are out of order.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I consider this to be a matter of the utmost importance, and I found the honourable member's comment quite derogatory. First, is the Minister aware of this incident and, secondly, if not, will he investigate it and issue clear instructions in an endeavour to avoid anything that has even a whiff of coercion?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is about only 20 minutes ago that I called for constructive, calm and sensible discussion of these matters. I do not believe that it is in order for any member to raise so-called horror stories in this place or to try to put some sort of interpretation on them.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Because it puts you under pressure.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Dunn says that it puts me under pressure; it puts me under no pressure at all because what I am doing in this very vexed area stands on its merits, and what the department is constantly doing in this very vexed area stands on its merits.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Elliott interjects and says that mistakes are made.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Don't pontificate to us.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Mr Elliott says that mistakes are made, but that is the line of argument which says that apparently you should never investigate these matters and you should never raise them or report them to the police despite a very clear legal obligation to do so. That is the sort of argument—and let us be very clear about this—which leads us down the track of saying that we should never investigate cases of suspected child abuse because—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: —if you do, from time to time, people will be wrongly charged. That is a ridiculous argument. It goes to the heart of the way that our system of criminal justice works.

I made the point during the ministerial statement that, if we were to follow that line to its illogical conclusion, we would never investigate a case of alleged rape unless two corroborating witnesses were to find somebody in the course of actually carrying out that rape. That is a crazy argument. It does the Hon. Mr Elliott no credit. I can understand Dr Diminished raising these sorts of argument, because he has a track record of acting in a most extraordinary way in this Chamber ever since he has been in here, but I certainly think that people like Mr Elliott, from whom I expect a considerable degree of responsibility, ought to think these matters through before they are raised.

Let me tell the Council that the sorts of validated reports of cases in which there is a conviction in the courts that come to my desk literally turn my stomach. If the members want, through this debate, to regress to a point of re-denial—and we have already been through the denial phase of this vexed and terrible problem—I would say that I am prepared, on a confidential basis, to show them the individual files of these cases. Once they have been educated in those areas I am sure that they will not ask the same irresponsible questions as they are inclined to do at the moment.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Dr Ritson has the gall to interject. I would have thought he would be hiding his head under the desk.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: When I need a legal opinion I will get it from the Crown Solicitor not from the not-so-learned John Burdett. If I need a learned second opinion, of course, I will go to my colleague, the Attorney-General.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I have thought very seriously, and for a very long time, whether I should in this Chamber give composite details of the sorts of cases that come across my desk from time to time. At this stage I am not inclined to do that. I think there is nothing to be gained by doing that at this stage, but the time may come when I may have to talk, in a non-identifying way, about some of the real horrors in child sexual abuse which have been proven beyond doubt through the courts system despite the difficulties under the existing legislation. So, I appeal again to everybody in this Chamber, in this Parliament, in the media, and in this State, not to politicise this matter. It is far too important to be politicised. It does this Chamber and this Parliament no good for the members to act in this way. It does this Opposition considerable harm, and so it should, to act in the way in which Dr Ritson acted last week. As to the question of protective and preventive education in schools, that is being developed.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: I taught it in schools for five years; I was the health teacher; I know all about it. I didn't ask any such question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Let me say that, if Mr Elliott was successful in his former career as a school teacher, it is nice to think that he has had at least one successful career, if not more than one. As to whether I have read this particular judgment: I have no recollection of having read it. That is hardly surprising. I do not read every judgment of every case that the Department of Community Welfare takes to the courts in the course of exercising their statutory obligation for child protection. If he would care to give me more specific details, and if he has specific complaints, then I would be pleased to prepare a report in confidence and to give it to him on a confidential basis. Let me make the point again, that if honourable members want confidential reports let them approach me in confidence. Let them take up the matters with me on a basis of confidentiality. I do not believe that it does anybody any good at all to drag these matters through this Parliament under privilege.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: It is the only way.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: 'It is the only way', says the not-so-learned lawyer, to air them. The law specifically forbids—and it is a law passed by this Parliament—their airing publicly. There is a very good reason for that. The interests of the child are paramount in these, as in other matters. The interests of the child must always be paramount. I appeal again: don't let us in some way become voyeurs in the matter of child sexual abuse. The actions of

people like Dr Ritson tend to accomplish that sort of thing. That is what the actions of the Opposition in recent days have tended to accomplish. If members want information, I am prepared to give it to them on a confidential basis. If they want to raise these matters with me, or with any of my senior officers, feel free to do so, but for heavens sake, don't drag allegations concerning individual cases through this Parliament under privilege.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seem to have been painted as if I was defending child sexual abuse and fathers who do things that quite clearly are criminal acts. There have been suggestions made that I was involved in some sort of denial phase when simply all that was worrying me was a particular case which has been determined by the courts and some innocent people who have been found not guilty have been denied access to the children. Something has been brought to my attention which is worrying me and I therefore raised it with the Minister. He will see how I behave when the Bill comes before Parliament.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: My question to the Minister of Community Welfare concerns women's shelters and I ask: has the Minister ever directly intervened in the affairs of a women's shelter, in relation to a resident of that shelter known to the Minister, following which the woman's wish for anonymity and security for herself and her children was compromised?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No, Ms President.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: If the Minister says 'No', will he state categorically that he believes that the practice of intervening in the affairs of a shelter as a Minister on behalf of any resident at that shelter is a totally unacceptable practice?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The woman speaks in riddles. I don't know what she is talking about. If she would care to clarify her remarks then I can respond intelligently, but when she asks unintelligent questions she cannot expect an intelligent answer.

PARLIAMENT ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Ms President, a question relating to the provision of offices for the two ALP Legislative Council secretaries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: As the provision of offices for the two ALP Legislative Council—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am not ALP. I wish to make it absolutely plain, Ms President, that I was referring to the ALP secretaries.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! This is a question to me, and I cannot hear it.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I will start again. As the provision of the offices for the two ALP Legislative Council secretaries required the virtual closing off of a major passageway on the first floor of Parliament House, would you agree that this indicates a critical shortage of space in Parliament House? Also, do you believe that the Legislative

Council requires extra office space for the proper function of its members and staff? Will you advise the Legislative Council of the full cost of establishing the ALP secretaries' offices, such costs to include the structural alterations, painting, installation of four chandeliers, wrong sized blinds returned for replacement, installation of power and telephone points, and furniture?

The PRESIDENT: I would agree that there is a critical shortage of accommodation within Parliament House and, in fact, I have told the Minister of Housing and Construction—and anyone who cares to listen—that my first priority is to try to get an office for every member of this Parliament. The fact that there are still members of the Legislative Council who have no other office provided for them—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I call the Attorney to order. I have repeatedly stated that my first priority is that every member of the Legislative Council who has no other electorate office should have an office for himself or herself on his or her own. It is unfortunately true that there are still members of the Legislative Council who have to share offices, with the consequent loss of privacy that that entails.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I call the Council to order. When there is a question directed at me it is rather hard for me to call for order and answer the question. I ask for your cooperation. I am not aware of the final costing of the alteration which was made to upgrade the accommodation currently occupied by the ALP secretaries. I suggest that the honourable member direct the question to the Minister of Housing and Construction, who is in charge of undertaking the work involved. I know that the so-called chandeliers are far from expensive and are, in fact, among the cheapest light fittings available. If the honourable member wants the full details of the costings, I suggest that he ask the question of the Minister of Housing and Construction.

AERO-MEDICAL RETRIEVAL SERVICES

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question on the subject of the cross-utilisation of aero-medical retrieval services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: In the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* of 23 July 1987 the Minister of Health announced that the St John Air Ambulance control will be shifting from Whyalla to Adelaide. The Minister says in the same article:

The transfer dovetails with other major developments including the Royal Flying Doctor Service's purchase of a King Air 200C aircraft and the establishment of a new airport facility for St John Adelaide based aircraft.

He goes on to say that the new Royal Flying Doctor Service's turbo-prop aircraft will be jointly used by St John. Today's *Advertiser* has an article suggesting that, when the RFDS's doctor and aircraft which were based in Port Augusta were away on a retrieval last Saturday, no back up was available. In the light of the Minister's statement of joint use of aircraft, my questions are:

1. Did the Port Augusta Hospital seek assistance from St John at Whyalla, 30 nautical miles south, when the Port Augusta Hospital could not provide backup?

2. As indicated in the Minister's press release of 23 July, can we expect cooperation between St John and the RFDS in emergencies in the future?

3. Can South Australian country regions expect to have access to RFDS aircraft and personnel when necessary?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I do not know whether the Port Augusta people sought assistance from St John at Whyalla. I know that other and apparently satisfactory arrangements were made. With regard to cooperation in emergencies, the answer is, 'Yes', when there is joint tasking. Remember that the tasking of the King Air, which will be based at West Beach, will be done from the St John headquarters and, of course, we can expect cooperation because it will be a single line of command in terms of tasking the aircraft and the retrieval teams. This mob never fails to amaze me! It is quite extraordinary. Here we have the best aero-medical retrieval services in the world—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is beyond contest. In terms of services to remote areas and to rural areas, we have in this State the best aero-medical retrieval services in the world. We are able to put a retrieval team from any of our major teaching hospitals in the air in less than an hour. We are about to commission through the RFDS and task through St John a King Air 200C fully pressurised aircraft which cruises at around 350 knots. It will be twice as fast as anything that has previously been in service in this State.

We are currently calling for expressions of interest to upgrade the helicopter service, as the Minister of Emergency Services said only one or two days ago. We have medical and allied health professionals in our teaching hospital system who are prepared to be involved with these aero-medical retrievals. It really is a stunningly efficient system, yet we have people like the Leader of the Opposition in this place and the Hon. Mr Dunn who come into this place in a reckless attempt to discredit South Australia's magnificent health services and carry—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You're a liar!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr Cameron to withdraw that statement.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No-one asked him to.

The PRESIDENT: I asked him to.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: I withdraw it. The Minister is not telling the truth.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Each time he opens his mouth he does that.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Their repartee is quite remarkable.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On a point of order, obviously both the remarks of the Hon. Mr Cameron and the interjection of the Hon. Mr Lucas constitute an injurious reflection on a member, and they should clearly be withdrawn.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am not going to withdraw mine, because I did not reflect on the RFDS at any time during my question. Have a look in *Hansard* if you want to. The Minister has been telling untruths all afternoon about that.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that there is a point of order there.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is a difference between saying a particular statement is not the truth and calling someone a liar. It is the use of the word 'liar' to which I took objection and for which I asked for an apology.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You got that.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: He did not apologise.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Minister of Health.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Thank you, Ms President. The report shows graphically the sort of jackass behaviour that we have come to expect from Mr Cameron. He has been a member of this Council for about 15 years, but has

never been in Government (he spent three years on the back bench during the Tonkin interregnum), and it is unlikely that he ever will be. He clearly intends to stay in Opposition permanently, so it is not surprising that he has become good at it. The allegation that there are deficiencies in the aero-medical retrieval service is quite wrong.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I have a supplementary question. My first question related to—

The PRESIDENT: No explanation is permitted to a supplementary question—only a question arising from the answer.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Did the Port Augusta Hospital seek assistance from the St John service in Whyalla? I ask this question in light of the Minister's statement about joint use.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I specifically referred to that matter when responding to the first question, so I refer the honourable member to tomorrow's *Hansard* pulls.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about Public Service superannuation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I pointed out at page 1897 of *Hansard* of 6 November 1986 that State public servants receive no notice or statement about their contributions to their superannuation fund, or about the management of that fund. I also pointed out that Commonwealth public servants do receive such information and asked whether the Treasurer would provide State public servants with some sort of accounting in relation to their superannuation and a report on the scheme management. I also pointed out that, in most cases, that was their main contribution to their old age. I received a reply from the Premier via the Attorney-General on 16 January 1987, which states:

I agree that there is value in members of the State superannuation scheme receiving annual notices setting out their entitlements and also receiving information on the management of the Superannuation Fund. However, the Superannuation Board believes that a notice of entitlement needs to be far more substantial than that produced for Commonwealth public servants.

The programming for these more extensive policies is complex but has been substantially completed. I expect the first notices to be issued within a few months.

As far as information on scheme management is concerned, the Superannuation Board is currently working with the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust on the preparation of a simplified annual report for issue to scheme members.

On 19 January the Treasurer said he would supply the information I had requested, but nothing has happened with regard to my questions. When will I get a reply?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer the honourable member's question to the appropriate Minister and bring back a reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 13 August. Page .)

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: When I sought leave to continue my remarks I was talking about road deaths, saying that anything that could reduce them should be supported by the Government.

My colleagues have discussed the role of trade unions in our society. They are a fact of life and should be treated as such. The attitude of some people in the community that trade unions should be abolished or crushed is doing a disservice to our society. A free and healthy trade union movement is the sign of a free and healthy democracy. The Government of the day should be involved in ongoing dialogue with the trade union movement to keep it informed of the Government's views and to receive and understand union views including fears of members of the trade union movement.

There are currently many areas of concern to the people of South Australia which involve the Government and the trade union movement and which need to be discussed and resolved in a manner which does the least harm to all concerned. Some areas of concern are the education dispute involving TAFE, the transport dispute which has just been resolved (and there is probably another dispute looming), the shopping hours dispute and the disputes involving major building projects in various parts of our city. These are some of the issues affecting all of us. Disputes that occur in these areas must eventually be resolved: my wish is that they are resolved sooner rather than later.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: In the Industrial Commission?

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: The Industrial Commission is presently hearing the TAFE dispute and the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is dealing with the regulations relating to that dispute.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is the proper way to go about it, isn't it?

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: There must be dialogue between the people concerned because, eventually, all disputes must be resolved. Given time they are resolved, but that must be done with as little damage as possible to the people concerned—the people working in and affected by the industry involved.

Disputes do not go away, but goodwill, common sense and understanding the point of view held by the other side can help to lower the level of disputation for all concerned. An article in the *News* of 11 August 1987 illustrates what I have to say. Headed 'Penalty rates must go: Top trader', it states:

Top SA retailer Mr Bill Dawson believes penalty rates must be abolished if SA wants to meet the demand for extended shop hours. Mr Dawson, former managing director of Myer Stores (SA) and a director of three other large SA retail companies, said customers' needs were not being met.

There were inconsistencies in shop trading laws and a number of 'myths' surrounded small business, Mr Dawson told Adelaide Legacy Club. Change was needed in the way government and the retail industry viewed service to customers. To achieve flexible trading hours, penalty rates would have to go, replaced by an hourly rate that would represent a fair deal for all.

'A fair deal for all' is the key to the whole matter, but it is buried in the midst of the article, which continues:

Customers' rights to service at times that suited them were being ignored in the wrangle over shop trading hours. An emotional appeal to protect small business had been used as an excuse to reduce service to the community and line the pockets of multinational oil companies. The so-called convenience stores were doing well trading around the clock because they were classified as small businesses.

'The reality is the great majority of these stores are owned and operated by multinational oil companies,' he said. The acting secretary of the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association, Mr Don Farrell, said his union would talk, but 'the retailers must get their act together'. Mr Farrell said no agreement existed among retailers about the extent of trading hours needed.

Such articles do nothing to help solve disputation. For a start, the headline 'Penalty rates must go: Top trader' aggravates sections of the community, one of those sections being the employees who receive those penalty rates, because they

know that penalty rates do not occur in isolation but have been achieved over many years of negotiation, conference and compromise. All normal checks and balances have been built in to those penalty rates, so to issue a bald statement saying penalty rates must go does a disservice to an industry and to the people in it. Penalty rates will go only when proper dialogue takes place between all concerned parties; no doubt compromises will occur on both sides.

The second section of the community that reads those headlines and to whom a disservice is done is those people who use community services. In reading behind headlines such as that they immediately assume that they are paying too much for goods and services because of the greed of those people in the industry seeking penalty rates. However, nothing could be further from the truth: penalty rates are only a small part of those things which decide the purchase price of a finished article.

Again, I say that change must come. Eventually shopping hours will change; it is inevitable. However, such change can come about only after proper dialogue with everyone concerned—the community, the unions, the employees and the Government. Without this the seeds of conflict and confrontation are sown and we all suffer from the fallout.

I will now mention my visits to two nuclear producing electricity plants in Britain during my recent study tour. The first was to Dounreay in Scotland. For the record, information that I obtained stated the following:

Dounreay is Britain's principal centre for fast reactor development and operates the 250 MW(e) prototype fast reactor and its associated reprocessing plant. Since opening in 1955, the site has operated two complete fuel cycles. The first was for the Dounreay materials testing reactor (DMTR), commissioned in 1958; and the second for the Dounreay fast reactor (DFR), which in 1962 became the first fast reactor to supply electricity to a national grid.

The prototype fast reactor (PFR) operates routinely at high power, earning over £10 million a year. Technical development work is focused on uninterrupted production and achieving high yield from the fuel, while meeting extensive research and development requirements for the design of future commercial fast reactor stations. It carries out irradiation testing of core components and materials, and plays a major role in European fast reactor research programs within the collaborative agreement signed in 1984.

Some 2 300 people are employed in that plant. I also had the pleasure of looking around it, and it was quite amazing.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: No wonder your hair is shining.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: It was amazing to be standing on top of the reactor and to be told that 15 ft underneath is a reactor that was working away with various radioactive associated problems that go with it. Another thing that I found fascinating was the observation chamber where nuclear fuel and highly radioactive material were being handled. We looked through a metre of glass which looked no thicker than two panes of ordinary glass. To see people operating those machines behind that metre of glass was quite intriguing.

The second reactor that I went to see was at Hartlepool, and that was a fascinating experience. In this respect, information that I obtained indicates the following:

Hartlepool Power Station is situated near Seaton Carew on the Tees Estuary four miles south of Hartlepool and five miles north east of Teesside in the county of Cleveland and is operated by the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB). Construction work started in October 1968 and the station first supplied electricity to the grid in 1972 from the gas-turbo generating units. The station has four 17.5 megawatt gas-turbo generators, normally used to provide station emergency electrical power.

There was one section that I did not get to see. About it, the information states:

The station is built in an area of specific scientific interest to naturalists; the 2 000 acres of mudflats, marshland, dunes and foreshore at Teesmouth are scheduled as sites of scientific interest

by the Nature Conservancy. Migrant birds of many species visit Teesmouth—including specialised feeders which depend on salt marsh, brackish pools and mudflats for their very existence. The area also contains the only real salt marsh left on this coastline. The CEGB in conjunction with local education authorities has provided land and accommodation, which has resulted in the creation of the Teesmouth Field Centre, run by the Cleveland Conservation Trust. This has enabled thousands of visitors per annum, many of them children, to visit the centre to study these scientific sites in the form of field studies.

Unfortunately, I did not have the time to visit that environmental part of the plant, although I would dearly have liked to do so. Of great interest in that plant was the place where it all happens. Under the heading 'Generations of Energy' the report states:

At Hartlepool—and for the first time in Britain—you can experience the energy scene for yourself. Sited near the power station is Hartlepool Energy Information Centre featuring *Generations of Energy*. This unique computer controlled audio-visual show uses the very latest techniques to tell the story of energy and electricity. Entry is free.

There, I spoke to a person who was designing it, as he was visiting from London and was checking it. My understanding was that the interpretation centre was worth £1 million, and it was splendidly presented. I thought that PR was handled rather heavily, to the extent that there was an oversell, but both in Dounreay and Hartlepool the emphasis was on PR. For those companies to spend £1 million just in one plant for an interpretation PR centre gave one food for thought.

I also visited Switzerland and had an interview with Dr Eduard Kiener, the Director of the Swiss Federal Office of Energy, and with a Mr Luthi from the same department. Our discussions related to the needs of the Swiss and their connections with other countries in relation to their power. Presently they have five nuclear reactor power stations and a sixth is in the planning. The sixth plant was the catalyst for an anti-nuclear demonstration in Berne and led to nasty scenes with the police and led to some protestors being injured. It depends on whom one listens to in relation to whether fewer than 10 000 or more than 20 000 protestors were involved, but it was generally agreed that the figure was between 10 000 and 15 000. This has thrown a cloud over the nuclear energy industry in Switzerland. Presently Switzerland's power is comprised of 60.1 per cent hydro and 38.7 per cent nuclear, with 1.2 per cent coming from either oil or gas, which is fired in a very small way. Presently almost 40 per cent of the Swiss nuclear power is locked into providing energy.

In Europe no country is isolated and the countries are all locked into a grid. The quandary that the Swiss would find themselves in if they decided not to proceed with another nuclear power station would be that of having to purchase power at peak periods possibly across the border from France—and of course as all members know France has nuclear capability. If Switzerland does not develop a power station it will have to purchase nuclear power from another country and will not have the control that would have had had it built its own power station. So, presently a great cloud hangs over Europe in relation to nuclear energy.

In the world today there are 397 nuclear power stations and 133 are under construction. Whether one likes it or not, I believe that nuclear power generation is here to stay for the foreseeable future. We in South Australia, with our Roxby Downs development, support that view. One thing that concerns me is the waste disposal problem. In all my travels I gained the impression that waste disposal was no problem but that its proper disposal was some years off. In all the conversations that I had and in all the printed literature that I obtained, it was impressed on me that waste disposal presented no problem, that they would come to

grips with it and that it was being handled in a responsible and proper manner. However, that is still a couple of years down the track. Everywhere I went it was a couple of years down the track. This concerned me, and I would dearly like to see what is happening to the waste of highly radioactive material from nuclear plants.

I believe that the problem is not as clean cut as the operators of nuclear power stations would have us believe. Chernobyl strikes a responsive chord in anyone who is concerned about nuclear power development. On 26 April 1986 the unimaginable happened—an explosion put the Chernobyl reactor in the history books for all time. The people responsible for this terrible accident have since been sentenced to gaol for their part in it. Presently the death count stands at 31. Cancer caused by direct exposure to radiation or by the ingestion of caesium 137 will probably claim thousands of victims over the next 70 years. More than 1 000 square kilometres of once rich Ukrainian farm land lie poisoned and devoid of people.

The accident that occurred, according to the Soviet Union, has cost \$A3 000 million. However, the cost of this to the nuclear industry is much higher. This accident has cast a shadow over the whole industry that has still yet to be resolved. While I was overseas headlines in the newspapers emphasised the matters that are still continuing. In England, three months after the accident, farmers were told that they could not sell their cattle, and checks on the counts in those cattle were still being conducted. Three months later the counts were higher. This accident was still headline news in the papers, and there was still concern about what food could be eaten and what liquids could be consumed. So, it is a huge problem.

It is a complex problem to the extent that everyone realises that they are locked into the nuclear fuel cycle and power development in Europe. Europeans would like to get out of the cycle, but they see no way of being able to do so. I believe it is a responsibility of the people in the industry and for the people who use the industry to ensure that we pass on a better world to our offspring. I do not know how we can go about it. Certainly, I do believe that there must be a greater liaison between the industry, scientists and the people who use the resources.

When we were in Switzerland the quandary facing people was put to us. People say that an end must be put to nuclear madness and the development of nuclear power stations, but at the same time there is an ever-increasing demand on power resources. On the one hand, people ask the authorities to stop their development of the nuclear cycle, while on the other hand those same people who are calling for a reduction in the development of the industry and of power are using more power than they have ever used before. So, we have this conflict of people saying one thing and doing the opposite in their lives. How one can come to grips with such problems is something that is still to be resolved.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Conservation for a start.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: Conservation cannot solve the problem at this time. I made inquiries about other forms of energy and was told that on the Firth of Forth they are building a huge complex that will take advantage of the large tides. There is over a 20-foot fall and a 20-foot rise, so that there is that much energy going into the generators. However, in the context of the amount of energy that is used in the world today, and bearing in mind the way that we are locked into the situation, there is no way, I believe, that we can dispense with nuclear power. Either we master it, or it will master us.

Indeed, I understand that some of my colleagues in this Council are members of the energy select committee which

is reviewing such issues. I wish them all the good luck in the world, because this problem will be taxing many minds in the future.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: Much of it is important. This all interrelates. I would like to conclude my remarks and wish this Government the very best with its program, because it has hard decisions to make in the future. I do not believe that the budget will be an easy one for this Government to bring down because of the constraints that South Australia is under.

In summary, there are developments elsewhere in the world which we can look at and of which we can take advantage, rather than having to learn from our own mistakes. Instead, we can learn from seeing the mistakes of other countries, thereby achieving some of the developments that we need in a much more painless way than having to go out and pioneer developments ourselves. Development has occurred elsewhere in the world and there are lessons to be learnt from that development.

In reviewing the earlier part of my speech I note that I said that I had lived through two World Wars—the First World War and the Second World War. I was not alive during the First World War, but the effects of it were passed on to me. I grew up during the Depression years. The situation was fresh in my mind and to visit East Berlin, the heart of Europe, from which two World Wars had emanated in a short space of time was a fascinating experience.

Certainly, I am grateful that I was in a position to be sent on a tour of such magnitude by this Parliament. I hope to be in a position to report to Parliament on my tour. I never write reports comprising more than a few lines, but this time I might extend myself a bit more. I advise members that I have much material and that I am only too willing to discuss with them any of the matters that I saw on my tour. I believe that my tour was well worth the effort, not just for me but in regard to some of the things which I learnt and which I hope I can pass on to the community as a whole. Certainly, I wish the Government every success.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I thank the Governor for his speech and, in speaking in support of the motion, I would like to address the subject that I have spent some time considering, that is, penal system reform. One of the most significant dilemmas confronting society is its struggle in defining the value of each individual. The concept of each person being of equal value in the sight of God and society demands legislative and social discipline beyond the capability of an elected Parliament. I believe such a tenet to mean that each person is of absolutely equal value before the law, and in entitlement to the essential means for a fulfilling life. We have tried to provide equal opportunity of education, health and availability of adequate housing, but we have not succeeded. We have tried to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race or sex but we have not succeeded. Maybe full success is impossible and we must be content with just significant improvement.

As a Christian, I believe that the perfect equality of each individual exists in the Divine assessment of God. I believe that God holds a black miner on strike in South Africa of equal value with a murderer and an Archbishop of equal value with a prostitute. There should be no discount on human beings. We should not be discriminating between the value of individual human beings. We can admire one individual more than others; we can reward one individual more than others; and we can punish one individual more than others. But, as a Christian and caring society, we cannot expel one individual from the human family. We

should not even give preferred privilege to one individual which is not available to all.

This challenge is most starkly brought to us by the way in which we treat criminal offenders. Because we have crimes constantly before us, there is a strong temptation to rectify the situation by saying that the perpetrators have 'forfeited their right' to be treated as members of society. For some, this means capital punishment and, for many, savage punishment, extracting revenge on the guilty, as if that in some way repairs the damage. A Christian society forgives. The basic girder of a caring society is love, and love is eventually all forgiving. This does not eliminate punishment, as punishment can be administered for the benefit of the culprit, as well as justice.

We have reformed the punishment of offenders over the last century, but there has been little attempt to reform the offender. When Ray Kidney, Director, Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Society of South Australia (OARS) spoke at the opening of the International Prisoners Aid Associations conference a couple of weeks ago in Adelaide, he stated:

Over the years I have come to regard prison and aftercare workers as very special people . . . It takes very special people to make programs in this kind of work succeed. Behind every successful program it is usual to find someone motivated by love. Only such people can accept the philosophy of the Prisoner Reform Association which states:

Since the object of the Prisoners Aid Societies and aftercare agencies is the reformation of the offender, we affirm that none should enter in or remain in this work who is not committed to the principle that every offender offers hope of reclamation.

As we know reformation comes from change within, which leads to new values, new beginnings, and a new way of life. This is the ideal to which we work, with many stages in between right down to continued care and hope for those who continue to fail. Only people motivated by love are able to keep on keeping on with such people. They are those who are prepared to work beyond the call of duty and reward for the sake of others. I remind us all that without love, we are nothing. We may even have great skills and much knowledge about correctional processes—we may be prepared to give sacrificial service and even donate money towards our cause. However, even this is little worth without love.

I remind us all that love is kind, but it is not jealous, conceited, proud, ill mannered, selfish or critical. People motivated by this love do not remember the bad things about people—nor are they pleased with the evil done by those who commit crime. Only through love will we never give up on anyone, whatever the crime—but display faith, hope and patience to those in our care. This love is not human—but Divine. It is the love of God that can change the human heart—David Rathman, historian, has written:

. . . each generation has produced a dedicated coterie of prison reformers. Yet each generation discovers anew the scandals of incarceration, each sets out to correct them and each passes on a legacy of failure. The rallying cries of one period echo dismally into the next . . .

As we approach 2000 let us dare to break this cycle; through workers and volunteers motivated by love we need to develop alternatives to imprisonment and go on caring.

I emphasise this point made by Ray Kidney:

Let us remember that the character and quality of any society is judged by the way it treats the least of its members.

I repeat that quote into *Hansard*, because I take it completely as my own statement of an assessment of our community in South Australia: let us remember that the character and quality of any society is judged by the way it treats the least of its members.

I was encouraged to read of initiatives towards penal reform in an article in the *Advertiser* of 17 August headed 'Justice faces the challenge of the 21st Century'. Comments by the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner) appear in the article, which states:

Mr Sumner went on to bemoan rising imprisonment rates, the failure in rehabilitation of prisoners, spiralling costs, increasing budgetary constraints, lack of media understanding and neglect of victims.

Later, the article went on:

Away from the 'them and us' mentality to a recognition of the need to educate police and public to work together. In administration, it is away from fortress prisons and away from a burgeoning plethora of new laws and new penalties towards community service, home detention, harsher penalties for really nasty crimes, but fewer and simpler laws of a more administrative nature to regulate minor miscreants.

The Hon. Mr Sumner was followed at this conference by a Dr Peter Greenwood, who states in the article:

I see corrections going to hell in a handbasket. Facilities are decrepit and outdated. There is a lack of leadership in policy, a decline in efforts to rehabilitate. Policy is in the hands of politicians instead of trained professionals. There has been a retreat to 'fortress prison' as the only means to protect the public. We always seem to revert to: 'Lock 'em up. Get tough. Nothing works'.

The article then refers to the Chief Justice, as follows:

... no-one who heard the Chief Justice's speech, or more importantly read and analysed it later, could have had any doubt that it was one of the strongest attacks in many years by a Chief Justice against trends which clearly are putting the judiciary under great pressure.

The article then quotes the Chief Justice as saying:

I emphasise the need for retaining a proper sense of perspective and proportion because anti-crime zeal can easily degenerate into hysteria and bring in its train greater evils than those which it aims to cure.

Our penal system in South Australia is dehumanising to both the inmates and the staff. In my opinion, it has slipped back from the time prior to 1983 with hope for reform under Robin Maslen, as Manager of Yatala, and Gavin Keneally, as the Minister of Correctional Services, to the current situation of a reactionary oppressive 'fortress' mentality in the department, the current Minister (Hon. Frank Blevins) and I assume the Government. Although there were deep problems in the system in 1983, there were signs of a constructive approach, aimed at making prisons more humane institutions where rehabilitation, dignity and creative activities were planned to make life more worthwhile for inmates and staff.

The 'fortress' mentality means that Minister Frank Blevins, and one assumes the Government, are determined that there will be no observable embarrassing incidents in the prisons. They realise, rightly, that any mistake or sign of 'weakness' resulting in an escape or bashing would be used by the Opposition and media to attack the Government's alleged weakness and mismanagement. Thus, progressive personnel in the department and staff are moved away from the key positions, and prison management has become a blend of control and retribution. There is no sign from the Minister or the department that they see any part of the role of correctional services as correction; they see it as rigid detention.

I am not arguing here the question of length of sentences; that is a separate issue. But for those people who are sentenced to prison, let us remember that they are still of equal value and entitled to love and care. Such an attitude demands more emphasis on rehabilitation and the opportunities to live creatively with dignity in the prison.

The moves to use home detention and community service orders as alternatives to prison sentences are to be applauded, provided of course that they are also administered with some sensitivity and have a rehabilitative aim. Unfortunately, they are proposed and justified more as measures to reduce the cost and overcrowding of our prisons than enlightening reforms in humanising our penal system. Society tends to close its eyes to our prisons; we do not dwell on the extraordinary difficulty the correctional officers have in managing recalcitrant prisoners, particularly when the

prisoners are in groups. It is often a frightening and thankless task.

Fear is a major deterrent in turning our prisons into constructive instead of destructive institutions. Young, unseasoned officers are often thrown into face-to-face situations with unruly prisoners while the more experienced officers have duties remote from prisoner contact. Prisoners are often frightened of other prisoners and of treatment by correctional officers.

It is time that our community determined what is required of our penal system so that it can have direction. I suggest that it is expected by different people to do one or more of the following:

1. Remove dangerous offenders from the community.
2. Punish wrongdoers.
3. Revenge the victims of crime.
4. Satisfy society's outrage at crime and criminals.
5. Rehabilitate social outcasts, that is, prisoners.
6. Provide a controlled environment for people who are not able to live at large in the community to live creatively and with dignity in prison.

It is time that society realised that incarceration is a soul crushing experience. Our present style of prison management turns out sullen offenders who have a bigger resentment against society than when they went in. There is evidence to support the notion that these people are more likely to reoffend as a result of the treatment received in prison.

For a State which has led the way in so many valuable reforms, it is sad to see a regression in attitude by the Government and the department. It does not require legislative change; it needs a change of heart in the department. The internal directives from head office are a major cause of discontent in the prisons; they are unnecessarily repressive and restrictive. The attitude of the head office reflects lack of communication with the inmates and the staff at the prisons which exacerbates unrest and undermines staff confidence. The head office reflects a siege mentality indicating insensitive handling by the Minister, inadequate resources and the wrong attitude to the job. The head office has a negative rather than a positive attitude to correctional services.

The Minister (Hon. Frank Blevins) does not seem to have the stomach for compassionate reform of the penal system. Having spent millions of dollars on securing an escape proof outer perimeter for Yatala, it was widely expected that that would lead to more relaxed and flexible management of prisoners. However, the opposite has occurred and, with a flurry of internal directives, the prison has become more oppressive rather than less.

Recommendations made by consultants in the Swink report of 1983 underlined the need for actions inside the prison aimed at reducing tension for prisoners. One could read these recommendations as a warning that conflict would result if appropriate actions were not carried out. It seems that fear, an antonym for love, won out and conflict, destruction and injury were the result. I suggest that the Premier relieve Mr Blevins of Correctional Services and give it to the present Minister of Education, Mr Greg Craf-ter, who I believe has the ability to turn the penal system around. This will result in a reduction in cost to the State of destroyed property through riots and of destroyed people through misguided prison management.

The new Minister would be able to select staff of like mind to ensure that his wishes were put into practice. He could have a series of ongoing workshops with staff of all levels and their unions to ensure a cooperative team effort right through Correctional Services. He could also set up

prisoner representative committees to minimise misunderstanding and suspicion. For a State proud of its history of reform and for a Government from the Labor Party, boastful of its history of reform, it is now time, indeed overdue, that reform recognising the equal value of prisoners and their right to compassionate treatment should be implemented. The reactionary attitude fuelled by sensational publicity and the primitive clamour for revenge and bloody punishment must be resisted so that the lives of our offenders and those who care for them can indeed be regarded as of truly equal value. I support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: In response to His Excellency the Governor's speech, I would like to extend my sympathy to the families of the late Hon. Ron Loveday and Hon. Don Simmons. I worked with Don in his electorate office in the late 1970s prior to his retirement in 1979. He was a friend and political colleague. His encouragement to women to enter political life is evidenced by my presence here and by the presence of the Hon. Barbara Wiese, who also worked with Don. Barbara was the first woman President of the Party and was followed by Ann Pengelly, who also had a close association and friendship with Don Simmons. I am sure we all agree that Don's friendship and support helped us to achieve our present positions. Don's widow, Betty, continues in her role as a hard-working and vital Party member.

Australia is facing difficult economic and social times. Now may be our last opportunity to change our way of dealing with the economy, the work force and labour training—we must change now or we will decline. Today, as in the past, one of the greatest forces behind constructive change is the trade union movement. A most important document which addresses Australia's future was released last month. It is the report of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the Trade Development Council's mission to Western Europe, and is entitled 'Australia Reconstructed'. The terms of reference for the mission were:

To examine the relations of Government, trade unions and business, and available tripartite mechanisms in the formulation and implementation of trade and related policy matters;

To consider the implication of technology, work organisation, education and productivity for international competitiveness; and

To evaluate the contribution of trade union research, education and organisation to union participation in trade related issues.

In the forward to the report, Bill Kelty, Secretary of the ACTU, stated:

In essence this report embodies the strategic issues all Australians must now address. The task of restructuring Australia is not simply a task for Government. We all must have a strong commitment towards fostering the highest possible economic growth and its equitable distribution, and to achieving the lowest possible levels of inflation and unemployment. Structural change and the promotion of a productive culture are necessary to enhance our international competitiveness, while employers need to accept that structural change and new work organisation are not simply opportunities to shed labour, and that workers need to be a party to any change. Similarly, employers and unions need to recognise their obligation to tackle the problems of skill formation.

We are about nothing less than the reconstruction of Australia. These are historic times. Our future is increasingly tied to the rest of the world. Many other countries faced with similar challenges are 'internationalising' apace.

Understanding and responding to the international pressures is a national requirement—a requirement to which unions must contribute. This report is part of that contribution.

Now, that statement, and the contents of the report, have shown an awareness of the situation which faces Australia, and an understanding of the need for us all to work together to solve problems. My recent study tour of Sweden, the UK and France, and my private visit to the USSR, has convinced me that there is a recognition for the need for change in the socialist and communist countries, but the UK particularly has not taken up the challenge. I have never seen a country so divided, both economically and socially. I was born in England and it saddens me to see that this once great country is being ripped apart by such enormous social divisions.

Sweden, of course, was one of the countries visited by the ACTU/TDC Mission. The USSR is undergoing a dramatic social and economic upheaval under the leadership of Mikhail Gorbachev—an upheaval which may well go down in history as the Second Russian Revolution of the 20th Century—albeit a peaceful one.

We, in Australia, are faced with two choices—we can either, like the Swedes, work in a spirit of cooperation: sit down around the negotiating table and come to terms with what our future may be if we don't cooperate; we can listen to one another; we can respect one another's differences and try to resolve those differences; or we can go down the path of the Conservative Government in the UK—polarisation, deep and lasting divisions in society, class war, racial hatred and long-term destruction of the economy and society. There really is no choice.

When I read in the media a report of the launch of 'Australia Reconstructed' I thought it seemed an exciting concept of cooperation and an opportunity for industry, State and Federal Governments and unions to have another go at making Australia a better place to live in for all Australians, but I was staggered to read on the same day the report was launched that the Director-General of the Confederation of Australian Industry, Mr Bryan Noakes, had this to say:

... but far-reaching and intrusive legislation they (the unions) have proposed would only cripple the private sector and cripple hope of an economic recovery... It's unworkable and unproductive.

Now, Ms President, as members can see, this document is a pretty weighty one. It has a mass of information and certainly proposes some pretty sweeping changes to our approach, but I find it amazing that the business sector can hurriedly skim through it, and dismiss it out of hand, without doing the very things the report suggests—looking at change constructively and together.

Our State Liberal Opposition, in typical fashion, said one day after the report was released that the South Australian Government should reject the plan, which would require considerable cooperation between Federal and State Governments, and the union movement. I guess it is to be expected that there would be criticism levelled at such a document by business and the Liberal Opposition. Doubtless, many of them would choke on such a suggestion that they should share information about corporate planning with the workforce.

But this document is a brief to start Australians thinking and, as such, will be discussed at great length at the forthcoming ACTU Congress by State and Federal Labor Governments, and I hope by industry leaders.

I would like to address myself specifically to one aspect of the report with which I have a particular interest, that of labour market and training policies. The ACTU noted that all of the countries which embrace the full employment objective pursue active labour market policies that emphasise skill formation, job placement, and reduction of labour market segmentation.

Certainly, the success of these policies is reflected in the low level of unemployment, and in Sweden it is currently 2.2 per cent (this is the latest monthly figure available for April 1987 and was issued in June 1987). Tripartite processes have long been recognised as being integral to labour market policy formulation and delivery. However, there is also a long-term commitment of substantial resources, both public and private, to training and retraining. Australia does not have a particularly good record of youth unemployment. I would like to make some comparisons of OECD standardised youth unemployment rates in 1985: in Sweden 5.8 per cent; in West Germany 9.5 per cent; in Norway 6.8 per cent; in the UK 21.7 per cent; in Austria 5.0 per cent; and in Australia 14.3 per cent.

This unacceptably high figure is partially attributable to the level of participation in post-secondary education. The percentage of Australians aged 16 to 24 participating in education in 1981 was only 36 per cent—well below the proportion in the US (73 per cent), Japan (54 per cent), West Germany (45 per cent) and slightly below the UK (40 per cent). The proportion of the Australian workforce with degrees was 8 per cent, the US (19 per cent), Japan (13 per cent), and about equal with West Germany and the UK at 8 per cent and 7 per cent, respectively.

The low proportion of teenagers engaged in various kinds of post-secondary education is a considerable problem for the future technological and economic development of our country, and also of great concern is the large number of young Australians who, through unemployment, are denied access to skills training through either work or education.

In Australia, of the 250 000 young people who reach the school leaving age each year, 40 per cent go on to year 12; 15 per cent gain an apprenticeship; perhaps 5 per cent enter full-time vocational courses and a staggering 40 per cent seek to enter the labour market with no substantial vocational preparation and with little prospect for employment.

It is important to note that, in countries where there is a successful training participation rate and lower youth unemployment, there is a proportionately higher national education expenditure. Sweden spends 10 per cent of national education expenditure on adult education. Government subsidised study circles involved 2.43 million participants out of a population of 5 million in the age bracket of 20 to 67. Expressed as a proportion of GDP the labour market program expenditure in 1984 was: Sweden 3.0 per cent; Austria 1.5 per cent; West Germany 1.9 per cent; and Australia 1.9 per cent.

Only 29 per cent of the total Swedish expenditure on labour-market programs was spent on cash support for the unemployed, compared to 75 per cent of the Australian total. Business firms in West Germany spend 2 per cent of GDP on training, but in Australia it is only 0.4-0.5 per cent of GDP.

There is a recognition by some employer groups that there must be an emphasis on training and education. In an address to the Royal Society of Arts in the UK in 1986, Mr Robert Malpas, Managing Director of the British Petroleum Company, had this to say:

Education at all levels is a source of great national concern . . . it is because of the growing realisation that what happens in education is crucial to everything else, particularly in solving the nation's long-term economic problems. Industry is an integral part of the nation's social and economic fabric. As such, the whole of industry—small, medium and larger firms—must be deeply concerned with education at all levels. Education affects the quality of the society in which industry operates—its customers, its suppliers, the people who work in it, and the people who invest in it. It is therefore vital that industry be closely involved with education.

He goes on to say:

British industry stands accused of paying insufficient attention to training and education, compared with its major competitors.

This is also true of Australia. We ignore this warning at our cost. We cannot afford to be unreasonable in our attitude to change, nor can we afford to be petty and guilty of point scoring on this issue. It is our future we are talking about.

It is obvious that countries like Sweden have long recognised the need for close cooperation between Government, unions and industry. In this recognition lies the secret of their success. A feature of the Swedish labour market policy is the important role accorded to the management organisation and labour unions. Representatives of both sides sit on boards of directors at all levels of the labour market administration which is responsible to the Cabinet and the Ministry of Labour for implementing Government labour market policy. The trade unions have six members and the employers three on the 15-strong directorate of AMS. Labour and management representatives are not restricted to decision making bodies alone, but are also found on more or less permanent committees that do research work, provide advice, and prepare various items of business.

One of the major criticisms of the 'Australia Reconstructed' document has been its emphasis on the Swedish model of labour market training and, more particularly, industrial democracy—whether it is wise to try to import a foreign system on the Australian scene. I believe that it is possible, but first we must import an attitudinal change. The Swedes historically are a very cooperative nation. They have a history of stable government, and while conservatives level criticisms at them for their social attitudes, I found them to be a very moral, caring and self-critical society. As with many occurrences on the world scene, we get only the 'bad news'. We should look most carefully at their system of cooperation, and we will have an opportunity at close hand when we venture into the submarine contract.

Ms President, I would just like to talk briefly here on how I saw industrial democracy and labour market training in action and working well in Malmö, in southern Sweden, home of the ship-building firm of Kockums. As members are aware, Kockums, like other ship-building companies throughout the world, is in serious decline. While I was there, about 2 000 workers were about to lose their jobs when the last vessel was to be completed. It was not a very nice feeling to be aboard that luxury vessel, locked in the ice of the Baltic Sea, and know that this was the last ship of its kind to be built at Malmö and that so many workers would then be unemployed. However, I discovered that in the true Swedish efficient manner most of these workers had been undergoing retraining for many months and that some 89 per cent of them would get back into the labour force as soon as their training was completed, while the rest would undergo further retraining over a longer period.

Naturally, the Australian contract was very important to them; as important as it is to South Australia. The attitude of management, workers and people involved with the labour market training convinced me that we have a lot more to gain than pure economic advantage from this contract. We will have the opportunity of studying closely Swedish methods and to see to what extent we can emulate their success. Already the AMWU has shown a high degree of cooperation in its attitude to on-the-job work practices involved with the submarine contract. If we can demonstrate that these methods of cooperation can work for us, then we must adopt a different attitude to change, and this attitude of change must come from all of us. I sometimes wonder if I will ever see the day when we sit down across the Chamber, as they do in Sweden, and discuss the problems of our society rationally: I rather doubt it.

But on some levels we must begin to cooperate now. Some of the suggestions for cooperation made in 'Australia Reconstructed' must be addressed urgently, particularly those dealing with training and retraining. I would like to summarise those recommendations here.

Employment and training programs should be fully integrated with the tripartite industry plans and the national development fund. A national employment and training fund should be established to ensure that enterprises and Governments are undertaking sufficient training and skill development for the future. Withdrawals from the fund should be conditional on reaching agreement between firms, employees and unions on training, superannuation, dispute settlement, work and management practices, job security, purchasing policy and reduction in labour market segmentation.

The fund should be coordinated with the national development fund; administered through the Australian Council of Employment and Training at the national level; implemented by tripartite committees at the local level; financed by a tax on companies; and set up after consultation between the Commonwealth, States, unions, employers and appropriate sections of the Swedish public service, consistent with the 1973 agreement between the Swedish and Australian Governments.

The education system must provide adequate and ambitious preparation for the world of work; include a general technology subject in school curricula; encourage all pupils, particularly girls, to participate in maths, science, economics and technical subjects; and provide equal opportunity for girls to aspire to non-traditional employment.

The Government should develop a five-year program for 16 to 24 year olds that guarantees access to education, training or employment. There should be no reduction in award wages for young people within this program. Special counselling for young, long-term unemployed people and the further development of programs such as CYSS are required. Labour market programs should be developed on a tripartite basis and emphasise skill acquisition, career development and job placement. Skills accords should be negotiated at the local and enterprise level.

Through the ACET, the Government should strengthen labour market information systems and develop tripartite procedures at the point of delivery of employment and training programs, in order to improve collection and dissemination of information. The ACET should be a statutory authority with a better resourced secretariat that draws staff from a wider cross-section of the community; is responsible for delivery of labour market programs and services; and is located in the industrial centres of Sydney or Melbourne, with branch offices in other major capitals.

The CES must be upgraded and streamlined to improve information gathering, analysis and counselling with better CES staff training and more effective liaison arrangements with DSS and other agencies, with a view to ultimate restructuring on a tripartite basis.

The notification of all vacancies and impending retrenchments to the CES should be compulsory. To reduce labour market segmentation and improve productivity, business, unions and Governments should cooperate to extend parental leave provisions in all awards and provide assistance to low income workers on compulsory maternity leave; ratify ILO Convention 156 (workers with family responsibilities); improve child-care facilities; implement arrangements for permanent part-time work in line with ACTU policy; and remove all impediments restricting the access of women and mature-age students to employment and training. Governments should develop a program to encourage young

women into the trades, other non-traditional occupations and new areas of employment growth.

Ms President, it is obvious that these recommendations and many others contained in this report, which I hope to have an opportunity to address at a later stage, will be the subject of many long-term discussions. The Federal Government shows some signs of recognising the need for change in the area of training and retraining. The Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training (Hon. John Dawkins), said at the launch of 'Australia Reconstructed':

... demand for skills contracted with economic activity but, crucially, little effort was made to establish a basis for expansion once growth again became possible. There were two failures. The first was failure to allow for the long lead-times involved in the creation of human capital. The second was failure to agree and fulfil the respective responsibilities of industry and government in skills formation. Industry had been allowed to slip into the bad habit of regarding a skilled work force as a free good. In-house training was regarded by industry, with some honourable exceptions, as a cost and not an investment.

Skill shortages were something that could be made up for by importing or poaching and a prime target for this latter activity was the public sector, which took its training responsibilities more seriously than most. I find it paradoxical that Australian business, which has much to answer for in whatever inadequacies are apparent in our training arrangements, is among the most vocal critics of alleged shortcomings in our education system. I suggest that there is little to be gained from mutual recrimination, because few of us have much to be proud of. I also find sterile the endless debate from fixed positions about the relative merits of general education as against those of vocational preparation. In truth, all vocational preparation—whether it be for the humblest of occupations or for the most exalted of professions—proceeds from the basis of a sound general education.

The task before us is manifold. We need to structure the transition from general education so as to ensure that all Australians gain as much benefit as they are willing and able to derive, general education being the best guarantee of a flexible and adaptable workforce. We need to ensure that training is related not to today's industrial requirements but to tomorrow's recognising that many traditional occupational specialisations are becoming obsolete.

We need to ensure that, except for the largest concerns, training is industry rather than enterprise-oriented, recognising that broadly relevant and periodically refurbishable skills are those least vulnerable to obsolescence. Let there be no illusions: even if unions, employers, educational authorities and governments can rapidly reach unanimity on what needs to be done, the fruits of that agreement will not be seen in the workforce for some years. We need to start now and proceed with urgency, but only time will tell us whether we have started early enough.

Ms President, we should heed these remarks along with those of Mr Robert Malpas of BP, and the Secretary of the ACTU, Bill Kelty, in his forward to the report. Now is the time to take some action as whatever action we take now will lead to the kind of future society we will have in Australia. I support the motion.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I support the motion and thank His Excellency for his speech on opening this third session of the Forty-Sixth Parliament. I affirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I join with His Excellency and other members of this Council in expressing sympathy to the families of the late Hon. Don Simmons and the late Hon. Ron Loveday.

I congratulate the Hon. Trevor Crothers on his maiden speech and look forward to his promise of vigorous cut and thrust now he has been untethered from the tradition of not interjecting before making one's maiden speech. One can only hope that the delightful Irish brogue we heard from him will not override the content of his contribution in whatever form it is made. I have something of an advantage in tuning in to the Irish accent as my male forebears' line goes back to County Roscommon they having crossed from Scotland in the time of James I. My mother's line goes back to Limerick and Kilkenny.

I was enchanted to visit both Southern and Northern Ireland in the mid-1950s, despite the setback of finding a number of my ancestors' graves showing the Bend Sinista sign, a diagonal line across the Coat of Arms (and I leave it to members to work out what that means). Despite that, I share the belief held by the Hon. Trevor Crothers that it is an immense tragedy that Ireland is split into two. I am pleased that he, like many speakers before him (including me), made reference to a unity of purpose between the Government and the Opposition to achieve a better Australia, and South Australia. I understood from the speech just concluded by the Hon. Carolyn Pickles that she also shares that wish.

There are ways to do this, and I am always happy to explore them with colleagues from either side of the Council. Indeed, in my short time here I have seen and been a part of many instances of cooperative legislation. I hold the view that the better an Opposition in questioning and probing the better the resulting legislation. Also, the more the public is aware of pending legislation, and the more the public's attitude is known to members, the better the legislation. It is the people who determine the direction that a Government should take by instructing the members of this Parliament. This can be done either on a day-to-day basis or through the ballot box at election time.

It was perhaps as much of a puzzle to me that the Hawke Government was re-elected as it was to the Hon. Mr Crothers and others that Mrs Thatcher was re-elected. There is only one certainty in contemplating the political climate in Britain and Australia and that is that the Conservatives will lose Government in Britain just as surely as the Hawke ALP Government will lose Government in Australia. This is democracy at work. There is no doubt that people judge that the various ALP Governments in Australia are following a conservative course for people are, by and large, still relatively conservative.

Although it hurts people on this side of the Council when it happens, we cannot complain when the Government does the sorts of things that we support. However, I warn people to beware, because there is quite a public agenda to socialise Australia. The leader of the Fabian socialists in Australia, the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, said, following the debacle of the Whitlam years, that 'We will find another way.' The Federal legislation relating to conciliation and arbitration which would have placed unions above others was temporarily withdrawn. That is one example of finding another way. The ill-fated Bill of Rights is another.

I suggest that the way in which an Australia Card would be used is another example of finding another way to socialise or engineer this country. I have no real objection to an identity card, nor do thousands of other law-abiding Australians. However, I do strongly object to having that identity card linked to so many other aspects of my private life. It has been interesting to note some sort of harmony between Opposition Liberals and Democrats, both Federal and State, in relation to the identity card issue: this is emerging quite strongly.

This harmony also emerged in relation to the argument over TAFE. I have no doubt that the people of Australia will exercise their right and collective power and throw this further example of socialist nonsense, the Australia Card, out on its ear. I am sorry that my Party did not spell out the horrors of the Australia Card in its present form prior to the recent Federal election. As I said earlier, people will tell members of Parliament what they think about this matter in a clear and concise manner, just as many members of the present South Australian Government demonstrated to show their displeasure about such matters as the Vietnam

War. I suggest to the Hon. Mr Crothers, the Hon. Mr Weatherill and others who expressed opinions about unfettered unionism that, under a totally socialist regime, there would be no unionism as we know it: unionism and socialism are not compatible.

Do members opposite really want to have the masses of suppressed people that we read about in Eastern Bloc countries and China, because if they do not it is time that they made up their minds one way or another? Countries that have not forced their trade unions to act under common law, or at least the same laws as everyone else, have achieved the very status that the Hon. Trevor Crothers abhors—dictatorship, oppression and poverty running rampant.

During the past four years of the Hawke Government, the number of people in poverty has more than doubled. Is not the Party opposite the one that claims to represent these very people? Is it not ashamed of that fact? Mr Hawke's disposable promise that there would be no young people in poverty by 1990 is a joke and everyone, including members of his own Party (even Mr Mick Young) and the press know that. Are members opposite not annoyed and embarrassed by the irresponsible and downright greedy people who have disrupted the Hyatt International Hotel and the others who have recently disrupted the Roxby Downs construction development by demanding more money because, they say, the companies can afford it? If members opposite do not support these things they certainly do not let the people know and, by not letting the people know, they are demonstrating a profound misunderstanding of how the productive and financial systems work.

I will spend a little time looking at what happens on the waterfront. The owners of a German ship, the *Musket Bay*, found that the ship had a faulty rudder which had to be repaired in Australia. The owners allowed 12 days for the completion of a task which, I believe, could have been done in Japan in six days. However, after a detailed examination the time was increased to 16 days. The maritime unions walked off the job, requesting redundancy pay, and an order, believe it or not, to build another Navy vessel before they would continue. In the end the job was completed in 37 days. Minister Button's only justification for this farce was that he was buying peace on the waterfront—the same sort of peace that the ASER developers had to buy for the Hyatt International.

Some of these bad practices were highlighted by the Costigan report and royal commission which looked into South Australian aspects of the waterfront. To say that national, financial and farming problems can be blamed on overseas conditions must be exposed for the shallow exercise that it is. One should take some examples from the evidence given to the royal commission on grain handling conducted by South Australia's former Director of Agriculture (Jim McColl). A Julian Cribb article in the *Australian* of 5 May states:

In the past four years unauthorised strikes and stoppages in Australia's grain export terminals and waterfronts have cost the nation the opportunity to load and ship 6 million tonnes of grain.

That stark statistic is one fragment of an appalling mosaic of industrial disruption, inefficiency, restrictive work practices and managerial failure hampering the nation's \$3 billion-a-year grain export industry.

It is a single facet of a litany of industrial problems affecting an industry already on its knees due to a vicious combination of high costs and poor returns to be presented to the Royal Commission into Grain Storage, Handling and Transport when it sits in Canberra next week.

Exactly half of the lost opportunities to load grain—more than 3 million tonnes in all—occurred in the strife-prone terminals of NSW at Glebe Island, Sydney, and at Newcastle—

and I might add, after looking at the relevant table, that it also occurred in South Australia during some years—

Last week workers of both terminals went on strike again over the sacking of an employee for persistent absenteeism. In the first four months of the current shipping year, 23 per cent of available work time has been lost to such disputes.

Strikes notwithstanding, the royal commission will hear that even when Sydney terminal is operating, it frequently does so with more than a quarter of its workforce absent.

In March 1987, the average level over the whole month was 37 employees absent out of a total workforce of 180. In January this year the situation was even worse with 48 men—or 27 per cent—absent sick, on leave or for workers compensation.

On top of the March figures, a further 20 work shifts were lost because of strikes by Australian Workers Union and Public Service Association members.

The royal commission has already highlighted the fact that of the total overseas price paid for wheat, barely half is finally received by the farmer who grew it. The remainder—more than \$1 billion—is swallowed up in the transport and handling pipeline.

It is those huge costs which will be under fire when the Grains Council of Australia, backed by the National Farmers Federation, goes into the commission hearings with both guns blazing.

Australia's ability to shift grain has long been regarded as dismal compared to that of our competitors in the United States and Canada.

For instance, the average throughput of grain per employee at Sydney terminal is just 17 000 tonnes a year—compared to 80 000 tonnes a man at Convent and Westwego in the US and 120 000 tonnes at Kalama.

The report continues:

Although there has been a significant decline in the number and duration of disputes in Australia in recent years, the waterfront, transport and grains industries still harbour significant black spots.

For example, last October all shipping in the port of Fremantle was frozen for a day because nine deckhands struck. They were claiming compensation for damage to their private vehicles during the America's Cup challenge.

That was nothing at all to do with the transport and shipping of grain. The article continues:

On another occasion all shipping at the grain port of Kwinana was held up for a week because two men in a launch crew—whom take the berthing rope from the ship to the berth—struck.

A launch crew usually consists of three men and they receive pay for a full shift even if they only dock one ship and throw one rope.

Similarly a mooring crew, consisting of six workers and a mooring captain, earn a full shift's pay merely for throwing and securing a couple of ropes—a task completed in less than 15 minutes.

Members opposite show great hatred for Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and particularly her moves towards privatisation. I do not hear anyone in this Chamber, on behalf of the Government, now condemning the practice of privatisation or commercialisation—call it what you like. Why? Because it is now embraced by this Government and its colleagues in Canberra and in other Labor States.

Why is privatisation taking place in Russia, and why is Gorbachev offering land to Russian farmers? It is to lift productivity. The Hon. Mario Feleppa and others are mesmerised by the press beat-up phrase relating to the New Right. I would be as ashamed of the policies of the Far Right as I would be of those of the loony left. Charles Copeland and Peko-Wallsend are not far right by any stretch of the imagination. The Peko experience has seen a massive lift in productivity by eliminating efficiency sapping restrictive work practices. This is the same experience as that at Mudginberri. If these restrictive work practices were not eliminated income earning companies like Peko-Wallsend would cease to exist in Australia.

To be petrified by the Peko experience is to ignore the real plight of Australia. It shows a real ignorance about the future that faces this country.

Mr Hawke wants to sell Qantas, the Commonwealth Bank, airport terminals, Australian Airlines, and so on. Let us see what fight members opposite and Mr Bannon will put up

to stop this happening. Members opposite and Mr Hawke threw away their principles in relation to selling uranium to France for economic reasons. There are even more compelling reasons now, economically, to throw away another set of principles.

What hypocrisy it is to condemn privatisation as was espoused by the Liberal Party in this State and federally, and then immediately go on and embrace it. Australians and South Australians must understand that ALP Governments are making decisions based not on philosophy or grass root Party policies, but on pragmatism brought about by necessity. That financial necessity is brought about largely by their own inept management of the economy and the country's resources—both primary and secondary, and people. Heaven knows what would happen if Minister Blevins got his head on State ownership—the old socialist dogma rearing its head, that the State should be owner of the means of production.

The Hon. Mr Crothers, in his contribution to this debate, stated:

I know that unions will not stray away from the original pieces of rationale that led to their formation. They are worth restating.

These points are worth commenting on. I refer, first, to freedom from hunger. As I have already said, poverty numbers in Australia are climbing and, in fact, have doubled in the past four years. No matter how much we may question the poverty line we cannot get away from the many indications of it that are obvious to those who want to see them. Of course, unionists and unions are not themselves in poverty. They are on, at least, a perfectly good basic wage. They are not missing out in any respect, but they are causing increasing numbers of other people to miss out. So, the power and the work of unions are not working in respect of freeing people from hunger in Australia, let alone in other countries.

The second point is the right to work. The trade union movement is one element helping to keep 8 per cent, 9 per cent or 10 per cent of people out of work. More especially our young are out of work, and I believe that that is a crime against society.

None of us can be proud of that. In South Australia unemployment is running at 9.3 per cent. We have recorded a massive 6.5 per cent increase in the number of teenage unemployed in one year. Youth unemployment now stands at 29.2 per cent: almost one in three of our 15-19 year olds is out of work. When will the Hon. Trevor Crothers and others get their unions to extend the right of work to all South Australians and, indeed, all Australians?

The third point deals with the right to a meaningful education, which I believe has been universally achieved. One might question how that right is now being used and the sorts of things that are being taught to prepare young people for the real world that they must face when they leave school.

The fourth point is the right to proper treatment of society's sick. Again, this aspect has been largely achieved—although at a cost. We on this side of the Chamber only question—and we continually do that—how that service is financed and delivered.

The fifth point raised by the Hon. Trevor Crothers is the right to be able to retire in decent, modest comfort. There has been some moderately successful implementation of this objective. Like the other parts in the points raised by the honourable member, it is a subject in itself, and I cannot cover it here adequately today. However, I should say that the ability to go on paying pensions at the present rate and to go on financing public and private superannuation schemes relies very heavily on efficient productivity.

I simply say that the ability to do that well in the future will depend heavily (and I emphasise that) on the attitude of the union movement and of Governments. If this country is pushed further towards the Argentine experience—and we are heading that way already at a great pace; many commentators other than myself have said that—there will be no pensions and no welfare. Let us hope that the commonsense and the experience of people like the Hon. Mr Crothers will demand that this decline is halted. Otherwise, we will have exactly what he described for Ireland: not a partition but a tragic mistake, indeed an accumulation of mistakes, which will represent short-term gain for longer-term human suffering.

In case honourable members opposite and even on my side are complacent about what faces this country, I want to draw on some facts and figures from an address to the United Farmers and Stockowners annual general meeting a couple of weeks ago by Dr Andy Stoekel, a respected and experienced economic communicator and Director of the Centre of International Economics, recently retired from heading the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. How bad is our plight? We are simply not paying our way in the world. Our net external debt position is expected to be around \$90 billion, or 36 per cent of GDP by June 1987. It is distressing to see another bad month for July, when I read the *News* of only today, where that balance of payments figure has reached \$1.35 billion, with revised figures of a \$915 million deficit for June and a revised figure of \$975 million for May. It is more distressing for me to see financial commentators applauding the fact that we are achieving monthly deficits of \$800 million to \$900 million.

There should be no applause from anyone until these monthly deficit results are totally wiped out and our monthly figures are on the positive side. Our economy ranks with many third world economies. Moreover, the position is deteriorating. Australians now owe over \$321 000 million, which is \$20 000 per head. This is four times the debt 10 years ago and 10 times the debt 20 years ago. A stabilised externalised debt problem relative to GDP is a minimum requirement for balanced growth. As the point has been made before, I acknowledge that the total debt is made up of private debt, company debt and Government debt.

Australia is extremely vulnerable to adverse external events such as more declining terms of trade or an international recession, and many economic commentators suggest 1990 as a predictable time for an international recession. That we are not in shape for that is the point that I want to make. We must bear in mind the position of the United States, which is now a debtor country for the first time, and the relative position of Japan, which is not in debt but which is in the opposite position. Both the United States and Japan are major players in the field with regard to an international recession or the possibility of one.

How can I best illustrate the dimensions of the problem? To prevent our net position from deteriorating further, our balance of trade would need to improve by up to \$15 billion annually. The Council should remember that that is about how much our net position is deteriorating, as set out in the 1986-87 figures that have been alluded to already in the *News* tonight.

I will put this \$15 billion into perspective. Exports of rural origin, which account for 36 per cent of Australia's merchandise, were \$11.6 billion in 1985-86, and we are looking for a \$15 billion improvement. Therefore, to achieve a turnaround is a major task. One point should be stressed: artificially encouraging a particular export sector, such as manufacturing exports, is not a solution. There is another point with this. Following the Government's restructuring

in Canberra over the last couple of weeks, the hand of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has been strengthened considerably. The new vogue term is 'positive assistance'. However, this is simply protection in new clothes. Someone has to pay, and it is the rural sector, amongst others, and other export industries that are the bunnies. South Australia is dependent on rural exports, and this sector cannot afford to pay any more. A recent OECD report on Australia was not fooled by the trendy words, because it said:

Even by the end of a relatively long period of adjustment, assistance to industry will remain excessive.

Domestic policies, both Federal and State, affect performance and have a lot to do with our monetary, fiscal and wage position. Macroeconomic policies, especially the reliance on a firm monetary policy for economic management as compared to fiscal policy, is anti trade.

Put simply, to do better at trade we have to take off the taxes and impediments to trade. Nowhere in the policy laid down by this Government can I see positive initiatives to address the trade problems to which I have alluded from a State point of view. I refer to the May statement from Mr Keating regarding the Federal scene; there is no great joy there either to address these problems. It is possible, I understand from Dr Stoekel, to pose the question: what would we have to do to improve our current account deficit by just \$1 billion, remembering that we need at least \$15 billion improvement? To lift the balance of trade by \$1 billion we would require one of the following:

1. A 9 per cent increase in world agricultural prices.
2. An 80 per cent cut in tariffs.
3. A 1 per cent cut in the cost of wages to employees.
4. A restructuring of taxes with a 5 per cent consumption tax accompanied by compensating income tax.
5. A 1 per cent cut in real Government spending.

Without checking it, I guess that all these points are almost exactly in line with those spelt out by John Howard at the last Federal election. We will see what happens if they are not abided by. Wages represent 70 per cent of our economic costs. How they are used is paramount to our future. To reduce our current account deficit by that \$15 billion we must concentrate on wages policy, management, work practices and productivity. They are the keys, and that is what Mudginberri was all about. Mudginberri was about increased productivity and increased wages, and both of those things happened. That is what Robe River was about, as I mentioned before—decreased workforce by a third, and productivity and wages went up. If this is the boggy that the Hon. Mario Feleppa and others call the New Right, then it is working and long may it continue to work and improve our country's net income.

Restrictive work practices reduce living standards, yet the Hon. Mario Feleppa and others are proud to tell us otherwise and defend the worst kind of work practices. Five countries—the United States of America, Japan, Germany, France and the United Kingdom—have an average gross domestic product per employed person over a 23 year period of 3.3; Australia has two. Some of the restrictive practices bearing on our bad performance can be illustrated following a survey of the metal and engineering industries here which found that 50 per cent of companies have a restriction on working hours; 46 per cent have inflexible manning practices; 46 per cent have limitations on subcontractors; 38 per cent have a prevention of payment for individuals' performance or incentive schemes; 35 per cent have demarcation disputes; 35 per cent have restrictions on part-time or casual employment; and 33 per cent have payment for work not done.

South Australia cannot hide its head in the sand; it must play a part in helping the Federal Government to address the huge economic problems ahead. I have no doubt that the Premier will be spelling out, as he has for some time, the fact that there are massive economic problems confronting this State, as well. The State Government and its instrumentalities, and indeed the various local government bodies, play a part in adding to the taxes and charges burden placed on ordinary households. Without having done any homework in this area, but having read the paper most days over the past month, I guess that the average rise in rates for local government, for instance, has been about 6 per cent to 10 per cent. I suppose that is responsible, but it highlights the fact that rates are rising and not really holding the line. While all around seems serene and comfortable, and indeed complacent for many, the iceberg below the water is growing and, as ACOSS and SACOSS (and even the Minister of Community Welfare would agree, I am sure) would say, all is far from well out of sight of those who do not want to see what is really happening.

His Excellency's speech highlighted many areas of State activity. My hope is that the Government will make every effort to help address the economic and welfare areas in such a way that we may not only help those in need but also stimulate private enterprise and, most of all, get the priorities right. There is no question that this State will continue to raise taxes and charges. As political Parties we will differ in what is raised and how it is raised; we will differ on what is spent and how it is spent; and we will differ on our priorities. However, we should not differ on one priority: that is, the cause of our problems should be addressed rather than just throwing money and resources at the effect.

I have very little conflict with ACOSS and SACOSS, for instance, other than in their dealings with Federal and State Governments. My contention, which I have made known to SACOSS following its well produced South Australian budget submission, is that it should demand that Governments reduce the problem areas that it has to deal with rather than ask for more and more money and resources to patch up the problems. I cannot highlight that more than I am now. Herein, of course, lies a well known conflict. Any agency dependent on Government money and resources does not overtly criticise the mouth that feeds it; it dares not do so—and more's the pity.

Recently, I heard the Chief Executive of ACOSS (Julian Disney), a man whom I respect, saying that we should not be worried about the current account deficit level proposed to run this year, at \$2 billion federally. Inherent in this advice is that welfare and so on has been cut enough by the May statement and no further cuts should be contemplated. With respect, this ignores the accumulating deficits which, when added to our current net external debt, produce a very grim picture of total national debt. Of course, State household and business debt is part of this picture. I remind the Council of what I said earlier and of what Dr Stoekel and others have said: if we go along the path any further of accumulating debt, we will achieve the Argentinian status. A number of countries are in that position. We will have a country dominated by poverty and people in need of welfare far in excess of the levels that ACOSS and SACOSS deal with now. I just cannot believe that those who sit in this Council, particularly members opposite, can condone the much publicised trend in Australia of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer.

In his speech His Excellency also referred to the introduction of the new local government revision legislation this session. I will spend a little time discussing local gov-

ernment and, in particular, I will relate my comments to the long running discussion in local government about the minimum rate. I will confine myself to the paper prepared for the Government on some alternatives to the minimum rate compiled by S.A. Easton and N.J. Thompson of the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies. It is inevitable when talking about taxes, rates or charges that some comment is made about their possible regressive nature. Indeed, on page 1 the paper states:

An inevitable consequence of a tax (the rate) levied solely upon the basis of the property value is that its pattern of incidence may be regressive in terms of amount of current income. This is the case for households, although it may be no less true of some trading enterprises (such as farms).

I suspect that this comment was made with the Housing Trust situation in mind. Nevertheless, the statement is accurate and vividly so when contemplating the present farm income crisis. Rural properties have high capital value with little cash flow and therefore the ability to pay. The traditional direction for farms has been to cycle between high and low income periods. The situation could be somewhat reversed from time to time for an average income earner in an average value suburban house.

Without being insensitive, I think we can get too carried away and sidetracked by trying to smooth out regression and always finding and looking for equity. After all, if we take the argument to its logical conclusion we would have the prices of every item we buy through shops, supermarkets, hardware stores and so on matched to different incomes. I think that local government has been very responsible as a whole although, of course, at times there are exceptions—as there are with State Governments—in keeping rates and minimum rates to an acceptable level. On reflection, the very low voter turnout at local government elections reflects this because, if there was great dissatisfaction of a large proportion, undoubtedly there would be large voter turnout and large turnover of councillors. However, we do not see that. What people are looking for and demanding is efficient expenditure of the rates raised. What gets up people's noses is the accumulated effect of adding rates to personal taxes and charges raised by State and Federal Governments and the way that these resources are spent by governments. I have made that point a couple of times.

The paper discusses minimum rates, equity and the role of State Governments in social welfare and the authors quote from a charter of the Housing Trust, as follows:

The South Australian Housing Trust exists to provide housing and housing related services for those in need and to do so in ways which contribute as far as possible to the social well-being and economic development of this State.

When reading that it causes me to wonder how much the South Australian Housing Trust has moved away from that charter and how many people in the Government are aware of the fact that there are quite wealthy people living in houses which should be reserved for those in need, as is the charter of the Housing Trust. How many families no longer in need are using Housing Trust houses? Based on some criteria, high income earners living in Housing Trust houses should be paying more appropriate rates. In addition to this argument, in the local government area these people contribute only a token to rates, as they pay rent. However, because as voters they have access to becoming councillors, they can in theory dominate a council and its thinking and rate raising, because they could have the majority to do that.

The policy put forward by my Party at the last State election—and now adopted in part by the Government—should be developed as quickly as possible, so that those who can afford to buy their own Housing Trust house can inject capital into the Housing Trust arena to enable the

Housing Trust to build more stocks of houses for those truly in need. At first glance, table 5 in this paper, relating to pensioner rebate concessions paid out of the State budget from 1975-76 to 1985-86, indicates a huge increase in payments from \$2.46 million to \$11.83 million, which is an increase of \$9.3 million or 372 per cent over 10 years. With help from research in the Parliamentary Library I have been able to rationalise that table. For example, the real increase in 1985-86 dollar terms in total payments has been \$4.1 million or 53 per cent over the period of 10 years. Table 5 can be misleading as it does not attempt to quote the figures on the same terms. Nevertheless, in accordance with my figures and those provided by the library there has been a rise in concessions paid as a total percentage of total payments on the Consolidated Account from .189 per cent in 1975-76 to .342 per cent in 1985-86.

However, it is necessary to look at the numbers of families granted eligibility. These numbers have risen from 50 655 in 1975-76 to 104 490 in 1985-86, a 104 per cent increase over that period of 10 years. Pensioners constitute about 90 per cent of those eligible persons. The remaining 10 per cent relates to those persons facing financial hardship. These people are chosen not by local government but by the Government with no involvement at all from local government. There is no question that the figure is high, and no doubt increasing, not only in cash pay-out but in the number of people eligible to receive the concessions and, if economic circumstances do not improve, that tendency will worsen.

Because this pay-out figure is at present high enough to be called into question by the Government, it should not be felt that the fault lies only at the door of local government. The whole question of the minimum rate debate will, whatever the outcome, ensure that councils have a hard look at their practices in the rate area. There has been ample warning that any questionable practice should be, and must be, eliminated. The examples of bad minimum rate practices which were given by the Minister and members of her department certainly appear to be questionable and should be tested by the courts. I understand that some of the questionable practices adopted by some people in local government are, in fact, being tested by the courts.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I am speaking in relation to the Minister's example of the caravan park rated at \$6 000 or \$8 000 (I am not sure of the figure). Individual van sites were identified and a minimum rate of \$200 per site applied, giving a rate of \$36 000. Then there was the boarding house that somehow had a minimum rate applied to each boarder. I do not know the exact details—these matters have been explained at public meetings as being problems, and I believe they are problems, but I will not comment further other than to say that they are unbelievable. I cannot believe that such things are happening.

I have seen other examples. During the last Federal election, when I was door-knocking in some areas I asked people in business, who were renting a small shop, what their rates were like. They said that their landlord gave them their own rate notice and they paid rent plus rates. I do not understand that arrangement. It seems to be a very questionable arrangement because rates are based on an assessment, and no individual has the right to break up an assessment without it going through local government and the right legal channels. The boarding house case, for instance, should be tested. However, these problem cases should be dealt with individually and not used to damn the whole minimum rate and the whole local government area. We should not have had the situation in which two Min-

isters said at Port Pirie that the minimum rate was illegal. The minimum rate is not illegal, but if there are facets within it that are illegal individuals should pursue those matters. I have no problem with that approach.

Another figure which is of interest and which was identified by library research is the concession per eligible person. In 1985-86 dollar terms, in 1975-76 it was \$150 per person. In 1985-86 it had fallen to \$113 per person. So, rather than getting more out of the system per person, local government is getting less per person in 1985-86 terms to the tune of \$39 or a 26 per cent decline. As the pensioner and financial hardship demands to councils for concessions are part of the minimum rate debate, the amounts involved should be understood. I understand that the pensioner rebate in 1985-86 amounted to \$12 million, and South Australian Housing Trust rates paid on behalf of its houses amounted to \$25 million, giving a total of \$35 million.

As with pensioner and concessional rebates we should look at the South Australian Housing Trust rates paid to local government. In 1985-86 dollar terms, there has been a rise of \$7.4 million in rates paid since 1975-76. I am not exactly sure for how long the water rates have been included in this calculation—I have not had the opportunity to go back and find when that began. In that same 10-year period the number of Housing Trust dwellings for rent has risen from 36 414 to 56 028. This is the total number of dwelling stock. That is an increase of 19 600 or 53 per cent over that period of 10 years.

Any council which finds itself with a large block of Housing Trust houses within its boundaries is at a distinct disadvantage in the present economic climate. This is not a criticism of the South Australia Housing Trust or the Government but I point out that this available land could easily be used for higher quality private housing or industry, and that, in turn, would return considerably higher rates than is the case at present. There has always been, according to my limited knowledge of the urban areas, an understanding between the State Government and local councils on this issue. I do not know whether a figure has ever been quantified, but it would be a great pity to stir up another hornet's nest in trying to quantify what that assistance is by local government to the Housing Trust and to the Government in providing that housing within council areas.

There remains in local government circles a suspicion that Housing Trust valuations are calculated on a different basis from other housing valuations. This should be laid to rest once and for all to the satisfaction of local government. I know that my colleague the Hon. Peter Dunn has asked a question on that very score, and the answer has come back that there is no different calculation for Housing Trust houses. However, I was at Truro with the Hon. Carolyn Pickles on Friday and I heard it more than once there: that they are suspicious that Housing Trust houses have a different basis of valuation from anyone else.

I would like to see that boggy—if it is a boggy—put to rest once and for all. If it is not a boggy, we should deal with it. When trying to understand and work through the Centre for Economic Studies paper, I could not at first understand the assessed values for properties in Whyalla. I admit that from now on it will be pretty hard going for anyone who wants to listen. It is a very technical area and I am going to cite a lot of facts and figures but, when one reads cold a report which is not in any great depth—and I am not criticising it for this point—one has to find some points that one can understand and work from. Luckily, mention is made of the Tatiara council area, of which I had been a member for 10 years, so I could relate to the figures provided. Examples of assessed property values in Whyalla

were provided, as follows: 98 per cent of values are under \$20 000; 4 600 properties are valued at between \$4 000 and \$5 000; and 4 467 properties are valued at between \$8 000 and \$13 000.

I might be dim, but it took me a while to work out that these were not on capital values, and I am not competent to comment on this except to say that I think it very odd that, in looking further, two out of the seven councils studied—Whyalla and one other—are not on capital values. I would have thought that like should have been compared with like. The graph form showing rate distribution as used by the authors may well be accurate for the sake of the paper and the conclusions drawn, but a minimum rate based on capital values in Whyalla, for instance, may well be different from one based on the unimproved value. That is the only point I wish to make there.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: That was the purpose of choosing a range of councils on different site values—to be able to assess the impact on current circumstances.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: That is fine, but I am indicating that that did not come through to me as it should, and I wonder how it has to other people. I do not recall any mention being made—although there may be—that it has been done for that reason; that there are, out of the seven, two on one set of values and five on the other. I turn now to the levy as calculated and discussed in the paper. The word 'levy' is used in two different calculations or in two different ways. First, in discussion on the seven councils the word 'levy' is used to identify the amount raised from the minimum rate; and, secondly, the word 'levy' is used in conjunction with the distribution of administration costs based on schedule 13 costs. To say the least, this is confusing to those trying to understand the paper.

How is the levy calculated? On the first example that I quoted—a levy on all assessments—a minimum rate is set by a council. It has two components: first, the property value multiplied by the council rate. If this sum does not add up to the minimum rate, council sets an amount which is the second component. This amount is added on to bring the total up to the amount set. For example, using the Tatiara figures, the minimum rate is \$142. Capital value on a vacant block is, say, \$10 000, and the rate is .512 cents. The rate income from this is therefore \$51. The difference between that and the \$142, which is set as the minimum, is \$91. It is not clear from the paper whether the minimum rate being distributed to all assessments for Tatiara of \$59 670, or \$17 per assessment in Tatiara is, first, the sum of all the differences calculated from assessments not making the declared minimum rate of \$142 or, secondly, the sum of all the assessments showing in the records or the assessment book of rates which were due at \$142.

It is important to clarify the methodology in that issue. Repeating the Tatiara example, the paper tells us that the minimum rate can be replaced by distributing the amount of \$59 670 to all assessments. The figure arrived at—\$17—is simply \$59 670 divided by 3 510, which is the approximate number of assessments. This certainly gets us to the starting point of no minimum rate and council receiving the same income. There is no other logic, because the \$17 does not relate to anything like a valuation. It simply adds \$17 to every assessment.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: It is based on the administration costs.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: It is not based on the administration costs. I might be able to clarify that later. The Tatiara example has \$59 670 distributed to everyone, which is \$17 an assessment. The section 13 charges for Tatiara amount to \$424 000. It is a part of it, but it is certainly not the

schedule 13 amount, unless I am completely off the track. I believe that it has even less logic the next year—and I must emphasise the next year—when a rate is applied to every assessment. This year we are going to have a rate assessed on capital value plus \$17, which gives council back the same rate.

What happens to the \$17 the following year? Where has it gone? How does one get that back into the process so that council does not lose out? The Tatiara example of a vacant block now reads \$51, which is valuation, plus the spreading out of the minimum rate liability of \$17, which equals \$68. To this we must add the levy equal to administration costs for schedule 13, if we are to comply with the conclusions in the paper—that is, a levy based on administration costs with a rate unchanged. From table 6 I can calculate that for Tatiara the minimum increase in rates under the levy plus no change in rate option is \$137—that is, no change in rates with redistribution of the old minimum rate amount—\$17 plus schedule 13 costs of \$424 796, divided by the assessments, giving \$120, which equals \$137. That just clarifies what I said before.

Using a Housing Trust house in Bordertown of the average value of \$40 000 as an example, which was given to me by the Tatiara people, the old rate paid was \$205, which is above the minimum rate of \$142. For the new option of a levy plus rate unchanged, we would have to add \$137 to that \$205, giving \$342—an enormous increase to the very people the Government wants to help. For the previous example of a vacant block, the final rate would be \$68 plus \$120, which equals \$188, or \$46 above the existing minimum rate.

For the record, the same house valued at \$40 000 in other councils used in the paper, with maximum add-ons as in the Tatiara example, would show the following: Willunga, \$256 against the minimum rate of \$210; Kensington and Norwood, \$238 against the minimum rate of \$250; Berri, \$356 against the minimum rate of \$240; Whyalla, \$287 against the minimum rate of \$252; Port Adelaide, \$255 against the minimum rate of \$230; and Burra, \$330 against the minimum rate of \$230. In every case, the new calculation is worse than the minimum rate, other than for Kensington and Norwood, where there is a slight improvement.

My contention is that a switch from a minimum rate to a levy on all properties based on schedule 13 costs plus the current rate is not sound. It would be sounder if the calculation was the following: first, the total rate required less schedule 13 costs divided by all assessments; secondly, plus the schedule 13 cost divided by all assessments; bring all assessments falling below the schedule 13 cost up to that amount. This would be not only sounder, but would retain a minimum rate based on schedule 13 costs as a minimum requirement. The whole calculation of rate for assessment is very close to the present situation with the minimum rate in this case being based on a known identifiable factor.

There may be some divergence from the classic valuation principle, but costs to councils are way above schedule 13 costs, anyway. What I have said is more a comment on the Centre for Economic Studies paper and its conclusions than a firm commitment from me on the conclusions I will reach once the legislation containing minimum rate proposals is before Parliament. I want to have a full discussion about this matter with my Party when all available advice is known before the collective wisdom of my Party indicates the correct path for me to follow. I welcome more discussion on the points that I have raised and clarification of the conclusions in the paper. My comments when discussing points arising in the paper from the Centre of South Australian Economic Studies were never intended to criticise

the authors, who may criticise me after reading my contribution.

It is my intention to meet with the authors of the paper to clarify this matter. I have just finished my work on this matter, so I have not yet had a chance to do that. I will certainly be better prepared to clarify my position on minimum rates when legislation comes before the Parliament. I will use that debate to update this contribution. It is with pleasure that I support the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I thank the Governor for this opportunity to speak to the motion. I express my sympathy to the families of the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday, both deceased. I did not know those former members well, but had met them officially and enjoyed their company. I congratulate the Hon. Trevor Crothers on his contribution. He has been here for quite some time and I was not sure whether he would break the ice, but he did with a rather loud 'Hoorah!'. I look forward to an interesting time with him as I am sure he will have something to contribute in this Council. I think today he made his maiden interjection: I look forward to more of that happening, because it will add something to this Council.

The Governor's speech was interesting: its theme seemed to be that the Government believes that things are tough but it is not to blame. The Premier appears to be saying, 'We are on hard luck times, but it ain't our fault.' He is also saying, 'We want a little more effort and you will get a little less reward' and, 'We want more effort from you but we cannot promise more reward.' However, when I look at what is happening this appears to be a bit lopsided: the Premier is saying it is not South Australia's fault and it is not the Government's fault that South Australia is in this position. He is saying that all his efforts have been to the good. However, when one looks at the indices that show what is happening to this State, one sees that they do not add up; we are going backwards.

We are not competing with the other States. This is due partly to the fact that there have been so many broken promises. Who remembers the very loud promise that the Premier made when in Opposition and his statement that he was the best informed Opposition Leader in Australia and that he knew most about finance? He also said that it would not be necessary to increase taxes and charges if he were in Government. That was a very effective statement, because he got into power.

However, the record shows that he increased taxes and charges enormously. When he made that statement he qualified it by saying that he was not aware that the Tonkin Government, which was in Government prior to his coming to office, had run down the State. He is either the best informed or the least knowledgeable of Premiers, if that is the case. This Government has caused its own problems. I am not a great one for figures but on looking at the indices and the key economic factors before me I see that they demonstrate graphically what has happened to this State in the past few years.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: That we have gone backwards.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Yes, dramatically. Employment growth was .2 per cent in the past year, the second worst effort of any State of the Commonwealth. Tasmania had minus .05 employment growth, so it has gone backwards. However, employment growth in Victoria was nearly 4 per cent, which shows how poorly the South Australian Government is handling our economy.

Another growth factor indicator is the number of building approvals. On comparing the 1985-86 figures with 1987 I found that we have suffered a regression of 13.1 per cent,

which is the second highest regression of all the States. That is a good example of the Government's poor performance over the past year. Retail sales for the six months to 31 March 1987 showed an increase of 2.4 per cent over 1985-86 in South Australia, whereas it was 10 per cent in Victoria, nearly 8 per cent in New South Wales, nearly 7 per cent in Queensland, and nearly 8 per cent in Western Australia. So, retail sales have grown more slowly in South Australia than in any other State of the Commonwealth.

I turn now to motor vehicle registrations. I have said time and time again in this place that people wear their wealth on their cuff and that that cuff in many cases is their motor car. One can see that by driving up and down Greenhill Road and looking at the number and types of cars in that area. Registrations in South Australia for the six months to April 1987 have dropped 30 per cent compared with 1985-86. Registrations in other States have dropped also, but the drop in South Australia has been the second greatest of all States—a poor performance by this State. Even more graphic is the figure for the number of bankruptcies, which South Australia heads. Bankruptcies increased by 58 per cent up until March 1987. All the indicators show that this State is doing very poorly.

The State probably is in a desperate plight. Even so, the Government has let the Public Service grow fairly quickly. Perhaps that is part of the problem. During the Tonkin era we saw a decline in the growth of the Public Service, but since the Premier took the reins in 1982 it has grown at an alarming rate, and the hard work done during 1979-82 was quickly lost.

Let us think about public servants. Their very name indicates what they are: they are servants who are there to handle the administration of the State, to assist and offer service to people where and when it is necessary. Comparing that to private industry, if one keeps increasing one's staff because it makes it easy for the boss and everyone else, eventually one reaches a stage where the business becomes uneconomic. That is what has happened in this State. We have a Public Service that is running rampant. Each person employed, with all the add-on costs, is a cost to the State of about \$50 000.

We cannot afford it. We have to cut that back. I am not suggesting that we should target any specific areas. Ministers will have to ensure that cutbacks are made and that the number of public servants does not increase simply because it is good for a Minister's image within the ministry. Ministers should not be able to obtain extra money so that they can put on more public servants. Certain sections of the Public Service will always undergo changes in emphasis in relation to the requirements of departments to service industries. That will always be and will always have to be—

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: But most of the staff are in education, health and the Police Force.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I will cite some figures. One should look at the growth that has taken place. A table showing increases in relation to State Government wage and salary earners, including employees in statutory authorities (and I think that it is necessary that they be included), indicates that financial and property services (that is, the State Bank and SAFA) employed 4 800 people in 1983, and in 1986 that figure had grown to 5 900—an increase of 1 100 in three years or 2.3 per cent; during 1983 community services (that is, welfare, police and fire, etc.) employed 69 600 people, and during 1986 that figure was 73 000 people—an increase of 5.3 per cent; during 1983 health employed 25 000 people, and in 1986 that figure was 27 800—an increase of 2 800 or 11.2 per cent. Has our population

increased anywhere near this? It has not. We have employed more and more people but we have not—

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Would you like us to sack the nurses and the police?

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The Minister interjects and asks whether we should sack them. I have just explained in some detail that we need changes in emphasis. I am demonstrating that there have been increases when there has not been a commensurate increase in our population. We are overservicing ourselves. In relation to recreation and personnel services, in 1983 there were 1 900 people employed, but in 1986 there were 2 800 people employed—an increase of 900 or 47.4 per cent. I admit that tourism is a growth industry and that we can allow for a growth to service it. However, is 47.4 per cent necessary? Need we tax others to supply that service? Perhaps it would have been preferable to farm out some of that to private enterprise.

I am pleased to see that governments throughout the Commonwealth are looking at privatisation. It is an awful word, but it effectively describes what should be happening: that perhaps more work should be taken on by private individuals. During 1983 there were 105 000 wage and salary earners in South Australia, but by 1986 that figure had increased to 110 000—an increase of 5 000 people or about 5 per cent. So there has been quite a dramatic increase in that area, but our population has not risen at the same rate.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They are not full-time equivalents.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: They are full-time equivalents; the Attorney says that they are not.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Does it include the State Bank?

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I have included the State Bank and SAFA.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: And you want us to cut back there, too!

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The Minister is suggesting that we should cut back in those areas. If the Government is making money in those areas, I suggest that the back-up services could be cut back if they were given to private enterprise. Do not tell me that it is necessary for all these money-making industries, for instance, the timber industry in the South-East—

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: But you are trying to sell them off. The Federal Government is doing likewise; it is trying to dispose of many of its money-making industries because it realises that it is not efficient in servicing those industries and that it is costing more. Others can compete better for whatever the reasons—and we do not need to go into that in any detail now. Minister Blevins indicated that because we are not performing too well as a State perhaps we will have to increase our taxes. To offset the increase in these public servants, we are going to increase taxes!

I think that the good Dr Cornwall suggested that we should have a Robin Hood tax. I think that Minister Blevins' call for a property tax is in the same field. That indicates dramatically the thoughts of the Government. If that is the case, and if we introduce property or capital taxes, it will depress what is already a very depressed rural economy. People will not invest if Governments tax those industries. Look at what is happening to the housing industry. Rental housing in Australia, because it is now being taxed and because people cannot obtain tax relief by investing in that industry, is in crisis.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The housing industry is facing a disaster. Whatever happened, it is not working.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. Carolyn Pickles): Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The honourable member says that it should have been put into public housing. We could go further than that. Perhaps we could put some of the tax gained from petrol into housing, as well. That has become the best industry to raise money—to tax the industry that really affects people who live further away from capital cities, and this compounds time and time again. If that has been suggested by Minister Blevins and by Minister Cornwall, what next? I guess an increase in land tax and perhaps the reintroduction of probate and succession duties. Recently it gained some publicity, and I will be interested to hear what the Minister has to say in reply because I believe that that form of double taxation does not have any place in our society today. Rural communities, in particular, find it very hard to compensate for probate and succession duties. There are some concessions and rebates at the moment in relation to land tax in rural communities, and I hope that they remain. If not, a far greater number of bankruptcies will occur. I have already indicated the figures relating to South Australia, where bankruptcies have increased by 58 per cent during the past nine months (until March this year).

These cases do not involve only small amounts of money; some are quite large. The burden would be on the shoulders of a few. The argument in relation to probate and succession duties has been well canvassed, but it is a form of double taxation that has a particularly bad effect on rural Australia.

The Hon. Mr Irwin mentioned minimum rates, the loss of which seems to impede rural development, although not entirely. However, it impinges on those people. A very small portion of rating in truly rural councils involves the minimum rate. I cite those areas particularly on Eyre Peninsula (other than Port Lincoln) with small towns attached to them and where the minimum rate is often very low, being around \$160 to \$200. That will be lost.

Those towns, and perhaps some of the larger Mid-North towns that have attached rural areas, will feel the loss of the minimum rate most. When that minimum rate is abolished councils will have to survive somehow, and they will do this by increasing their rates. When one has a large—

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: They will increase their levy, as the Minister suggests, to offset what has been lost in the city area. I suggest that that will again impinge on those people who probably at present can least afford it. This year we have seen \$58 million put into rural communities that need to be kept afloat until overseas prices improve or inflation or interest rates fall. The minimum rate creates fear in old people, and we know why that is.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: You know that that is not right.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order, Mr Davis!

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The Government will gain by the removal of pensioner concessions. I can tell the Minister that many old people have expressed to me their concern about this. They cannot offset such increases. Pensioners are always behind. They are slow to get their payment, once again demonstrating the ponderous movement of Government. They are slow to get paid—they are the last to get paid. Many pensioners try hard to pay off their homes before going on the pension so that they can have some security in their own home and they can sit there and,

despite whatever else happens, they can feel fairly comfortable in the belief that no-one will take it from them. That situation came home to me fairly clearly recently.

My own parents are still alive and well into their 80s and my father, who was a fairly outgoing man, expressed his concern to me. He said that he was happy that he had his own house but he was disturbed about what was happening in just living in that home. It is not productive—it is just a place in which he is living out his life.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Then he does not understand the provisions of the Bill.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I do not suppose he does. He is 87. I have not discussed it with him. He understands what he has been told by people around him. People are not excited by what they hear, and I do not blame them. The Government has not handled this matter at all well and it is putting an impediment on the people who are least able to afford to pay it.

Also, we have seen an increase in taxes in water rates and electricity tariffs. Those increases are remarkable in that they have increased at a rate so much faster than the average rate of inflation. In South Australia we were able to brag that we had cheap power. As members will recall, when GMH started at Elizabeth, it was given land free of taxes (and land was found for them) and it was given free power for a small period during its establishment period. In that way South Australia attracted the company here. Also, South Australia established a system of power generation in Port Augusta using Leigh Creek coal. This gave us continuity of power. At that stage we did not rely on coal from the Eastern States, and many of us will remember the problems that occurred in the middle to late 1940s in this State when we could not get coal because of the coal strikes. Indeed, that prompted the rapid development of power generation in Northern Spencer Gulf.

Subsequently, we had the development of gas power generation. I would have thought that, with those two natural commodities in South Australia, this State could have supplied power at a reasonable cost. I note that the State Government would like to tax ETSA, which in turn has to increase its rates to a point where we will have the second highest power charges in the Commonwealth. I suggest that soon we will probably have the highest charges.

I applaud ETSA for its efforts in providing us with power. It has done that extremely well, but the Government has been on its back and there is a development phase at the moment. It will be interesting to observe in the next couple of years in which direction it heads for the next energy source to generate power.

I turn now to payroll tax. The Premier made a bold and loud announcement not long ago about introducing support for regional industry. In the same breath he said that he would take away the rebate that has been given to country industry in regard to payroll tax.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Robin Hood in reverse?

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Yes.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: He is right.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: He is exactly right. If ever this State needed decentralising, it needs it now.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The Government has really done a good job on this one! I would have thought that every effort would have been made to decentralise this State, which has 1.35 million people, nearly one million of whom are located in this city. One comes across many problems, and many of them manifest themselves in public transport and so forth. Certainly, the loss of \$100 million, through the provision of public transport in this city alone,

could have done much good in the country to seal up a few roads. Country areas would love a bit of that money which could be used to attract industry to the country. Certainly, we need more industry in the country, and I am sure all members would agree with that. This action by the Government is absolutely contrary. Merely because Victoria did it, why did South Australia have to follow suit? It is a bit like school—peer group pressure. Victoria has done it and so we will follow.

However, Victoria has much larger rural towns which can probably cope with such changes. Victoria does not have the distances to travel that we have in South Australia. It does not have a gulf running through it which is an additional impediment to travel and the transport of goods and services, and so it can probably withstand such changes. That is not the case on Eyre Peninsula. The Government could see a quick quid at the end of this. The sum of \$6 million was the previous rebate which helped industry stay in the country. What does the Premier do now: he withdraws \$6 million and says that he will give \$3.5 million. Is there any guarantee that country industry will get \$3.5 million? I do not think that there is any guarantee at all.

I refer to some of the criteria that have been included in this new support scheme for regional industry. One must meet the criteria before one is eligible for any of this money—up to \$500 000.

I will read from the eligibility criteria for some of these projects. Before you can obtain money for support for regional industry, to be eligible for projects you must lead directly to the expansion of long-term employment opportunities in the region. That is fine. Another condition is the retention of employment through restructuring or the introduction of new technology or processes. That will cut out 60 per cent right from the word 'go'. So, if an industry is well established but is just making a profit, that condition alone will make it ineligible for support and it will not receive any rebate. So it will lose its rebate. It pays pay-roll tax but will become unviable; then, some other method will be needed to prop up that industry.

Firms will now be eligible for assistance under other programs as well as the Regional Industries Development Program, and I will refer to some of the conditions relating to that. The payment must be shown to be a significant factor in influencing the decision to proceed with the project. In other words, they must be behind the eight ball before they start; they must be seen to be losing money before they can be eligible to receive support.

Another condition is that projects must normally involve an increase in employment of more than five persons. There are many industries which cannot do that and, indeed, do not need to do that under the present system. To make them do that before they can become eligible for a rebate is unfair and, as I suggested, it is typical of the Government's thinking, whereby an industry is being forced to expand so that more people are employed. The result is that it becomes uneconomical and they must approach the Government for another handout. That amounts to robbing Peter to pay Paul. Also, applicants will be competing either in markets outside South Australia or in the South Australian market against goods produced outside this State.

One has only to add up all these things. If they must meet all these criteria before becoming eligible for support, firms will not make too much headway. Another condition is that the project will not injure South Australian industry. So, if someone wants to start up a business in, say, Whyalla in competition with an industry in Adelaide, they will not be able to do so according to the criteria because it may injure present South Australian industry. Another condition

is that firms have reasonable prospects of trading viably and have the capacity to fund the project. I agree that they probably would not need the money if they met that condition. That is the whole idea.

When the Tonkin Government introduced this program the idea was to attract industry out into the country and to keep it reasonably viable. It was a very sensible and workable project. Under the criteria that are now set down there is no way in which anyone will be able to meet the conditions and obtain any money from the scheme. The final condition is that the incentive payment is a material factor in enabling the project to proceed. The previous set of criteria fully negates that. What will happen is that the project will not be able to proceed, so in a number of cases they will have to approach the Government to obtain money by some other means. Once again, we see areas outside the metropolitan area being hit to leg. It is a direct impediment to anyone wanting to start up an industry outside the confines of metropolitan Adelaide. A suggestion is that \$3.5 million is involved. This time next year I will be interested to see how much has been spent. If \$3.5 million is available, I will be pleased to look at the average having regard to the criteria. Furthermore, the Government has saved itself about \$2.5 million because the original rebate was more than \$5 million and, I understand, fairly close to \$6 million.

Once again we see country industry being disadvantaged. As I said, it was to be a one-off situation and, originally, it was a good idea. The rebate was to be a continuing initiative, but this measure is only a one-off proposal. One gets the original grant, if one reapplies for it, or one loses it. So, I see very little advantage in it.

South Australia needs as much industry as it can get. We have seen people such as Shearers on the Murray finding it very difficult to survive. They need as much encouragement as they can get—not the sort of silly movement by the Government which will discourage them and will only cause the city of Adelaide to continue to grow. There is probably nothing apparently wrong with the city's growing, but there should be a balance and the country regions must grow at the same time as the city. It just demonstrates to me that this Government really does not like country people, and in that regard I will refer to another issue.

Let us look at what is happening in the health area. About 12 or 18 months ago we saw the suggested withdrawal of birthing facilities in some rural areas. That suggestion was headed off and, to the Minister's credit, he made sure that existing facilities continued to be provided, which I think was very wise. It is very difficult to attract professional people—such as doctors, bankers, dentists and accountants—to the country. It is very hard to attract people who provide those services if we do not provide them with the facilities that are necessary for the good running of a small community.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Well, to continue with that, I attended the Eyre Peninsula Hospitals Association meeting about a month ago and I listened to an address by the Chairman of the Health Commission, who suggested that perhaps there would be some rationalisation of hospitals throughout the country areas of this State. Following a question, the Chairman suggested that perhaps a hospital such as the one at Cowell, which is 30 kilometres away from Cleve, could become a geriatric hospital and the Cleve hospital could become the prime hospital in the area for surgery, and so on. I do not think that that would be terribly wise. That approach has created some problems, and one has merely to read the local newspapers to see how local communities have reacted to that suggestion. The local

people are not impressed. They believe that a facility that has been provided through enormous subsidies from local people—

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: You can't have cuts in the health staff area and keep everything going, as well.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I suggest that most of the increase in staffing in this area relates not to facilities but to administration. We see the provision of executive officers and people looking after other people. There is an incredible number of people involved in administration. If you let those people run their own industry, I think you would find that they would run it much better than we are doing at the moment. We tax everyone until they are almost out of breath and then judiciously hand it back as we think fit. I think it is time that communities handled their own affairs. We have reached a stage where small communities such as Keith, for instance, are not allowed to run their hospital. They are virtually pressured into joining the system, and the Health Commission tells them what, where and how they will do things.

I should add that very few hospitals in this city receive the same amount of support that many country hospitals do. Country hospitals raise their own funds with cropping projects and fetes. They contribute greatly their own personal wealth and effort. Although there is not a lot of wealth in some of these areas, a lot of effort is put into maintaining those facilities, so that the people around them can feel secure and happy in the knowledge that, if something goes wrong, they have somewhere to go to seek help. I believe that the problem is that the administration has run rampant in some of these areas. We see it in local government as well.

Let me finish on a brighter note by saying that the South Australian country areas are looking good. A month ago I made a trip into the North, stopped at a number of stations and looked at other parts of the State. It is lovely to see such a good season, and the Government must feel happy about that.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: That's the only thing they've got no control over.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Yes, and it is running very well, I might add. Despite the Government, the season is going extremely well in most parts of the State, and that is a delight. Many rural communities will not make a lot of money because we know that overseas prices, other than in the wool and cattle industries (for instance, the citrus, wheat and grain industries), are very poor, and that involves three of the biggest industries in the State. Country people are feeling very good about the situation, they are seeing good crops and they are very happy about what they see.

It is interesting to note that the Far North had good rains early in the season. I note that this is the first year that a number of cattle and stock have come out of that country. As most members are aware, the TB and brucellosis program has been in force and most of the North of South Australia has been destocked. The area is now relatively clear of TB and brucellosis. However, several years ago a number of cattle were brought back into the North and this year they have been fattened. Some of these people are getting their first income for five years, and they are feeling very good about it. Cattle prices are high, and it is very pleasing to see that those people are feeling this way.

While I was in the North of the State I was informed that TB had broken out on two stations. I am not sure whether this has been confirmed, but it is fairly certain that Tieyon Station had about 1 000 cattle that were with an infected animal and that the station would have to be destocked of those cattle. Muloorina was another station

that was suspected of having cattle that had a positive reaction to TB. Unfortunately, they will have to destock 300-odd cattle if that is proven positive. The compensation that they get for destocking those cattle is not very good, and they are having to buy back extremely expensive cattle. So, they will find themselves in the dilemma of having to buy and transport stock and starting off again, which is bad luck.

I would like to further comment on the TB and brucellosis program. We bowed to the wishes of the American Government which wanted us to be TB and brucellosis free in the next few years. We did that so that we could export beef to that country. I was recently in the Mount Isa area and looked at some cattle-running country, and I do not believe that it will be possible for Australia, to become TB and brucellosis free. We know that America is not free of this problem, so for it to require Australia to have that standard is rather rich in my opinion. However, if anywhere, South Australia will be the State that will become TB and brucellosis free, purely because of our natural terrain and probably because it is an easier State in which to muster cattle and clean out diseased cattle. It is bad luck that these outbreaks have occurred in the North. I hope that the testing procedure is good enough to stop reinfection with infected cattle in the future.

Finally, there is one point about which I must complain, namely, ANR. Although this is not a State matter, it is important, relating as it does to those cattle which have been proven to be TB and brucellosis positive and which need to be taken away from the stations very quickly. They cannot be sent back out into the countryside in case they infect other cattle. Because stations do not have small paddocks those cattle stay in the yards and have to be trucked out very quickly. I was challenged by one owner who said that he wished to transport eight cattle from Cadney Park, a station which is part way between Coober Pedy and Marla. When that owner asked ANR for a van to truck those cattle out he was informed that he had to order a minimum of two vans. Each van costs \$400 to hire, so it would have cost him \$800 to transport eight cattle out of that area. I believe that that is an injustice to the people in that area. The result is that they will lose business. Trucks will go onto the property, pick up the cattle and bring them down to Adelaide.

Another story is attached to that situation, but that will be for another time. I emphasise that the State Government should talk to ANR. If the Government is going to install

railway lines such as, for example, the run to Alice Springs and, if it wants the people to use that line, it must be reasonable and sensible about the method of charging for the transport of stock or goods. Those involved must get their act in order and not charge huge sums of money, such as \$400 per van. ANR should let the owner have one van, but it is apparently too much effort to unhook one van. Two vans have to be unhooked so that cattle can be put in them. It is ridiculous to the extreme to charge \$800 minimum. If only one van was required for the eight cattle it would still cost \$800, and that is crazy.

So, problems have developed in the North. There are problems with transport in that area, and we heard in the House today of problems relating to the medical area. The efforts that have been put in by those people who service those areas are generally excellent, and I give them full praise for trying. I refer particularly to the stock freighters, the Royal Flying Doctor Service and those people who do the mail runs, etc. They do an excellent job, but we do not need to make it harder and harsher for them and for those people who live in the country. We need to destock the city; we need to get out in the country, develop an industry out there and make it worthwhile.

There is plenty of country in South Australia; members should not worry about that. However, we need to get industry out there to get people out into the country. The Bannon Government does not want that to happen—not considering its efforts in relation to payroll tax. From their so-called efforts in relation to health it would seem that the Government does not want it to happen. If the Government does not change that tactic it will at some future time reap the rewards of its efforts in a very unpleasant manner. It gives me a great deal of pleasure finally to thank the Governor for his speech. I look forward to this session and perhaps to some legislation dealing with the northern area, which is, I understand, in the pipeline. I refer, of course, to legislation to amend the Pastoral Act.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 19 August at 2.15 p.m.