

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 15 August 1989

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—
 Friendly Societies Act 1919—Alterations to General Laws, Lifeplan Community Services.
 South Australian Superannuation Fund—Actuarial Report, 1986.
 South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust—Report, 1987-88.
 Superannuation Act 1988—Regulations—Exemption.

QUESTIONS

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question on the subject of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: My office was contacted today by a very concerned constituent who says he is furious that the Bannon Government is now boasting about ending the year with a \$106 million surplus, yet only a few months ago was unable to offer financial assistance to the Royal Adelaide Hospital when it needed a couple of million dollars to avoid closing beds and cutting back on services, and they are not my words. This man's anger is understandable and of a personal nature, given that his wife was due to go into the RAH's oncology ward this morning for an ongoing course of chemotherapy. The treatment is being given for a malignant bone tumor, which earlier this year paralysed the left side of his wife's body.

Due to aggressive treatment of the tumor with chemotherapy, the woman has regained the use of her left arm and left leg which had been paralysed. Therefore, it is understandable that the woman was concerned today to learn that the oncology ward C6 at the RAH is full and her planned admittance had been cancelled. The hospital told her that they hoped to have a bed tomorrow. Later, surprisingly (after some contact with the hospital), the couple were advised that a 'dreadful mistake' had been made and a bed would now be available this afternoon. I am advised that ward C6 was this morning occupied by nine cancer patients while several other beds were being used by general patients who could not be accommodated elsewhere in the RAH. This woman has had an ongoing battle with tumors going back to 1977. The latest episode in which a malignant tumor was detected occurred in March.

The woman's husband pointed out that one cancellation of treatment and then subsequent discovery of a spare bed has caused some distress to his wife. It is not unusual for patients going into hospital to get emotionally worked up about the impending treatment or surgery, and particularly so for this type of treatment, which can last up to nine days and is very unpleasant. Cancellations of this nature are increasingly being brought to my attention and it begs the question of when the Government will finally act on the bed shortages at this hospital and others. What steps will

the Minister and the Government take to ease the continuing chronic shortage of beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, given that patients—some of them awaiting vitally needed cancer treatment—still are being turned away.

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

ABE SAFFRON

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Saffron interests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Concern has been expressed by the hotel and restaurant industry about the move by Saffron interests into South Australian licensed premises. This came to a head at the end of last week when it was reported that the Police Commissioner was lodging an objection to an application by relatives and an associate of Mr Abe Saffron to acquire the licence to Regines Restaurant in Light Square.

The report indicated that Sound Deal Pty Ltd was applying for the transfer of the licence, and that the directors of the company were Mr Saffron's wife, his sister and his accountant. Mr Saffron is presently serving a three year gaol term in New South Wales. It is known that Saffron interests already have several other liquor outlets in South Australia.

In 1978 Mr Peter Duncan, then a State parliamentary member, made some rather scathing criticisms of Mr Saffron and of his involvement in South Australian business activities. In May 1985 the Premier indicated as follows:

... both licensing authorities and other authorities that may be involved, including the police have, over the years, kept an eye on Mr Saffron's activities and have ensured that there has been proper surveillance and checking.

Under the Liquor Licensing Act it is permissible for an inspector, in addition to the Police Commissioner, under the Places of Public Entertainment Act to lodge an objection to the transfer and, if the matter gets to the Licensing Court, for the Liquor Licensing Commissioner to intervene. My questions are:

1. Does the Attorney-General as Minister of Consumer Affairs intend that any of his officers will make an objection to the transfer of the licence to Saffron interests?
2. What steps has the Government taken to monitor the involvement of Saffron interests in the liquor industry in South Australia?
3. Have any objections been made to earlier applications for licences or transfer of licences by Saffron interests? If yes, in respect of which matters were they made? If not, will the Attorney-General indicate why such objections were not made?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The background with respect to this matter, at least post 1978 when Mr Duncan made his statements about the undesirability of Mr Saffron or of his interests participating in activities in South Australia—sentiments which, I should say, I and the Government share—is that an application was made in 1984 by Peter Vardon Fairweather for approval of change of directorship and shareholding of Blair Athol Hotel Pty Ltd in respect of premises known as the Blair Athol Hotel. The application sought the appointment of Abraham Gilbert Saffron and John Leonard Bandick as directors in lieu of M.J. Whitbread, J.G. Flavel, M.A. Smith and B.K. Martin, and the transfer of the issued capital of Blair Athol Hotel Pty Ltd to Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd.

The Assistant Superintendent of Licensed Premises, Warren L. Lewis, objected to the application for change of

directors and shareholders on the grounds that Abraham Gilbert Saffron, one of the directors, was not a fit and proper person, for the reason that the following convictions had been recorded against him:

- North Sydney, 19 September 1938, use a place to bet, fined 5 pounds;
- Castlereagh (NSW), 27 February 1984, fail to display trading hours, fined \$40;
- Castlereagh (NSW), 27 February 1984, alter premises without authority, fined \$100;
- Castlereagh (NSW), 27 February 1984, fail to display correct sign, fined \$10; and
- Adelaide Magistrate's Court, 2 April 1984, supply liquor to minor (5 counts), fined \$50 on each count.

Also, Mr Lewis objected on the grounds that he was a person of bad fame or character for the reason of the findings in the Parliament of New South Wales report of the Tribunal to the Minister for Police pursuant to an inquiry under section 45 of the Police Regulation (Allegations of Misconduct) Act 1978, into certain matters relating to discipline in the Police Force and Mr W.A.R. Allen. This inquiry is dated April 1982 and the involvement of Mr Saffron in that report occurs on pages 16, 17 and 25.

All those matters were put to the Licensing Court judge at the time—Acting Judge Kelly—and the application for change of directors and shareholders was heard by the acting judge. The Acting Superintendent of Licensed Premises, to whom I have referred, Mr Lewis, was represented by Assistant Crown Solicitor, Eugene Biganovsky, and, indeed, I was involved in ensuring that that objection to the application for a change of directors and shareholders was opposed.

On Wednesday 12 September 1984 Acting Judge Kelly granted the application and appointed Abraham Gilbert Saffron and John Leonard Bandick as directors in Blair Athol Hotel Pty Ltd. The approved shareholders became Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd (499 shares) and Peter Vardon Fairweather (one share). The directors of Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd were Abraham Gilbert Saffron and Doreen Saffron.

Following his conviction in New South Wales on 23 October 1987 for conspiring to defraud the Commonwealth of income tax, Abraham G. Saffron resigned as a director of Blair Athol Hotel Pty Ltd, effective from 23 October 1987. He also resigned as a director of Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd (a shareholder in Blair Athol Hotel Pty Ltd) and transferred his shareholdings in that company to his sister, Beryl Blemen Buckingham, who also replaced him as a director.

On 24 March 1988 application was made to the Liquor Licensing Commissioner for Peter Vardon Fairweather to be approved as a director in Blair Athol Hotel Pty Ltd in lieu of Abraham G. Saffron, resigned. The application for change of directors and shareholders was approved by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner on 15 April 1988. The company structure of Blair Athol Pty Ltd was: directors: Peter Vardon Fairweather and John Leonard Bandick; shareholders: Peter Vardon Fairweather, one share; Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd, 499 shares.

The company structure of Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd was: directors: Doreen Saffron (wife of Abraham Gilbert Saffron and Beryl Blemen Buckingham (sister of Abraham Gilbert Saffron)); shareholders: Doreen Saffron and Beryl Blemen Buckingham.

On 20 July 1976 the Full Bench of the Licensing Court held that Peter Vardon Fairweather was not a fit and proper person to be licensed pursuant to the Licensing Act 1967. The court found that, as long as he was a director, none of the companies with which he was associated as a person in

a position of authority was fit and proper to hold a licence in this State.

The Liquor Licensing Commissioner had regard to the fact that, although he was declared not a fit and proper person in 1976, he had not offended for approximately 10 years. Further, he had held directorships in companies which were shareholders of companies holding liquor licences and was an approved shareholder in Blair Athol Hotel Pty Ltd (approved by the Licensing Court in December 1984.)

With respect to another interest, the Brighton Hotel, on 23 January 1989 South Western Hotel Pty Ltd applied for transfer of the hotel licence in respect of the Brighton Hotel from S. & G. Hotels Pty Ltd to South Western Hotel Pty Ltd. The details of South Western Hotel Pty Ltd were: directors: Doreen Saffron, Beryl Buckingham and Peter Vardon Fairweather; shareholders: Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd (one ordinary share) and Peter Vardon Fairweather (one ordinary share). The corporate structure of Marsala Holdings Pty Ltd was: directors: Doreen Saffron and Beryl Buckingham; shareholders: Doreen Saffron and Beryl Buckingham.

The Commissioner of Police did not intervene under section 83(1)(a) of the Act, that is, that either Doreen Saffron, Beryl Buckingham or Peter Vardon Fairweather was not a fit and proper person. Given that all three were approved in respect of the Blair Athol Hotel, the transfer was approved. Abraham Gilbert Saffron is not approved as a person in a position of authority in respect of any licensed premises operating in this State.

On 7 July 1989 an application for transfer of an entertainment venue licence was lodged with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner. A transfer of an entertainment venue licence must be dealt with by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, as opposed to the Liquor Licensing Court, which dealt with the application relating to the Blair Athol Hotel in 1984. The application of 7 July concerned the premises at Regines, 69 Light Square, Adelaide, and the applicant was Sound Deal Pty Limited, of which John William Randall is the proprietary manager. The directors of Sound Deal are Peter Vardon Fairweather, Doreen Saffron and Beryl Buckingham. The shareholders of Sound Deal are Peter Vardon Fairweather, one share, and Marsala Holdings Pty Limited, one share.

The application for transfer of entertainment venue licence from the current licensee, Hylegin Party Limited (receivers and managers appointed) to Sound Deal Pty Limited was heard before the Liquor Licensing Commissioner on 14 August 1989. The Commissioner of Police lodged a notice of intervention and gave notice at the hearing that he intends to introduce evidence about whether the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a licence. I trust that answers the honourable member's question.

In 1984 the Acting Superintendent of Licensed Premises objected to a licence being granted to Mr Saffron, but that objection did not succeed. Since Mr Saffron's conviction in New South Wales, he is not now personally involved in any licensed premises in South Australia. An application is now before the Liquor Licensing Commissioner in respect of Regines, to which the police have indicated they will object. As the matter is now being heard by the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, it is not possible for me to instruct him on the matter. He will hear the evidence presented by the applicant and objectors and will make his determination.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Any other officers?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not think that any other officers can be instructed to appear and object to that

licence. The appropriate officer is the Commissioner of Police and he has said that he intends to lodge an objection and to introduce evidence dealing with the fitness of the applicants to hold a licence.

MULTICULTURAL WRITERS' WEEK

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the Multicultural Writers' Week.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I have received comments from many people following the speech of the Minister for the Arts at the opening of Multicultural Writers' Week last Monday. Some people described it as an Academy Award winning speech. I was not surprised to see in the *Weekend Australian* that it was the lead article in a column called 'Inside Running'. The Minister made a passionate speech about the contribution of foreign-born writers to Australian literature and to the way in which we perceive ourselves as a community. She singled out the contribution of Nino Culotta for *They're a Weird Mob*, saying that Nino Culotta was an outstanding example of a foreign-born writer who had made a great contribution to Australian literature.

I have spoken to some people who were at the speech, who said that there is no shadow of a doubt that the Minister was in deadly earnest in revealing this to the unsuspecting and bemused audience. It is perhaps appropriate to advise the Council that John Patrick O'Grady is Nino Culotta and John Patrick O'Grady was born in 1907 in Sydney, the oldest of eight children. He spent most of his childhood on a remote New England farm and had no formal education until the age of 12.

Then, in 1957 he wrote a novel, *They're a Weird Mob*, supposedly written by an Italian migrant journalist turned Sydney builder's labourer, Nino Culotta, which was an instant and continuing success. Those facts are in fact from the *Oxford Companion to Australian Literature* (page 531). So, it is a fairly well sourced summary of Nino Culotta. It continues:

Nino Culotta's bewildered but sympathetic perceptions of Australian habits and language and his progress from outsider to insider provided a perspective on national attitudes that many Australians found fresh and congenial. The book was produced as a film in 1966. O'Grady subsequently wrote two more Nino Culotta books, *Cop This Lot* (1960)—

perhaps the Minister might like to read that one— and *Gone Fishin'* (1962)—

and perhaps the Minister wishes that she had done that last Monday. The summary goes on to point out that O'Grady wrote another 16 books under his own name, none of which proved as popular. In fact, O'Grady, alias Nino Culotta, was occasionally described as the Rolf Harris of Australian literature. He certainly was not a foreign born writer.

Remembering that largely we adopt a bipartisan view on the arts and that it is only on occasions when gross bloopers occur such as was the case in this instance that we raise matters of importance, my questions to the Minister are:

1. Does the Minister now admit that she made an embarrassing mistake in front of an important group of multicultural writers?

2. Will she ensure that in future she checks her facts before making speeches to important arts groups?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am well aware that Nino Culotta is John Patrick O'Grady—and I have known this for a long time.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Since this morning!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have known it for a long time, as I read of this back in the 1950s or early 1960s, or whenever it was that Culotta's real identity was revealed to the Australian public.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Be quiet! The honourable member has asked me a question so let me answer it.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The reference that I made to Nino Culotta in the speech to which the honourable member has referred was a reference in terms of foreign names appearing on book covers. I did not explain at the time that Is knew Nino Culotta was not of foreign origin because I took it that everyone there would be aware of that fact and that it would be quite unnecessary to explain it to the audience to which I was delivering the speech. The mention of Nino Culotta was in terms of foreign names appearing on the book covers of Australian produced books. I used that as an example, saying that it was the first time that an apparently foreign name had appeared on an Australian book. I then went on in my speech to talk about later authors of non-English speaking background, whose names are not Anglo-Saxon and whose names now appear very frequently on the book covers of books available in Australian book shops. I suggest that the honourable member's remarks would have been more pertinent had he been present and actually heard the speech and been aware of the context in which my remarks were made.

The PRESIDENT: Before we go any further, I request that the photographer in the gallery does not take any photographs while Parliament is in session.

OVERSEAS QUALIFICATIONS

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, a question about overseas qualifications.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Mr President, in his address to the Legislative Council on Thursday 3 August, His Excellency, the Governor, indicated that the Government would be moving this session to upgrade the status of South Australia's Ethnic Affairs Commission by creating, through appropriate legislative measures, a new Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. I have raised this question of overseas qualifications before in this Council, and I do so again because I believe that it is a matter which has yet to be resolved satisfactorily.

The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, in his launch of the agenda for a multicultural Australia, had this to say:

For a nation desperately seeking the new skills that migrants can provide, we have been tragically wasteful in squandering many of those skills because of our failure to recognise many legitimate and valuable qualifications gained by migrants before they come to Australia. Some estimates put the annual cost to Australia of this failure adequately to tap our human resources at more than \$250 million without counting, of course, the personal cost suffered by those who arrived with professional and trade skills.

Given that statement on behalf of the Federal Government, it may be appropriate for the State Government to propose legislative measures to deal more constructively and speedily with the recognition of overseas qualifications. In view of the fact that we will—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: That will happen, Mr Lucas. In view of the fact that an amendment will be introduced in this parliamentary session, it may be appropriate that we empower the proposed Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs with the responsibility to deal at State level with the recognition of overseas qualifications.

My question to the Minister representing the Minister of Ethnic Affairs is as follows: Will the Minister indicate to this Council whether the issue of recognition of overseas qualifications will be considered as part of the proposed new Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission legislation and, if not, what other plans are the Minister or the Government considering to overcome the problem of overseas qualifications recognition?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The issue that the honourable member raises is, of course, a very important one which needs to be continually addressed in our State as, indeed, it does within our nation. The question of the recognition of overseas qualifications has been on the agenda virtually since the 1950s, when large numbers of migrants from non English speaking countries arrived in Australia and consequently had difficulty in having their qualifications recognised.

Honourable members are probably aware of the numerous stories, albeit anecdotal, that circulate about the highly qualified surgeons from Eastern Europe who had to come here and work in jobs completely outside of their qualifications because the Establishment in this country was not prepared to give recognition to their qualifications. That applied particularly in the medical area, but the problem that was highlighted there by those sorts of examples also flowed through into other areas.

Since then, of course, a number of organisations have been established to deal with the recognition of overseas qualifications. COPQ (the Committee on Professional Qualifications) was established many years ago and attempted to deal with this issue for those people whose professional qualifications were not recognised.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: The medical situation is very much better now.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The medical situation is better now, and the Hon. Dr Ritson would probably know that better than I. I am pleased to know that it is better, but there is no doubt that one of the principal pockets of resistance to the recognition of overseas qualifications in the past was within the medical profession. This was because Australian doctors and their medical associations felt that there could be a reduction in the quality of care if people with overseas qualifications did not come from British systems or recognised systems derived from Britain. That was probably too narrow an approach.

The Hon. Dr Ritson now says that the situation with respect to the recognition of medical qualifications is much better, in that they are more easily recognised than in the past. Nevertheless, that attitude permeated not just within the profession but also through the technical and trade areas. Earlier this decade, the Fry committee was established, and it made certain recommendations about the recognition of overseas qualifications. This led to the establishment of offices within most of the Governments of Australia which had the task of facilitating the recognition of overseas qualifications.

For some time now there has been within the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission an officer dealing with this topic, answering queries and attempting to facilitate the recognition of those qualifications. The Ethnic Affairs Commission cannot recognise the qualifications itself; that has to be done by the accrediting bodies, whether they be

professional, technical or trades associations. However, the Ethnic Affairs Commission has been dealing with people who complain about the non-recognition of their qualifications. The matter has therefore been addressed in the past, but I would suggest that more must be done.

The Federal Government's agenda on a multicultural Australia, which was announced recently, gave a high priority to this issue when Mr Hawke made his announcement. I am pleased to see the Liberal Party picking up what Mr Hawke said and also saying that this issue needs further attention, because that is also the view of the State Government. I have already announced that I believe that the anti-discrimination legislation should contain provisions dealing with the recognition of overseas qualifications, and this will be addressed during this session of Parliament.

As to the specific further initiatives additional to those that are already in place within the Ethnic Affairs Commission, that matter is currently being considered by the Government in the context of the budget, and I anticipate that it will be possible to make an announcement about that matter when it has been finally considered by the Minister and Cabinet.

HOSPITAL VISIT

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about extremely bad taste.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Last weekend the *Sunday Mail* carried a feature article which offered the South Australian public the spectacle of a rather ridiculous looking Health Minister dressed in theatre garb and ran the story of his attendance at an operation at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The response to this amongst my colleagues has been one of great distress, that a Health Minister—a Minister of the Government—should, albeit with the approval of the hospital authorities, invade work areas to produce what is really a political display.

The Minister had no earthly reason to be there except to get his picture in the paper in that context because an election is nearby. The fact is that every additional person unnecessarily in an operating theatre increases the risk of infection. If they are people without some training in asepsis and knowing not what to touch, that risk is increased further. It apparently occurred at night with an entourage and cameras, and no Minister whom I can recall since I have been interested in politics has ever done that before.

The proper way to visit a hospital is to go there during normal hours in normal clothing and go around with the heads of services, being guided by them and discussing the needs of the institution. Of course, that is something Dr Hoppood has not actually done or else he would have understood the terrible damage inflicted on that hospital by the bed closures. However, after doing nothing for a long time, he has decided to dress up, costume himself in the garb of a doctor and have his picture taken in a functioning operating theatre. On behalf of many of my colleagues who have taken great offence at this distasteful invasion of a serious working place for political purposes, I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Health to ask him to please promise never to do that again.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: At first I thought the Hon. Dr Ritson was giving us a diagnosis of a health problem that the Minister of Health might have but, instead, it turns out to be simply a case of sour grapes. The honourable member apparently begrudges the Minister of Health's

receiving any publicity for the very hardworking effort that he puts into making sure that he is familiar with the various aspects of the health system. I am sure that the Minister of Health would have been nowhere near the theatres in the hospital had he not been invited to those areas. Therefore, the honourable member's question is nothing more than sour grapes and I am sure that the Minister will treat it with the contempt it deserves.

TREATED TIMBERS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Emergency Services, a question about the fire risk with respect to treated timbers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: My attention has been drawn to the dangers that might be associated with the burning of timber containing copper chrome arsenate, a material I have mentioned before in this place. Copper chrome arsenate is used particularly for treating pine timbers and gives it a long life but, if it burns, it gives off arsenic trioxide, a highly toxic gas. People have been warned not to burn it in their backyards, in either barbeques or just as a means of disposal. In the past couple of years there have been a couple of major fires in Adelaide timber yards. It has been asked of me what should happen if such a fire should occur in a large pile of this treated pine timber with suburban areas adjacent. My questions to the Minister are: has an assessment been made of such a risk and, if so, what was that assessment and what safety precautions are required of such yards? Secondly, what assessment has been made in terms of the risk that CFS people might be put at in fires involving large amounts of treated pine posts used as fencing and other materials?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer that question to the responsible Minister and bring back a reply.

FRIGATE CONTRACT

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of State Development and Technology, a question about the frigate contracts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: As members are aware, South Australia will benefit from the announcement yesterday of the frigate contract to Amecon. South Australia's share of the contract will be 16 per cent and will result in about 1 400 jobs. Of particular importance is the considerable increase in employment and expertise in the area of high technology. A number of South Australian companies will benefit from the contract and this has been welcomed by the Chamber of Commerce and South Australian industry generally.

The article in today's *Advertiser* makes some inference that Federal Labor MPs will benefit from the contract when it should be apparent that all South Australians will ultimately benefit. Will the Minister advise what existing South Australian companies will benefit from the frigate contract, what new companies will be formed in South Australia, what proportion of the contract will each company receive, how many jobs will be generated and where are these companies located?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague, the Minister of State Development in

another place. Briefly, what we do know about this contract is that it will bring significant long-term benefit to the people of this State, both through the generation of new jobs which will last for many decades and also with the new wealth that is generated by the work that flows into South Australia as a result of the frigate contract and also the submarine contract and the associated development of skills in many areas that will make South Australia pre-eminent in this field. It will enable us to bid for contracts in a whole range of other areas not necessarily associated with the defence areas, thereby bringing wealth and future prosperity to South Australia over a very long period of time. However, as to the specific questions asked by the honourable member, I will refer them to my colleague and bring back a report.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the Local Government Advisory Commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Section 26 of the Local Government Act refers to the reference of proposals to the Advisory Commission. Under subsection (6) the commission is required to give public notice of a proposal which is not regarded by the commission as of a minor nature. One month is to be given for submissions to be made; then under subsection (7) a hearing is to be held and those who made submissions and any other persons may be heard. This may mean a delay of some months.

In the Premier's press release of 9 August he says that it is in everyone's interest that the Mitcham issue be resolved as quickly as possible. Will the commission give the public notice required by the Act and hold a public hearing before making a report and, if not, why not?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: At the press conference held on 9 August by the Premier and me, it was made quite clear that we would be asking the Local Government Advisory Commission to consider the proposal which I had put before it regarding the Blackwood area as quickly as possible, having regard to its statutory obligations. Members might be interested to know that this morning I met with the Local Government Advisory Commission and reiterated my complete confidence in it and—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY:—reiterated that it had complete independence. I also stressed the high regard in which I held its work, and also stressed, as indicated in the letter that the Premier and I sent to it, that while we would, as would the people of Mitcham who have spoken to us, like an early resolution of this matter and a speedy consideration of the proposal put before it, that, naturally, this had to be done within its statutory obligations. There is no question whatsoever that the Premier or I would in any way suggest that the Local Government Advisory Commission should act other than in the manner prescribed in the Act.

ELECTORAL SURVEYS

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, in his capacity as Leader of the Government in this place, a question about recent electoral surveys.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Mr Rex Jory in an article in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 12 August this year speculated about the date of the State election which, in no small measure, has been fuelled by the State Opposition. The article in part states:

The reality is, nobody really knows except Mr Bannon . . .

That is the honest truth; it is accepted by those on this side of the Council, just as much as we accept that the Opposition continues to try to adopt the electoral ploy of looking like winners. The article continues:

The tense and confused political situation has been further complicated by a rash of conflicting public opinion survey results which can be interpreted to suit mood or political bent.

The Liberals trickled out selected statistics from a detailed survey of 300 people in the eight metropolitan marginal seats which showed Government was within reach.

This writer has seen the survey booklet and at least it is contemporary, even if it does conveniently suit the Liberal's current strategy of trying to look like winners.

My questions are:

1. Does the Attorney-General agree with Mr Jory that part of the Opposition's current electoral strategy is to try to look like winners?

2. Further, does he agree with Mr Jory's statement that 'the Liberals trickled out selected statistics' from the recent survey and, if he does, will he comment why they used only selected statistics from what, after all, was purported to be its own survey?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It would seem that the battle of the pending election is also the battle of the statistics—the poll results that the Parties and the pollsters disseminate from time to time. I was somewhat amazed, on Wednesday of last week, I think, to find an article on the front page of the *Advertiser* indicating that the Liberals were home and hosed in the forthcoming election. That upset my usual tranquillity at morning breakfast, and it was only when I arrived at my office later in the day—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:—that I was told that that day's *Bulletin* magazine had indicated that the Labor Party was well ahead in the polls, according to the Morgan poll that is published in the *Bulletin* on a regular basis. The *Bulletin* poll showed that Labor was at 45 per cent and the Liberal-National Parties at 41 per cent; that Mr Olsen's popularity or approval rating was 41 per cent and the Premier's (Mr Bannon's) was 73 per cent.

Needless to say I felt a bit better as the day went on. However, it is quite clear that the Liberal Party had a tip-off that the Morgan gallup poll was going to be adverse to it, so it cobbled together 300 citizens of South Australia to formulate a poll that it could release on the morning of the gallup poll to try to depress Labor voters and Ministers over their breakfasts. Undoubtedly that was part of the Liberal Party's tactic to try to indicate that it has a chance of winning the next election. Of course, the Morgan poll indicated to the contrary.

It is perhaps similar to Mr Peacock's recent performance when he was portrayed as the hollow man in the same *Bulletin* that I saw later during the Wednesday. Apparently, when asked by commentators what he thought of the polling which showed that the Liberal Party had slipped behind the Labor Party, he said:

That was only in the earlier polling. The polling taken last Thursday showed that we were winning by 16 seats—

that is, the Liberal Party was going to win by 16 seats, according to the last part of that particular polling. Well, what has been revealed since? Someone, and I am not sure

who but presumably it was one of the investigative journalists who exist in the political arena these days, determined that no such poll was taken last Thursday and that Mr Peacock had no such poll to refer to, and that has now been—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:—revealed to the public of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Its relevance to South Australia and the honourable member's question is, simply, that the Liberal Party will use opinion poll data cobbled up to give the impression that it is doing better than in fact it is doing, or, in the case of the Federal Leader of the Opposition, that he will use opinion poll data that does not exist.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labour, a question about WorkCover advertising.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Recent television advertisements on Spencer Gulf television advertising WorkCover have been brought to my attention by businesses in the area. These businesses believe that they are being denigrated by the manner in which the advertisement begins, when one employee says to the other, 'What has the boss ever done for you?' The advertisement then goes on to extol the virtues of WorkCover and what a marvellous Government initiative this had been.

It has been suggested to me that the opening lines of the advertisement might be answered by saying that without the boss and his capital there might not be any job for the employee to complain about. When WorkCover was introduced by the Bannon Government competitors were excluded by statute, so WorkCover became the sole insurer—the only exclusion being those organisations big enough to self-insure. As an employer who employs casual workers, I have no choice with whom I insure. In fact, only two weeks ago I received a receipt from WorkCover for premiums paid to cover employees who worked for me during 1988-89. My questions are:

1. Why is it necessary for WorkCover to advertise when it is the sole insurer?

2. How much have the WorkCover advertisements cost so far?

3. How much will be spent in the future by WorkCover advertising its product?

4. Will this become a standard by which other Government departments, for example, the Health Commission, Lands Department, and E&WS will start advertising their wares?

5. Is this just a method that the present Labor Government uses to get cheap political advertising?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The answer to the last question is 'No'. As to the detail of the question, I will have to take that on notice.

CREDIT OVERCOMMITMENT

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about credit overcommitment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In late October 1987—some 22 months ago—the Attorney-General established a working party which was headed by the Director-General of Public and Consumer Affairs (Mr Neave) and which was designed to investigate means of providing practical solutions to tackle the problems arising from consumer debt and overcommitment. When I raised this matter in March this year, the Attorney-General said that he had not yet received the report but that he expected it any day. I have been told that it is rumoured that the report is about to be delivered to the Attorney and, as I say, it is about 22 months after the working party was established. Concerns have been expressed by financial counsellors and the like about the impact of high interest rates and median income people putting more and more of their debts on credit. Has the Attorney received the report? If he has, is he willing to release it, acknowledging the interest in the community about the impact of credit overcommitment?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The answer to the first and second questions is 'Yes'. The report will be released as soon as I have considered it and decided what is the Government's response to the recommendations in the report. I expect that it will be released reasonably soon.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Will the Minister of Local Government confirm that she or the Premier has made a submission or written a letter to the Local Government Advisory Commission as referred to by her last week? Will she table a copy of that letter or submission, and will she also table her new proposal about the City of Flinders?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am quite happy to confirm that the Premier and I have written. I suggest that, if the Hon. Mr Lucas had been listening, he would have heard me refer to that in my previous answer to the Council a few minutes ago.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I confirm it yet again.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not have a copy of it with me but I shall be happy to bring a copy tomorrow and table it in the Council. There is no secret about it.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: And the proposal?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The proposal that I have put before the Local Government Advisory Commission is a proposal which was detailed to the press when it was sent. It was a proposal to maintain the boundaries of Mitcham council in their current form.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Why not table it?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I shall be happy to provide a copy of the proposal, but I can assure members that it is exactly as I have stated.

structure of family life. Couples are marrying later and having fewer children; divorce and remarriage are occurring with greater frequency, creating blended families, and more couples are living together outside of marriage. Increasingly, too, women are working outside of the home in the paid work force. The extended family network has also declined, resulting in increased isolation of families. Such trends cannot be reversed; Australian society has changed. Some people on the conservative side of politics—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is your side.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: That is your side, Mr Lucas—have called for a return to traditional family values in response to today's social problems. We need to ask ourselves what is meant by this. While many traditional values have considerable merit, such as responsibility, caring and support, do we really want women to be returned to the narrow confines of domesticity, without the additional opportunity to enter the paid work force? Do we really want to return to the Victorian concept of a male breadwinner as the head of the household? In the latter half of the twentieth century we have come to accept the sharing of parenting and paid work. Emotionally laden appeals to the past are all too often based on a rather idealised and out-of-date concept of the family.

In looking back nostalgically to the so-called golden era of family life in the 1950s and early 1960s, it is easy to overlook any problems which existed at the time. Undoubtedly, these prosperous years may have been happy ones for many, but for others they were not so favourable. Speaking of these early post-war years, Don Edgar, the Director of the Australian Institute of Family Studies, in a recent issue of *Family Matters*, said:

... it is easy to forget that many people could not afford a house, did not have adequate wages, holidays, health benefits, or the chance to save for retirement. Many lived in slums, had poor schools, suffered ill-health and witnessed parental conflict that scarred their lives.

Clearly, the post-war years were not free of social problems. Nor are we today. However, a return to the traditional family will not necessarily solve these problems and may even, in some circumstances, compound them. Indeed, many of the major social problems which we as a community are now having to deal with are inherent to the traditional family itself, and the social structures which sustain it.

Some of the attributes of the family as an institution have the potential to generate conflict and violence. A recent study of crime statistics in New South Wales, contained in the report, *Violence in Australia*, by the Australian Institute of Criminology, found that more than 40 per cent of homicides occur within the family circle; about 25 per cent of all homicides are marital killings; and almost all child homicide victims are killed by family members.

Homicide represents only one aspect of the problem of violence in the family. While it is difficult to estimate the extent of domestic violence, as it generally occurs behind closed doors, some statistical evidence is available. According to the South Australian police, an average of around 600 restraining orders is issued in South Australia each three months, with the majority relating to domestic violence.

A 1985 police survey found that, within that year, the police received 8 500 calls to domestic violence incidents within the Adelaide metropolitan area alone. The Legal Services Commission of South Australia has estimated that 50 per cent of its family law clients are victims of domestic violence. Figures from the Women's Information Switchboard show that in 1985 it received 251 calls from women directly related to domestic violence crises, and in 1986 the figure had risen to 344.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption
(Continued from 10 August. Page 192.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Mr President, I support the motion. I would like to refer to aspects of Government policy in the areas of health, welfare and housing. In the past two decades we have witnessed major changes in the

The cost to the individuals and families affected by domestic violence is hard to assess. For the victims, who are largely women and children, this can mean a number of things. For the women, domestic violence limits their life options and dramatically curtails their contribution, not only to their families, but also to the community. The effect of domestic violence on the lives of children is brutal, disturbing and itself brutalising. They are forced to grow up in a fear-ridden, deprived and impoverished environment. The cost to society as a whole is also extremely high. Women and children forced to leave their homes because of violent relationships often live in poverty and consequently become dependent on emergency welfare, health and income support services.

Another significant social problem which occurs within the family is that of child abuse, a problem which encompasses physical, sexual and emotional abuse and neglect. The vast majority of child abuse and all child neglect is perpetrated by immediate family members, close relatives or close family friends. While the extent of child abuse is also difficult to estimate, available data suggest that the rate of child abuse in Australia is approximately three cases per 1 000 children, although some believe this to be an under-estimation. It has also been estimated that 25 per cent of all fractures seen in the first two years of life may be due to the 'battered child syndrome', and that at least 10 per cent of children presenting to casualty departments with 'accidents' may be suffering from child abuse. The seriousness of the problem of child abuse lies not only in the damage done to those who are unable to protect themselves but also in the proven, long-lasting effects of abuse on the development and personalities of abused children.

There has also been concern in recent years in Australia about the problem of child pornography. Sadly, there have been cases where parents have involved their children in depraved situations. On the international scene, there is a great deal of evidence about the growing traffic of young children in prostitution and pornography. A recent international study found that one million children a year in the world are being involved in child pornography—and that is regarded as just the tip of the iceberg.

It is interesting to note that a recent case in Norway was brought to world attention. A Norwegian couple had involved themselves in crime against children in a foreign country. Following deportation, they are currently being tried under Norwegian law for crimes committed overseas. Norway accepts responsibility for its citizens while out of their country. Norwegians believe that their citizenship bestows responsibility on citizens to behave in a manner acceptable to Norway. Child molestation and child pornography is totally unacceptable.

It would be interesting to see how many otherwise 'respectable' Western citizens were guilty of crimes against children, particularly those in developing countries, while holidaying overseas. If any members doubt that this horrifying trade exists and in such magnitude, I recommend that they look at the film *Throw Away Children* which was ordered by the Norwegian Minister of Justice.

Child abuse is an issue of national and international concern. In July this year, I attended the first annual general meeting and conference of the National Association for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN). NAPCAN is a national body whose objective is to open the lines of communication between community groups and professionals across Australia, working towards the effective care and protection of children. The conference recommended that both State and Federal Governments legislate to implement the treaty obligations of the new United Nations

Convention on the Rights of the Child. I, too, urge support of this convention.

Another problem facing young people, which in many instances can be linked to child abuse, is that of youth homelessness. According to the Burdekin Report of the National Inquiry into Homeless Children, released this year by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, Many of the individuals and organisations that gave evidence said that physical and sexual abuse were major factors motivating many children and young people to leave home. The report states:

The substantial link between child abuse and ultimate homelessness is, in many cases, beyond question.

The task of estimating the number of young people who are homeless is, once again, not an easy one. Many homeless people are a hidden statistic and there is also some difficulty in distinguishing between the long-term homeless and those in temporary crisis. Nevertheless, some attempts have been made to determine the extent of youth homelessness. The Burdekin report highlights this difficulty. It points to the Report of Homeless Young People in Australia: Estimating Numbers and Incidence, by Dr Rodney Fopp, who conducted a survey in Victoria in 1978 which concluded that 15 000 people, aged between 15 and 22, would be homeless in the course of a year.

A 1980 survey in Brisbane concludes that over 2 000 young people per year were homeless in that city alone. A 1979 Adelaide study concluded that a minimum of between 5 500 and 6 000 young people were in need of housing in metropolitan Adelaide. A 1980 survey updated this figure to 9 000 young people per year. These figures show no indication that these young people were living in the streets, but rather that they were seeking accommodation outside the family home. At present 6 600 people under 25 are on the Housing Trust waiting list for accommodation, with about 2.5 years waiting time. In the past 12 months, 2 650 tenants were housed under the Housing Trust youth accommodation program.

Homelessness exacts a high price from youth. The absence of adequate shelter—one of the basic necessities of life—and the accompanying lack of income make homeless youth particularly vulnerable. They are likely to experience social isolation, alienation, loneliness and frustration. Other consequences of homelessness include major health problems; chronic unemployment due to difficulties in continuing education; participating in job training or obtaining employment; and involvement with alcohol, drugs, prostitution and crime.

Youth homelessness has consequences also for the community in general. It is not only the homeless who suffer. Not only are there economic costs in terms of increased Government outlay, but individuals also suffer, both directly, through losses from crime and associated higher insurance premiums, and indirectly through a decline in community amenities and quality of life.

It is clear that, in tackling such difficult social problems as domestic violence, child abuse and neglect and youth homelessness, families cannot be left to fend for themselves without social support. The State needs to intervene and to provide safety mechanisms. The State Labor Government has responded, and continues to respond, to these problems in significant ways. It has, for some time, played a leading role in responding to the issue of domestic violence. Some examples of this include the introduction of restraining orders in 1983. This was implemented through an amendment to the South Australian Justices Act, and effectively provides for the restraint of behaviour which is criminal or which is likely to lead to a breach of the peace.

In late 1985 the State Government set up the Domestic Violence Council to look at domestic violence in the areas of community education and prevention, human services, legal issues and professional education and awareness. The council presented its report to the Government in October 1987. In response to the report, the Domestic Violence Prevention Unit and the South Australian Domestic Violence Prevention Committee were established by the Government in 1988. In 1987, the Victims of Crime Branch was also established within the Police Department.

South Australia has also been at the forefront in the fields of providing workshop packages on domestic violence for service deliverers and the counselling of violent men, both of which have received national attention. In April this year, a State education campaign against domestic violence was conducted in conjunction with National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, administered through the office of the Status of Women in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. These campaigns were aimed at raising community awareness about domestic violence and changing the current perception that domestic violence is a 'private' issue to one of seeing it as a 'community' problem which requires a community response.

The State Government has also been in the forefront in responding to the problem of child abuse, instigating a range of child protection measures. In 1983 it established the Children's Interests Bureau to emphasise the importance of the rights of children. This service is unique in Australia. In 1984-85, standard procedures for child protection were first introduced by the Department for Community Welfare. These were subsequently reviewed in 1986, and in July 1988 new and more specific standard procedures were introduced. These procedures enabled professionals to make more accurate and better informed decisions for children and families.

The Child Sexual Abuse Task Force was established in October 1984 to identify problems associated with the existing law and services to sexually abused children and their families. Following the presentation of the task force's findings in 1986, the Government established the South Australian Child Protection Council to take responsibility for implementing the program for the alleviation and prevention of child sexual abuse, as outlined in the task force's report.

A review of Part III of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, which deals with the procedures to protect children in need of care, was commissioned by the Government in November 1985. Following the release of this report, the Government has initiated a number of legal reforms to improve the 'in need of care' proceedings and to establish a child advocacy unit within the Children's Interests Bureau.

The Government has also been instrumental in introducing alternatives to corporal punishment in schools, acknowledging that there are other viable and more positive ways of managing children in schools than through the inflicting of physical hurt on a child. The management of student behaviour policy was developed last year and provides a framework in which schools, as a total community, can work together to develop alternative behaviour management strategies. By 1991, it is intended that corporal punishment will no longer be administered in South Australian schools—and that is long overdue.

The State Government has also responded to the problem of youth homelessness, developing programs specifically for adolescents in crisis. In 1987, the Government announced a review of the Adelaide inner city region. Following the receipt of the subsequent report, 'Inner City Kids', the then Minister of Community Welfare announced a \$500 000

relief package, which included, among other measures, a doubling of crisis accommodation for young people in the inner city area and the development of special services for young Aboriginal people.

Another South Australian initiative is the Department for Community Welfare's 'Adolescents at risk program', a coordinated program for adolescents at risk, with particular emphasis on the development of more preventive services. Working closely with youth agencies, adolescent support teams have been established throughout the State. The teams provide individual support for youth in crisis, run groups for youth experiencing similar difficulties, and develop community support networks for adolescents at risk. These and other important Government measures have been developed to provide safety measures and to assist individuals and families in crisis. If leaks in relation to the Federal budget are to be believed—and I cannot say this for sure—we are expecting and hoping for a significant announcement this evening from the Federal Treasurer concerning youth homelessness.

From the extent of these major social problems that I have outlined, it is clear that we cannot expect families to survive alone without support. We need to re-examine our values as a society and to ask ourselves why violence within the family is tolerated and accepted. This requires that we look closely at the power relationships within the family which result in unequal access to resources among family members, leaving the most vulnerable members of a family susceptible to abuse. We must also question whether what happens in the family is really just a private concern or a matter of concern for the community as a whole.

While the State can intervene when things go wrong in families, community support is also necessary. Rather than looking back to 'family' values and insisting on a family structure—which for many family units no longer exists—we should be looking towards promoting 'community' values. Such values might include more sharing and commitment to each other as a part of a whole society. With these we could work towards building better communities for people to live in, and on a fairer and more equitable basis.

Finally, from my observations of life in two very different countries that I have been fortunate to visit—the USSR and Sweden—and from comparing these countries with Australia, I have found that there are very different responses to the problem of children in crisis. In the USSR, for example, the 'blame' is attached to the parents, not the State. In our country we are often willing to blame the State. Unfortunately, comments such as 'no discipline in schools' and 'unemployment breeds crime' are often heard, as are, even more unfortunately, comments like 'It's all the fault of working women.'

In Sweden, I found that there is a willingness to accept community responsibility when things go wrong. Questioning the way society works and the way people interact with one another is widely discussed and debated, and an enthusiasm to change, in order to make the world a better place for children to live in, is high on the Swedish Government's agenda.

The South Australian Labor Government has, I believe, gone a long way down the track of seeking ways to help those vulnerable members of our community. It has taken up the difficult challenge of responding to some very complex social problems. It is up to us as a community—and as members of Parliament—to face these problems and to assist, not frustrate, measures to safeguard our most valuable future resource, namely, our children. I support the motion.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I commend His Excellency the Governor on his speech to open this session of Parliament, and for the manner in which he and Lady Dunstan fulfil their vice-regal duties. I join with His Excellency and other honourable members in expressing my sincere condolences to the families and relatives of the five former members of this Parliament who died during the past 12 months.

It is 12 months since I was elected to Parliament and therefore it is appropriate that I should address some of the community concerns that have been raised with me as a member of this Council during my first year here. Despite what the Federal and State grim reaper Governments would want us to believe, thousands of ordinary working Australian families—which Labor claims to represent—have been totally devastated by Labor's economic and interest rate policies.

For example, ordinary Australians, like Jack and Glenda Annells, who told their story to the *Sunday Mail*, due to the greatest rate rip-off ever seen in the history of this country, have been forced to sell their home and abandon their great Australian dream, and they will possibly never own a home again. By the time they sold their home and got the home loan off their backs they had paid \$17 000 in interest and only \$200 off the principle. The interest rate on their \$30 000 home was 13.5 per cent when they signed the contract but it had progressively risen higher ever since, to a level of 17 per cent, pushed to that level by Labor's economic policies. With their two young children the Annells were forced to sell their home and buy a caravan.

Of course, the National President of the ALP, South Australian Premier, Mr Bannon, wants us to believe that this situation has nothing to do with him or his Government and that the matters of interest rates and the hike in State taxes and charges are outside his control. The Premier of this State, who, as National President of the ALP, has endorsed Labor's anti-family and anti-business policies—together with his Federal partners, Mr Hawke and Mr Keating—has deliberately allowed Labor to turn the screws on middle Australia in a most heartless, needless and cynical way to dampen consumer demand and to raise revenue for Labor's phoney election gimmicks and vote-buying bribes.

We all know that the three grim reapers are locked together in the greatest exercise of extortion from the people of Australia, and this is hurting struggling home owners and working people. How can the Premier face the people of this State with a budget surplus of almost \$106 million, derived from increases in State taxes and charges and a hike in interest mortgage rates, which were fully endorsed as being necessary, and now, just before an election, offer South Australians some of their own money back? Most South Australians would know that the cynical thimble and pea tricks played by the Premier are purely election stunts, a way of buying his way into another term in office. They will not be conned by his election bribes.

The fact that this Government has lifted the stamp duty exemption level for first home buyers from \$50 000 to \$80 000 will not help Jack and Glenda Annells to buy back their first home which they have lost. The pressure which the ruthless and greedy Labor Administrations have brought upon families, coupled with rising interest rates, water rates, council rates, and gas and electricity charges, will undoubtedly be the cause of many family arguments and of more broken marriages.

In the meantime, our State transport system is expensive and unreliable and our health services are in a mess, with more people paying more for these services on the basis of

a diminishing return. Many South Australians are totally demoralised. They have had enough. Yet the good news Premier would have us all believe that everything is fine and rosy in the garden. Twelve months ago when the Treasurer, Mr Bannon, released his Government's 1988 budget, he told the people of South Australia:

The budget handed down reflects the approach the State Government has taken in framing our budget. There is proper regard for the social needs of families and of the need to reduce debt burden on the community.

The Premier went on to say:

I think this budget gives everyone confidence that they can embark on home loan seeking and purchase with a fair degree of confidence that at least interest rates will remain stable. If predictions are fulfilled, they will come down.

Now, Mr President, that is what Mr Bannon told the people of South Australia not even 12 months ago: that is what he told Jack and Glenda Annells, and I would put it to all members of this Chamber that the Premier and Treasurer of our State has carelessly and deliberately misled the ordinary citizens of this State by leading them without remorse or compassion to financial suicide.

How can the Premier face the hundreds of families who took his open advice and believed him by borrowing money to buy their dream home and who are now forced to sell them simply because they are unable to meet the higher interest repayments? Can the Premier now repeat his good news statement which he made less than 12 months ago after he told us that his budget gave everyone confidence to embark on home loan seeking and purchase with a fair degree of confidence that at least interest rates will—*not may*—remain stable?

People are having difficulty raising the deposit for a home, or in meeting the mortgage payments for the one they are buying, because of a combination of high taxes and charges and higher interest rates. Figures produced by economists show the average Australian wage earner needs a tax cut of at least \$56 per week, just to get back to the same value of the take-home pay enjoyed in 1982, when the Hawke and Bannon Labor Governments came to power.

The latest interest rate increases have added almost \$60 per month to the average home mortgage payment. Meanwhile, the housing crisis for hundreds of would-be home owning South Australians remains and, like Jack and Glenda Annells, they will be forced to sell their dream home. How can anyone believe this man, who last year further promised tax cuts to all South Australians?

At the same time, the Premier has recently issued more good news statements about tax cut packages, hoping to con people, as he did in 1985, by throwing money around in a desperate bid to buy their votes. I believe, however, that many of the people with whom I have had contact, including many Labor supporters, have condemned this cynical exercise as a phoney election trick and will register their vote accordingly.

Now, Mr President, I will briefly turn to the question of investment and unemployment in this State. As honourable members are fully aware, and as the Hon. Mario Feleppa has correctly stated, youth unemployment in South Australia is the highest of any mainland State and, when the *7.30 Report* recently asked the Premier why it was above the national average, he gave his answer as follows:

The reason our unemployment rate remains intractably and unacceptably high is largely based around an increased participation rate in the workforce. It's, if you like, part of the symptom of success of a lot of new investment in this State, so I'm not as concerned about it as I might have been some years ago.

This extraordinary gobbledegook and political rhetoric has been equalled only by his national counterpart, Treasurer Keating, who said that Australians have had too much of

a good thing and are creating their own poverty, and who also described our improving terms of trade, which were like 'the champagne effervescing over the side of the glass', as the problem. These are statements made by two of the leading Labor Treasurers in the country, both dealing with important economic issues and giving answers to serious questions put to them by the media.

These answers from the Labor Treasurers of this country are responses to questions put to them about the problems which have been experienced by ordinary Australians and, at State level, by the young unemployed. Can you really believe it? How would members like to tell their young unemployed sons or daughters that they cannot get a job because Mr Bannon, our Premier, said that it is due to the fact that more people are working and, therefore, it is like part of the symptom of success of a lot of new investment in this State. But members can tell them that the Premier is not as concerned about their unemployment problem now as he might have been some years ago. That is the hope that our Premier is offering to our young unemployed South Australians.

I suggest that the Labor Government and the Premier of this State clearly tell all the young unemployed South Australians of this marvellous position that Mr Bannon has identified as the cause of their plight, and of the fact that he is not as concerned now as he was years ago. I am sure that they will all be suitably impressed by his analysis and solution to their unemployment problems and that they will vote for him at the next State election! However, as the Chief Executive Officer for the Department for Community Welfare said when addressing a youth affairs seminar recently:

There are many children who need help, and their numbers will go down when there are more work opportunities, but what we see now is a feeling of despair they didn't once have.

Ms Vardon said that there had been an increase in teenage suicides, serious self-mutilation and self-destructive behaviour. Is this the sort of successful commitment referred to by the Hon. Mario Feleppa when he claimed in his speech that his was the only political Party which cares about providing opportunities to all in the community, regardless of their financial situation? I agree with him when he said that our young people deserve better than what they are getting, as his Government has failed to provide the appropriate employment opportunities since 1982. As the State's youth unemployment figures tell us, we may well become the only other political Party to be given the task of creating the necessary employment and investment opportunities expected of any responsible Government.

The fact is that, for all the public boasting this Labor Government does, most people feel and know that they are worse off now than when the Bannon Government was first elected. They feel that their situation is getting worse, not better. They know that more and more of their earnings are never seen, as the Labor Governments grab more and more from their pay packets with increased taxes and charges. They know that of what does remain, more and more has to be devoted to paying off mortgages and finding extra cash for the never-ending increases in taxes on petrol, water and sewerage rates, electricity and other Government charges. They know that they have spent the past six years going backwards, which is a damning indictment of Labor's performance and string of broken promises.

Whilst the Neros of the Labor Administration sit and fiddle while watching Australia burn, respected people like Sir Arvi Parbo (a migrant himself, and now Chairman of Australia's largest company, BHP) tell our Labor fiddlers that the country has to face the fact that its external debt position is deteriorating very quickly and that something

needs to be done about it before we lose our economic independence. Sir Arvi Parbo was quite critical of Labor's economic policies because, he said, they had done nothing more than lower Australians' living standards, keeping our nation in a permanent state of recession. As Mr Terry McCann, the *Advertiser* columnist said recently when dubbing 1989 as the year of living dangerously:

Labor had failed to address the fundamental problems of the economy which, in the longer term, will leave Australia unable to grow strongly into the 1990s.

Mr McCann claimed that Labor's economic policies had been based largely on 'playing games' with the trade union movement, and some clever exercises in deception. I fully endorse his comments.

When we consider the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures which show that, while spending in other States has increased by up to 40 per cent while we show a miserable fall of 3 per cent, can anyone claim that this is the sort of result which will make South Australia a dynamic, go-ahead and aggressive economy? Unless we develop policies which really tackle the fundamental issues in South Australia, we will never succeed in making our economy more expansive, more productive and more competitive. There are numerous examples where the Bannon Government has failed to tackle the really hard issues, such as transport, health, education, housing, work practices, law and order and, above all, Government waste. The bottom line is that we are not competitive. Productivity in manufacturing industries has been faltering since 1988. We have heavily relied on our primary producers to do all the work and carry the can for the rest of the State.

A Liberal Government will promote productivity, efficiency and excellence. It will encourage positive cooperation between Government employers and employees, and it will assist industry to become more competitive on a world market. It will be our intention to provide long-term credits for viable primary producers to encourage them to work for and create more export income. We will stop Labor's tax hike, and work to achieve greater efficiencies in providing Government services and assisting our senior citizens with better and more appropriate services and concessions. Ms Acting President, I have spoken briefly about some issues which are of concern to many South Australians. I intend to raise many more issues and concerns on future occasions and conclude my remarks, again indicating my support for the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Madam Acting President, I would like to thank His Excellency for presenting his address to us and I will make some comments about it. Before I do so, I wish to express my condolences to those who are mourning the deaths of the past members of this Parliament to whom His Excellency referred. Five died during the last session: James Alexander Heaslip, Leslie Charles Nicholson, John Richard Ryan, Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Campbell Rymill. Each of them contributed in his own way to the success of the running of this State. History will prove, however, that present members can contribute as much as those people did when they were in charge of the running of this State, mainly during the era of the Playford Government, when this State really made a lot of progress.

A few minutes ago, I saw that someone was quoted in the paper as stating that South Australia was the Detroit of Australia. Unfortunately, we cannot brag about that now. We have lost that name. Indeed, we have lost most of our industry, including the whitegoods industry and most of our car industry. We have a very high unemployment rate compared with the rest of the Commonwealth, where unemployment rates are also high. In fact, we have become nearly

a mendicant State. It is interesting that some of the legislation introduced now will make us more so if we continue in that way.

I want to speak mainly about the fishing industry and the greening of Australia by green Bob, green John and green Susan. The Governor's speech is really running up to the election and has included all those nice things that one would expect in this period. The Government's program is very strong on talk but pretty weak on delivery. I cannot see anything in it of any benefit to the State. Really, it is very verbose, and talks a lot about regulation and administration but very little about improving the lot of the people who live in this State.

The fishing industry is an important primary industry for the State, bringing in overseas dollars and raising our standard of living, but it is not being well administered under the present regime. To give some idea of what it does for the State, in 1982-83 it brought in approximately \$61 million to the State and in 1987-88 it brought in about \$107 million. They are all fresh dollars and I guess a lot of that money is processed by other workers and, therefore, it has a multiplier effect for the State.

Having moved around the State and listened to some of the fishermen, I am very disappointed in their attitude towards the industry. The industry has much litigation at the moment as the fishermen are not happy with the way they are being regulated. They are being told very little but, when they are told, it is a *fait accompli* and they are not being consulted, but that is nothing new for this Government. That fact is highlighted every day we sit in this Parliament. A recent example of that is the case of the amalgamation of the Mitcham council and the galloping over the top of the people by Government decisions. However, when the Government is confronted with such opposition, the Premier backs off, and maybe that is what the fishing industry needs to do.

The Department of Fisheries employs about 97 people to administer the licences and assist in research in the industry for those fishermen. That works out at about one person per \$1 million that the industry brings in. The number of licences has gradually decreased during that period. In 1985 there were 1 258 licences in the State and in 1988, the most recent figures obtainable, there were only 1 208. That means a drop of 50 licences in the State during the three-year period 1985-88.

To give some idea as to why I believe this rather unhappy industry is not very well run, one just has to look at what has happened within this State in the past couple of years. The Gulf St Vincent prawn industry absolutely collapsed, so the Government instituted a buy-back system after a review by a very expensive gentleman by the name of Professor Parsival Coates who came out from Canada to review the industry. The Government was just duck-shoving to try to head off the fishermen. The recommendation of Professor Coates was that there be a buy-back system. That has been put into gear and he indicated that the fish stock in the Gulf St Vincent would rise immediately the pressure came off the industry. The fact is that the stocks have not risen. Less fish have been caught and the stocks have certainly not risen to the extent that he predicted. I suggest that much of the cause of that is the Government's allowing the Gulf St Vincent to be polluted. One only has to go a little way north to St Kilda to see where the effluent from this huge city is dumped and the damage caused to the flora, particularly along the coast where much of the fish stock, fingerlings, and breeding take place. It is a pretty sad indictment of the fishing administration in this State.

The other area within the fishing industry which is most uneasy at the moment is the rock lobster industry in the South-East. In fact, that industry reached the stage where it was believed there was too much pressure on the stock so, once again, the Government decided on a buy-back system. The rock lobster fishermen themselves agreed to that, and that seems to be working relatively well. The biggest problem with it is that the overseas price of rock lobster has dropped rather dramatically, so we have a situation where the buy-back system is on the edge of being either a success or a failure. I understand that a number of fishermen are not making enough money to meet their buy-back commitments. The industry itself is relatively efficient. Those who work in the industry are good people. They work very hard and have a job that I do not want. I believe they are entitled to have a reasonable return for the risk at which they put themselves and for the lovely product they provide and the export income that goes to raising our standard of living subsequently.

Another big part of the industry is the tuna industry, and we have seen some enormous changes in that area. Members would understand that it is licensed by the Federal Government and not by this State Government, but it is still this State Government's job to keep a watch over it and do some research work. When the tuna industry started in Port Lincoln, the Haldane brothers came out from America and were poling tuna from the back of relatively small boats by today's standards. Today the fishermen use relatively large boats with purse sein catching methods, with mother ships from countries such as Japan and Taiwan operating in the southern oceans. The fish are caught and processed on the mother ships and are returned to their countries in either the frozen form, tinned or however they are processed.

It is interesting that in the late 1970s about 60 000 tonnes of tuna were being caught predominantly in the southern ocean south-west of Port Lincoln. However, this year the catch will be barely 6 000 tonnes, and that is an indictment of what has happened to the tuna industry. When those huge numbers of tuna were being caught, they were mostly canned. However, today the biggest percentage of the 6 000 tonnes will be processed for sashimi, the highly priced product that goes to America. That has offset the loss of income involved in the drop of the catch. I believe that that is quite correct and proper. However, the canning of tuna and the use of some forms of tuna for pet food has shifted to a different variety of fish. When referring to sashimi, we are talking about the southern bluefin tuna but, when referring to the canned product and other forms, we are talking about skipjack tuna.

It is interesting to note that a number of the big fishermen from Port Lincoln went to America and purchased fishing boats that are now fishing out of Rabaul and in the equatorial regions where skip jack tuna is plentiful. These boats were surplus to the requirements of the Americans and the Australian Government had to survey these boats, and that cost was astronomical. The boats had already been surveyed in North America whose requirements were as strict if not stricter than those of the Australian Government. Two persons went from Australia to America to survey those boats and the cost involved their fares over and back and a high daily rate to live in America. The Australian Government could have speeded up this process which, in the long term, would have been of benefit to Australia as some of the boats were held up for as much as two months while being surveyed.

I understand that this problem has now been rectified, but it demonstrates what can happen when bureaucracy runs wild, particularly when administered by Federal Gov-

ernments. I have related this information because it deals with a problem that seems to be increasingly occurring in this State. The tuna industry is a very expensive one to be in and the cost of running ships and one or two aeroplanes per group is enormous. The refrigeration requirements for sashimi are critical. The temperature must be within fine tolerances. It is a very expensive operation. Although some of these fisheries will bring in as much as \$50 000 or \$60 000 a tonne, that return needs to be received to offset the costs.

The abalone industry is another industry with fairly high returns. Although relatively small, it is nevertheless important. There are 35 licensees operating in South Australia, but that does not mean that they are the only people catching the abalone. Illegal poachers in the industry have been well documented. Recently the department had some success in prosecuting illegal poachers and I hope it has such successes in the future. If well run by the department and well handled by the fishermen, this industry will return high rewards to South Australia. In fact, those 35 licences return in the order of \$11 million to the State—in the order of \$50 a kilogram. This dangerous industry needs the support of the Government with assistance, good regulations and communication by the public servants who administer it. There is no provision for relief divers, and this is becoming an important issue in the whole fishing industry. If a diver gets the bends, which frequently occurs, gets a cold or for some other reason cannot dive, then he cannot earn a living. The weather conditions west of Port Lincoln particularly, where 25 licensees operate, is not always conducive to good diving and divers are limited to a few days in a year. They need to make full use of that time, particularly during summer, to catch their quota.

In fact, at present the regulations actually force sick divers to catch their quota. I suggest that relief divers should be allowed under a licence so that if a diver gets the bends or an illness a relief diver can be used. I have been told by people at the Royal Adelaide Hospital that divers should not go back in the water for at least a fortnight, and preferably three weeks, after having the bends. But, that is not happening. Some divers have their own remedies, but they are in danger. The department needs to accommodate the problems that occur in this very dangerous industry of harvesting abalone where divers sometimes dive to 100 or more feet.

I guess that the marine scale industry is the biggest employer in the fishing industry with 670 licences. However, if one takes into account deck hands and the people who process the fish, the number involved in the industry is very great. This part of the fishing industry is always in ferment and turmoil. Recreational fishermen believe that they are entitled to part of the fish stock, and I do not disagree with that. However, the licensing restrictions put on professional fishermen have led to a lot of discontent. This industry, with some 670 licences, brings in approximately \$18 million. When compared to the abalone industry which has 35 licences bringing in \$11 million, one can understand that marine scale fishermen reap much less than those fishing for abalone. This fishery mainly deals with whiting, snapper and some of the lesser known fish that are caught around our shores.

However, amateurs have been getting a fairly rough trot in this industry and I believe it needs to be careful how it develops. If amateurs are totally shut out it would do an enormous amount of damage. I notice the Minister of Tourism sitting here and she would understand that. Several months ago a group of Japanese were catching large snapper at Whyalla, but the regulation is that they can only catch two per person or five per boat, which is not very much.

When there are a dozen people in a boat, that does not even get them one fish each.

The point is that they were very excited fishermen that evening when I saw them after they had caught several large snapper. However, I calculated that they paid about \$1 500 per fish in order to catch them. If tourists are willing to do that, we should encourage them to visit South Australia and spend their money here. South Australia is lucky because of its two lovely gulfs where we have fish which are relatively easy to catch. The only problem is that I cannot catch them, but for professionals they are relatively easy to catch.

We should be promoting our fishing industry to the rest of Australia. We hear much about the catching of swordfish and tuna in the warm subtropical waters of the Gold Coast and the Great Barrier Reef, but it might take a visitor a week—going out over several days—to catch one of those species and it is an expensive operation. However, in our South Australian waters people can get a reasonable feed of the premier fish in the world—King George whiting—quickly and without much effort. South Australia should be promoting that attraction more widely. That activity would come under the amateur code.

I now turn to a problem which has developed in this industry and which is commonly called shamateurism. This involves unlicensed fishermen who sell their catch on the side. I do not care what the industry is, some people always cheat. We all cheat one way or another, perhaps by driving over 110 km/h or we bend other rules a little at some time. However, this industry is becoming a big one involving shamateur fishermen—fishermen who catch fish as amateurs and then sell the catch for reward. I believe the problem is more an education and self-regulation problem. Perhaps if the department looked at the matter more carefully and said to those involved, 'Let us license you, so that we have some control over you', it could gain some control over such activities. That approach might be the solution. Although I have not thought that question right through, it is something that ought to be looked at.

Another problem that occurs within the marine scale industry to which I referred earlier concerns relief days for masters. The Minister or the Director, through regulations introduced just last week, has stopped masters or the people in charge of boats from being able to go fishing or put anyone else on the boat and letting it go fishing if the master or operator is sick. Previously, a regulation allowed them 20 days a year when they could put anyone on their boat. That regulation allowed them a holiday or time off if they were sick, just as other people have so many sick days leave a year.

The Minister has amended the legislation to force masters to have a medical certificate before they can put another captain on their boat. This is plain stupid. If one uses the analogy that I have a farm and a share farmer who farms it for me, the Minister is saying that, if I get sick, I cannot employ someone to do the work while I am sick. If we refer that to the fishing industry, that is a ridiculous situation. If a licensed fisherman cannot nominate his deck hand or some other person who can take over when he is sick, it will cause great difficulty.

True, this situation has been abused in the past, although I will not go into how it has been abused. Despite past abuse, if the industry was consulted, perhaps a better method than has applied in the past could be worked out for the future. The Government has handled this matter poorly. Again, it has gone in boots and all and has got the industry offside.

I now refer to another matter that is quite remarkable. Although it has nothing to do with the fishing industry, it

is a matter applied by the industry. I refer to the regulations introduced by the Government. I have received a letter from a person saying that he had received a letter from the Director of Fisheries indicating that regulations had been introduced in the last session of Parliament. I have the regulation with me now and it was introduced last week before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Although I do not have the exact date, the letter states:

Under the previous arrangements, persons who, for the purpose of trade or business, only obtained fish from a registered fish processor, were exempt from having to be registered as a processor.

In other words, if a hotel wanted fish and it bought them from a processor, it did not have to have a licence as a fish processor. The letter continues:

The amended legislation encompasses all persons who purchase, obtain or process fish for trade or business. However, those who sell fish only by retail will be exempt from payment of the prescribed fee, but will be required to maintain records of transactions as provided for in the current regulations.

That means that if one has a hotel or a fish shop and wants to sell fish, the proprietor has to keep a record of where he bought his fish and who he bought them from. The proprietor has to provide that information to a fish inspector.

I refer to the number of hotels, fish shops and other establishments selling fish. Every delicatessen and road service station will have to have a processor's licence. This is indeed Government humbug, and is ridiculous. Proprietors will have receipts for taxation purposes anyway and I see no reason why an army of fish inspectors should be checking up on hotels, restaurants and the like about where and from whom they purchase their fish. Goodness me—this is socialism gone berserk, especially when this sort of thing happens.

I know why this change has been made—it is to try to find out from whom people are buying their fish other than from licensed fishermen. If this matter cannot be handled closer to the fish catching arena than under this system, then I do not believe the Government will ever find the culprits this far down the track. This is a ridiculous situation which demonstrates the foolish approach by the department to this method of control. This method is stupid and will not work. Proprietors do not have to pay for their processing licence and do not have to do anything other than keep records, but one can imagine the abuse that will be created. A bad regulation has been introduced in this situation.

I now turn to the shark fishing industry. This is an important one and the Government has muffed its lines in regard to the industry. South Australia has an agreement with Victoria to sell its fish in Victoria. It is a free trade and I suppose that section 93 of the Commonwealth Constitution provides for free trade of goods across State boundaries. However, the shark fishing industry has run into trouble. The Victorian industry will not accept fish with an organic mercury content above .005 per cent, but South Australia accepts fish with an organic mercury content of .01 per cent. I point out that organic mercury has very little impact on human-beings, while inorganic mercury does. Indeed, I refer to the recent television program showing that some people have a reaction to amalgam in teeth.

It seems that South Australian fishermen must have been putting a few too many fish into the Victorian market and the Victorians decided that they would accept only two sorts of shark, that is, gummy shark and the common school shark. Victoria wanted to be able to observe the processing of those fish when they were pulled from the water and processed in South Australia.

Once the fish has been processed, it is hard to determine what type it was when it came out of the water. Victoria believes that only two types of fish have acceptable levels of mercury. Anything caught by Victorian fishermen is

acceptable in Victoria, but fish caught in South Australia is acceptable in Victoria only if it has a mercury content below .005. If the Minister had been half awake when he was negotiating this agreement, it could have been resolved. The problem is not recent; it began four or five years ago, and the Government has dillydallied and scratched around the edges.

The industry now has \$1 million worth of fish in cold storage. That will be useless in 12 months, as it will deteriorate so much that it will not be acceptable to anyone. It is plain stupid that two Labor Governments cannot get together and solve this problem. It shows very poor negotiating ability and administration. It may be that the problem ought to have been solved long before it reached the Minister, but it is stupid that one State cannot freely trade with another in fish that are caught legitimately. We are in for a poor future if there is no trust and honest dealing between States.

To add insult to injury, the eastern boundary of South Australia's rock lobster fishing limit has been moved. The border is set at longitude 141 degrees, but when it gets to the River Murray, for some reason—perhaps the surveyor had been drinking too much—it comes over two minutes to 140 degrees 58 minutes. The border then continues down to the sea just east of Mt Gambier. South Australian rock lobster fishermen had always fished to 141 degrees, which is the normal longitude of 141. However, after a decision of the High Court of Australia, they can fish only to 140 degrees 58 minutes. This means that South Australian rock lobster fishermen have lost about 40 square miles of a very productive rock lobster fishery to the Victorians.

I have not heard a squeak about it, so that the Government has done little to assist the rock lobster industry to overcome this problem, at Beachport or anywhere in the South-East. This again demonstrates the weakness of the Government and its arrogant attitude to the public of South Australia.

The fishing industry has been involved in much litigation recently and is currently involved in cases against the Department of Fisheries. The industry is made up of a mixture of people from around the State who do a very hard job, but they do it well and provide us with a product which is very good for people who have heart problems. The Hon. Trevor Crothers probably has a feed of fish every day to keep his heart beating well. Fish is an important part of our diet and people should eat more fish. Fishing is an important industry because we have a long coastline and enclosed waters in which grow whiting, snapper, snook and other edible scale fish.

In his speech, the Governor said:

My Government recognises the value of rural land, and the immense problems caused by land degradation in our State. With an annual loss to South Australia of some \$80 million in agricultural production, land use has emerged as a crucial area of agricultural management. The Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill has been developed by my Government to assist in the control of soil, land and water degradation throughout the State. A feature of the Bill is the active involvement of landholders and community groups in developing district plans for land management and conservation in their areas.

My Government, in concert with Federal Government plans, will be encouraging a much expanded rural and domestic tree planting program.

I presume he is talking about green John, green Susan and green Bob, in that order. It is amazing how quickly Governments have got on to the band wagon of the green revolution, or grey power, although that seems to have lost favour recently. Where did the Government get the figure of \$80 million lost in agricultural production? How can the Government determine the amount that soil degradation has cost the State? If any Minister can tell me, within a ball

park figure, how the \$80 million was worked out, I would like to know. The figure was pulled out of the air, with no substance for it at all. It could be \$80 million today, \$180 million tomorrow, or the figure might be only \$20 million. It is stupid to make that statement.

I do not deny that there is land degradation, but wherever there is land there is degradation. There is degradation of the land on which the city stands, because it is covered with tar and cement, making the land non-productive.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It is the best land in the State.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Some of the best land in the State is covered with tar and cement. The Adelaide plains were the grain bowl of Australia in the late 1800s and early 1900s, but they are now covered with people. That is a shame because, as a percentage of population, more people in this State live in the capital city than is the case in any other State. That is not for the benefit of the development of the State.

However, the Government says that rural producers have raped and pillaged the country—the words are used time and time again on television and we read them in the newspapers—but the rape and pillage has been done with the best intentions. I am not suggesting that there has not been some malpractice—everyone has been guilty to a small degree—but that practice has been changed quickly by those who understand that it is wrong.

For the Government to say, 'You will have farm plans' is socialism gone berserk. Even the Chinese and Russians are going the other way and saying, 'For heaven's sake take the country back and run it yourselves; we know we cannot survive. We know we are not able to produce enough food to feed ourselves.' We are heading in the direction that China and Russia are moving away from. The Government will never learn how to handle people who work with their hands, those who get out in the bush and do a hard day's work, those who can load up a grease gun and know in what direction to point it. While green Bob and John and Susan are in charge, the Government will continue to impose restraints on people who are generally going about their work, and who are not in the best financial condition.

Compared to the wealth that one sees when looking around this city, there does not appear to be a great deal of it in the country, and in my opinion it is quite stupid for the Government to put more impediments in the way of country people. In fact, who is it that actually pollutes this country? I suggest that it is not the people who live in the country but the million people who live in the city. It is surely the disposal of effluent—a matter to which I referred earlier—that gives rise to the pollutant which is ruining the seagrass in Gulf St Vincent.

Further, what about the generation of electricity for this city, at either Port Augusta or Torrens Island? Surely that gives rise to pollutants. Very little of it goes to the country. Most of the pollution takes place here in the city. It is the city that gives rise to most of the pollutants. What about the half a million cars, spewing out their CO₂ and nitrous oxide, and with their leaking air conditioners?

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Greenhouse.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Yes, they are contributing to the greenhouse effect, and causing holes in the ozone layer.

But there are very few cars out in the country, and so pollution from cars is much less there than is the case in the city. So, the country areas seem to be the butt of the Government's correction of all this pollution attributed as it is to rape and pillage of the environment by country people, while very little effort is coming from the city to assist in providing help with these problems.

As I have said before in this place, it is easy for people sitting in their loungerooms to become greenies: they all understand how to fix the problem. We see the David Bellamys, the Les Hiddinses and the Harry Butlers: they all present great programs, and I watch them with a great deal of fun myself, but they show the rosy side of things and not what the facts are. It is unfortunate, but Governments have picked up some of these matters without investigating them very well.

I suggest to the Council that more money should be provided by the city. More money should be provided to the Department of Agriculture. The Government has run the Department of Agriculture right down, to the extent that it is barely a skeleton of its former self. I would suggest that had a little more money been put back into the Department of Agriculture perhaps some of these problems referred to in the Governor's speech would not have occurred.

As to the reference in the Governor's speech to an annual loss to South Australia of some \$80 million in agricultural production through land degradation, I am still wondering how the Government arrived at that figure. I should be pleased if the Minister could provide some details about that. However, to go around blaming farmers for causing a loss of \$80 million is claptrap. It is emotional, ugly and stupid. We need money put in upfront. The problem cannot simply be pushed back on to those people who are trying very hard. Farmers know full well that if they ruin the land that they are working, there will not be any income for future generations. If the people in the city simply bleat and say, 'Look, you have ruined the land', and do not provide more money, we will finish up with a problem even worse than it is today.

I have meandered a little in talking about matters pertaining to the fishing industry and the rural industry, but these are important areas. I believe that the Government has been fairly slack in its attitude to these primary industries. As I have said, there is no-one in the Government who has had any experience at all of primary industry. I guess, then, it is understandable that the people in Government do not understand the industry—or do not want to understand it. However, it is time that they did. I hope that the forthcoming election result will reflect the disenchantment that people have with the Government's attitude to primary industry—an industry that certainly contributes to raising everyone's standard of living.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.41 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 16 August at 2.15 p.m.