

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 7 August 1984

The House met at 2 p.m.

The ACTING CLERK: I have to inform the House that, owing to absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business, the Speaker will not be able to attend the House this week.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That, pursuant to section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1934, and Standing Order 24, the honourable member for Whyalla, Mr M.J. Brown, Chairman of Committees, do take the Chair of this House as Deputy Speaker to fill temporarily the office and perform the duties of the Speaker during the absence from the State of the Speaker on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

The ACTING CLERK: There being only one nomination, I declare the member for Whyalla elected Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Max Brown) took the Chair and read prayers.

PETITIONS: KINDERGARTEN UNION

Petitions signed by 260 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intention to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education were presented by the Hons B.C. Eastick and Michael Wilson and Mr Mathwin.

Petitions received.

PETITION: TEACHERS

A petition signed by 52 members of the school community of Para Hills school praying that the House urge the Government to convert all contract teaching positions to permanent positions; establish a permanent pool of relieving staff; improve the conditions of contract teachers, and improve the rights and conditions of permanent teachers placed in temporary vacancies was presented by Mr Trainer.

Petition received.

PETITION: NETS

A petition signed by 298 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ban the use of nets in a three-mile radius of Port Vincent wharf was presented by Mr Klunder.

Petition received.

PETITION: COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT

A petition signed by 261 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to amend the Community Welfare Act so as to prohibit the removal of children from their parents without parental consent or direction of a court was presented by the Hon. J.D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITION: PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

A petition signed by 1 347 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to install

pedestrian activated traffic lights opposite Christ the King Church, Lockleys, was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: HENS

Petitions signed by 36 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit battery egg production and debeaking of hens and provide for the labelling of free range eggs were presented by the Hon T.H. Hemmings and Mr Mathwin.

Petitions received.

PETITION: WAROOKA PRE-SCHOOL SERVICES

A petition signed by 58 residents of South Australia praying that the House ensure the provision of adequate funding for pre-school services in Warooka was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 570 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw pornographic material from prisons was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 6 and 7.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

By Command—

i. Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group—Report, 1983.

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—

Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—

i. Construction of Foot and Vehicular Bridges at Morialta Conservation Park.

ii. Erection of a Classroom at Gladstone High School.

iii. Regulations—Development Control of Air Pollution.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Highways Act, 1926—Approvals to Lease Highways Department Properties—Report, 1983-84.

By the Hon. G.F. Keneally, for the Minister of Education (Hon. L.M.F. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. South Australian College of Advanced Education—Report, 1983.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Health Act, 1935—Regulations—Nursing Homes.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Local Government Act, 1934 and Fees Regulation Act, 1927—Regulations—

- i. Local Government Officers Qualifications.
 - ii. Local Government Auditors' Certificates.
- Local Government Act, 1934—Regulations—
- i. By-Law Offences Expiation Fees.
 - ii. Forms.
 - iii. Prescribed Municipality.
 - iv. Long Service Leave.
 - v. Members Allowances for Expenses.
 - vi. Miscellaneous Revocations.
 - vii. Proceedings of Councils.
 - viii. Certificate of Legal Practitioner Certifying a By-Law.
 - ix. Corporation of Thebarton—By-law No. 7—Vehicle Movement.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—Care Labelling.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICE REPORT

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Commissioner of Police has advised that he has discovered certain errors in the figures relating to reported robbery offences contained in his annual report for 1982-83. The figures were contained in Appendix A and the errors only relate to those robbery offences that were reported as having been cleared by arrest or report. The Commissioner regrets the error and has provided me with a corrective summary which I now table for the information of members.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STEWART COMMITTEE REPORT

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In May I announced that the Government had endorsed the general strategy recommended by the Stewart Committee for providing for the State's electricity generation needs up to 1996 and had approved specific action in a number of related areas.

The Government has established the Future Energy Action Committee to progress these matters. Headed by Mr Doug Stewart, the Chairman of the former Advisory Committee, with its membership drawn from Government and the energy supplying utilities, it will advise the Government, co-ordinate, and where necessary initiate action across functional areas. A number of subcommittees have been established reporting to it to deal, in particular, with coalfield selection, interconnection and natural gas.

I want to stress that the important energy supply issues facing our State have already been thoroughly canvassed. The major role of FEAC will not be in writing reports but in getting action in accordance with the general strategy set out by the Stewart Committee.

The Stewart Committee was unable, on the basis of the information available to it at the time, to make a selection amongst the local coal deposits. The Coalfield Selection Committee, led by Mr Stewart, engaged the West German group Rheinbraun Consulting and Bechtel Pacific to carry

out a comparative analysis of the combustion characteristics of each of the deposits and to determine which deposits could be developed for use in a conventional pulverised coal fired power station commissioned by 1993. Kingston, Lochiel, Sedan and Wintinna remain in contention in terms of these combustibility and timing criteria.

It has been decided that proposals should be invited from the licensees of the four deposits for economic and technical evaluation. This is a competitive commercial situation designed to provide the kind of objective information on which the Government can base a decision. As a result of discussions with the proponents it has become apparent that the preparation of these proposals and their subsequent evaluation will not be completed by the end of September as had earlier been anticipated and may not be completed until early next year. I am advised that this extra time will not affect the target commissioning date of 1993.

The Gas Committee, headed by the new Chairman of Pasa (Mr Ron Barnes), has commenced negotiations with the Cooper Basin producers to secure a more acceptable contract than is provided under the Pasa future requirements agreement. It should incorporate satisfactory supply, price and exploration arrangements as recommended by the Stewart Committee. I expect real progress to be achieved in these discussions over the next few months.

Gas sharing negotiations are continuing, as are negotiations for gas supplies from the Queensland section of the Cooper Basin and Bass Strait. In case a satisfactory gas supply and price situation does not eventuate, ETSA has commenced detailed design and environmental studies on a possible conversion of 400 mw of Torrens Island plant to black coal. A draft e.i.s. should be available for public comment during 1985.

The Stewart Committee found that the development of a third 250 mw unit at the northern power station is dependent on proving the economics of a further expansion of mining at Leigh Creek. I understand that recent indications have been very encouraging. A further examination will be undertaken later this year. A commitment is not necessary until late 1985.

The establishment of the interconnection between Portland, in Victoria, and Monbulla, in South Australia, is being pursued by an Interconnection Management Committee consisting of representatives of the New South Wales, Victorian and South Australian electricity supply authorities. It is examining the possible technical and commercial basis for the project. Detailed route studies and the preparation of environmental impact statements were jointly announced last week by Premiers Bannon and Cain. It is expected that a heads of agreement could be negotiated by late 1984. The target date for commissioning has been set for early 1990.

QUESTION TIME

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I advise the House that, in the absence of the Minister of Education, any questions that normally would go to that Minister will be taken by the Minister for Environment and Planning.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Deputy Premier, as Minister responsible for police services, say how much the Government has allocated for police involvement in the planned Roxby Downs blockade to begin later this month, and how many police officers will be sent to Roxby Downs to maintain law and order there? To give the Premier time to give the

Deputy Premier the answer, I will explain the question. There have been a number of press and media reports speculating on the cost and extent of police involvement in the blockade. However, so far there has been no official statement from the Government as to that cost.

I have been told that 500 police officers will have to be sent to Roxby Downs during the planned six week blockade, and that the cost to taxpayers will be about \$1.6 million. Last year, an estimated 750 demonstrators took part in the blockade, and 250 police were present at Roxby Downs. This year, the organisers estimate something like double the number of protesters.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Leader did not make clear what he wanted. Does he want information or is he condemning the Government for taking precautions? I am not sure what his question really means. I think that he wants to stir up some further trouble about this matter, as he has done in relation to other matters.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Of course it does, and that is why I am finding the Leader's question very peculiar. If he were in government he would do exactly the same as we are doing. We understand, from allegations being made at the moment, that there may be double the number of protesters that there were last year. That is not untrue. Quite obviously the Government wants to take precautions to protect property and people in that area. It also wants to see that the law is obeyed.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the member for Torrens is patient he will find that I will come to that answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens is out of order.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yes, Sir; I agree. The final figure is not yet determined, nor can it be at this stage. One could only hazard a guess. The budget at the moment indicates that it will be more than \$1 million. That is the anticipated cost at this stage, but I will not be held to that by the Deputy Leader if the figure is below or above it. One cannot be certain of the cost until the exercise is finished. However, let me say that the Government is taking every precaution to ensure that this is a peaceful demonstration. The Government believes that the right to peaceful demonstration is a right of society, and it is anxious to ensure that this demonstration is of a peaceful nature.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

LANDS TITLES APPROVALS

Mrs APPLEBY: Is the Premier aware of reports of significant delays experienced by the building and housing industry in the processing of approvals for lands titles, subdivisions, etc.? In yesterday's edition of the *News* the Leader of the Opposition was reported as accusing the Lands Titles Office of causing major delays in the processing of subdivision applications, and claimed that additional delays were being caused by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Electricity Trust and the Highways Department. According to the Leader, development of approvals was taking up to eight weeks in some of these departments. He also stated that he had received numerous complaints about the impact of delays on building costs.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It has been a source of continuing disappointment, I guess, to our colleagues opposite that South Australia is experiencing a massive building and construction revival. In fact, it has reached boom proportions. It is a result of the combination of policies which this Government undertook to implement on its election and

the Federal Government's initiatives in this area, and now I am pleased to say that that development, particularly in the public sector, has been matched by private sector development. It has been very interesting that, far from the Opposition's welcoming this development, the jobs it is bringing, the marvellous activity, and the increase in values, all we have had from it is this carping and nonsensical criticism about delays, costs, and so on.

I really think that we have to ask the Opposition what it is on about. Quite clearly, if there is a massive revival of the nature just experienced there will be pressures for the services required by those involved in the developments. Quite clearly, if there is a major upturn—the first for three years—in the demand for housing and serviced land, the cost and value of housing and serviced land will rise. I suggest that one should ask the 80 per cent or so of our population who own homes or are paying off mortgages whether they think the trend to better values and lower interest rates is a good or bad thing. In fact, it has substantially improved the living standards of thousands and thousands of South Australians, contrary to what the Leader says about deteriorating living standards.

The Government is responding very positively to the welcome pressures that this development has created. It was brought to the Government's attention very early on that there were likely to be delays experienced in the processing of approvals, stamp duties, and so on, and it has moved very quickly to look at the capability of the Lands Titles Office, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and other development departments to ensure that they meet those demands.

In fact, the examination has led to the provision by this Government of trained staff in the Lands Titles Office increasing from 197 at the end of June 1983 to 224 at the end of June 1984, and further trained personnel will join the office shortly. In fact, my colleague the Minister of Lands has told me that just this week applications for a further eight additional staff for survey examination and document examination areas will be called in tomorrow's Public Service Notice.

So, we are responding. I might mention that we are responding against an Opposition which criticises us every single time we employ someone in the public sector. This is the extraordinary double standard we have had to cop so often. On the one hand, the Opposition is saying, 'Cut down these delays; do something about increasing the processing speed.' That certainly can be done, and we intend to do it, but the only way of doing it is to employ trained personnel. That means that in that Department numbers have increased, as must occur in order to meet the demand, yet what is the response of the Opposition? It turns towards the other direction, saying, 'What a terrible thing it is that the Government is employing people in the public sector.' That kind of hypocrisy I think should cease, as it has been going on for too long.

I do not think anyone, not even the most optimistic Government full of Tonkinesque fantasies, could have predicted the extent of the revival that we have had to date. In 1983-84 almost 13 500 new dwelling approvals occurred, compared with 8 800 in the previous year. That is a rise of over 50 per cent—a remarkable rise over 12 months. Other building approvals have strengthened. There will be a large boost in major building construction in the other building areas. There was an increase on values of 30 per cent last financial year. We welcome that recovery. We are very pleased to have to deal with problems of delays and of stretching resources, and I would hope that we would receive some support from the Opposition in doing so.

Incidentally (and I think this is an important point to finish on), our Lands Titles Office and our whole area of

development and planning is regarded as one of the best in Australia. Indeed, it goes further: it has an international reputation. On 15 August the Director of Lands, Mr Scriven, will be going to the United States to receive an award on behalf of the South Australian Government from the international organisation, the Urban and Regional Information Systems Association. That Association makes an award each year called the Exemplary Systems in Government Award, acknowledging the most efficient business system in Government enterprise. Only twice has this award been made outside North America. This year it will be made to an operation outside North America: it just so happens that it will be made to the South Australian Government for the Land Ownership and Tenure System in recognition of the extraordinary effectiveness and efficiency of that system. That is consistent, of course, with a long tradition in this State of being in the vanguard of international developments in land tenure and land titles. I would also point out that that system has created commercial interest in a number of South-East Asian countries, and we hope that that system will indeed be bought and will result in commercial benefits to South Australia in the not too distant future.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Deputy Premier tell the House what arrangements are being made to ensure that the involvement of so many police officers in the Roxby Downs blockade has not in any way jeopardised the ability of the police to maintain law and order in other parts of the State? The Deputy Premier was vague in his answer to the Leader's question about the cost to taxpayers of mounting the police presence. The *Advertiser* reported some time ago that the South Australian police planners had recently completed a cost estimate and had submitted it to the Government. That report goes on to mention a figure, no doubt known to the Government, although the Deputy Premier was not prepared to confirm or deny it today. However, it has been revealed that the commitment of the police to the Roxby Downs blockade will prevent the participation of the police greys, the police band and police motor cyclists in this year's Royal Show.

The extent of this commitment to the Roxby Downs protest will involve, as the Opposition has been told, more than 500 members of the Police Force, or more than 13 per cent of its total strength, raising the possibility that police resources in other areas will be stretched to the limit. I therefore ask the Minister what assurance he can give to the public that an adequate level of policing will be maintained in other parts of the State.

The Deputy Premier will no doubt remember that at a police briefing which he and I attended earlier this year the matter was raised of the strain put upon police resources as a result of the former blockade and the great difficulty in maintaining adequate police presence in metropolitan Adelaide. This situation appears far more serious.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: First, I refute the allegation by the Deputy Leader that I was vague in my answer to the Leader. I told him the cost as I understand it to be at the moment but it might be increased or reduced. We do not know at this moment, but if the Deputy Leader so desires, I will bring down a factual account of the cost after the event is over, when we will all know exactly what it has cost. I am not in a position to say what the cost will be but I have said that it will cost more than \$1 million.

One would think from the line of questioning today coming from the two Leaders of the Opposition that they do not want us to send any police there at all, that they do not want to preserve law and order. That is how it seems to

me. The framing of the questions today appears to indicate that they do not want us to keep law and order up there. This is a police operation. It has been said by both Parties in this House over many years that South Australia's is the best Police Force in Australia. I do not think anyone would deny that. I see the Leader nodding his head. In those circumstances, I have every confidence that the Police Force in South Australia will be able to cover both aspects of keeping law and order throughout the State as well as at Roxby Downs.

I reiterate that I have every confidence in the force and the Police Commissioner to be able to handle that situation. I am disappointed that the Deputy Leader would want me to divulge publicly the plans of the Police Force for that period. That is the question that has been asked. The Deputy Leader asked a question that would lead me to divulge police plans, and I have no intention of doing so.

HALLEY'S COMET

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether the Government has given consideration to promoting South Australia as an ideal location for overseas astronomers to view Halley's Comet during 1985 and early 1986? I am informed by many amateur astronomers that South Australia will become a mecca for astronomers from all over the world to enable them to view Halley's Comet during 1985 and 1986.

For those who are not aware, Halley's Comet appears only once in every 76 years and will appear over South Australia from October 1985 to March 1986, a period of five months. I am informed that the Southern Hemisphere is the best place from which to view this, and that South Australia would be an ideal location for those astronomers who come to Australia. This would be of considerable benefit for the economy of this State with such tourists coming here.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: There is no doubt that astronomical phenomena can induce some sort of tourist activity. I can recall that, when the total eclipse of the sun occurred in 1978 (and the member for Mount Gambier might recall), the South-East was packed with Japanese, American and other amateur astronomers who had come that long distance in order to see that unique phenomenon. I was in fact privileged to have the opportunity to go to a property called Marlex, out of Tantanoola, and join the Astronomical Society on that occasion.

This matter, which has been considered by Jubilee 150, was first brought to the notice of that organisation by the Hon. Anne Levy, and Jubilee 150 sent her an application form for an event to register the perihelion passage of the comet as part of the celebrations. Perhaps I should discuss with the Minister of Tourism whether this interesting suggestion has gone further. It is unlikely, for those who remember the spectacular passage of the comet in 1910, that it will be as spectacular this time: first, because astronomically the comet will be less well placed for observation in either hemisphere; and secondly, today we have street lights, and the honourable member will probably know from his discussions with amateur astronomers that street lights are their bane. The gentle brightness of the comet is no greater than that of the Milky Way, and it is a sad commentary on the fact that we have such light pollution these days that most children have not seen the Milky Way.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier seek assistance from the Federal Government to deal with the Roxby Downs block-

ade? Replies from the Deputy Premier to the previous two questions about the blockade confirm that it will be costly and stretch South Australian police resources to the limit. The participants in the blockade are coming from all over Australia, but South Australian taxpayers will have to meet the cost of protecting this project from unlawful activities in which such people may be involved. The Federal Government has also recognised that this is a project of major national importance. Both these factors impose obligations on the Federal Government to consider helping South Australia deal with the blockade. Such help could take the form of funding to provide accommodation, catering, medical, transport and communications facilities, as well as personnel and facilities from various Federal departments or agencies involved in these fields. Such assistance could help limit the impost of this demonstration on South Australian taxpayers and the need for as much police involvement in providing logistical back-up support for those officers involved in the maintenance of law and order at Roxby Downs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Premier to reply, I point out that the Chair is being a little lenient in this matter. The question entered into the field of debate, and I hope that the Premier does not take the debate too far.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that it is in the interests of anyone to take the debate too far. I am surprised at the attitude being adopted in this matter by the Opposition. The Leader has raised an interesting suggestion, which I will examine. However, the question asked and the way the Opposition is seeking to highlight this matter can be calculated only to focus greater attention on and give greater publicity to the demonstration. Obviously, the Leader is ensuring that even greater numbers are encouraged to take part in the demonstration, and I have a sneaking suspicion that that is what the Opposition has had in mind, because nothing was needed in the terms of the questions asked. As the responsible Minister pointed out, the matter of cost has already been discussed: indeed, it has been the subject of open debate. I am on record as saying that it is regrettable that the expenditure of such sums may be necessary, but whether or not they are spent will depend on the scope and nature of the demonstration. At present, all our efforts behind the scenes are devoted to ensuring that the demonstration requires the minimum resources, and I hope that we get the co-operation of those involved to ensure that that is the case.

The Minister did not say that the police resources would be stretched to the limit. On the contrary, the police have matters well in hand, and the Police Force is capable and competent, with the goodwill of those involved, to solve any major problems. I regard it as deplorable that the Opposition should raise these unnecessary questions with one purpose only: to ensure that the matter is raised as prominently as possible so as to encourage more and more people to be involved. It is about time it became responsible on this issue and assisted the Government in its efforts to ensure that a quiet, peaceable protest takes place that does not consume public resources, and does not threaten the Roxby Downs project. However, the sort of hysteria being promoted by members opposite certainly gives the Government a difficult task.

RADIOLOGICAL BASED DISEASES

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health, urgently investigate the absence in South Australia of any medical specialist in radiological based diseases and take prompt action to ensure

that such a specialist is recruited urgently, and that appropriate arrangements are made to ensure that people who have worked or lived at Radium Hill, Maralinga and Roxby Downs, or who have otherwise been exposed to radiation and who believe that they may be suffering from radiation induced diseases, can have appropriate specialist medical tests and treatment?

Recently, a constituent sought my assistance in relation to the unavailability of specialist medical diagnosis for diseases possibly arising out of exposure to radiation. This constituent worked at Maralinga during the 1950s and now finds that he is suffering from a rare disease which manifests itself in the thickening of his blood. His complaint arose out of his general practitioner's inability to take action other than to treat the blood thickening with medication designed to thin his blood.

His g.p. told him that there was no appropriate specialist in South Australia to analyse and treat this disorder. At this point he sought my assistance. Initially, I contacted the Commonwealth Department of Health, where I was told that he should see his own doctor. I explained that he had done so and that apparently there was no specialist in radiological based diseases, nor any organised programme by the Federal Government to enable people who have been exposed to radiation at Maralinga or elsewhere to be examined by specialists. I was then told that the supply of medical services was a matter for the State Government. I disagreed with this, and that was the end of that conversation.

I then spoke to Dr Keith Wilson, of the South Australian Health Commission, who recently retired. He confirmed that there is no specialist in radiation caused diseases in South Australia, and suggested that my constituent should be sent to a medical haematologist for a complete medical check and the obtaining of an opinion as to the cause of any anomaly discovered. He indicated, however, that this course of action was at best a second rate treatment in the circumstances, and confirmed that no organised programme exists to enable people such as my constituent to have a full medical checkup.

I am aware that a Royal Commission has been established at the Commonwealth level to look into matters associated with Maralinga and other nuclear weapons tests in the 1950s and that part of its terms of reference will be to require consideration of and recommendations as to medical and other tests and treatment made available to nuclear victims and others exposed to radiation. However, some people believe that they need urgent medical treatment and, accordingly, I ask the Minister to make an appropriate specialist service available in South Australia to enable those people who believe they need treatment now to obtain it.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member certainly raises a matter of critical importance to the well being of South Australians. I will take up the matter with my colleague in another place and have an urgent report prepared for the honourable member.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Mr GUNN: In view of the publicly stated intentions of the organisers to defy the law during the Roxby Downs blockade, has the Premier asked members of Young Labor not to participate in the blockade and, if not, will he immediately do so? A handbook for the blockade, published by the Coalition for a Nuclear Free Australia, says participants will:

Break the law openly and collectively with the full knowledge of our actions and the consequences that they entail.

I understand that members of Young Labor from throughout Australia are making a significant contribution to the organ-

isation of this demonstration and will be participating in some strength. In view of its cost to South Australian taxpayers, the pressure it will place on police resources, and the plans of the participants to openly defy the law, I ask the Premier to use whatever influence he has within the Labor Party to prevent the ALP's involvement in a demonstration which is clearly against the wishes and interests of South Australians. In view of the Premier's comment that he wishes to see this matter defused, and that he was concerned about the cost to South Australian taxpayers, will he take up this positive suggestion?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I expect all members of the Labor Party, including Young Labor, to observe the policy of the Party which, as everyone knows, is a policy which permits the development of Roxby Downs.

INTERIM DEATH CERTIFICATES

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Lands investigate whether it is possible to issue an interim death certificate which is acceptable to insurance companies and other agencies so that urgent documents dealing with matters such as insurance policies and long service leave payments can be processed without delay? I have had several cases in the past few months in my electorate where the breadwinner of a family has met with accidental death and there has been a delay in the processing of a death certificate. In the latest such case a delay in finalising the autopsy report has held up the processing of the death certificate and it is likely to take at least 10 weeks from the death of the breadwinner to the availability of the death certificate. The problem is, of course, that in such matters mortgages do not decrease in that time period, whereas income slumps drastically.

I understand that it is possible to get an interim death certificate which establishes death but indicates that an investigation into the cause of death is still proceeding. The problem is that such a certificate is not universally acceptable. I also understand that the terms of some insurance policies preclude payout under certain circumstances in the case of suicide. I therefore ask the Minister to look at the possibility of producing an interim death certificate which separates the fact of death from the cause of death, except in the case of suicide, and which is acceptable to all those who need to see such a certificate.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The principle behind the honourable member's question is an important one and one that I support. I will bring a very early report back to the House on the matter.

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS FUNDING

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I direct my question to the Premier because it involves an important matter of both Federal and State policies. If he wishes to pass it on to his colleague, so be it. Does the Premier agree that if the proposed Federal funding guidelines for non-government schools published today are implemented there is a real danger of some non-government schools becoming financially elite and that those schools will become less and less open to fewer and fewer people? It is reported in today's *News* and also in the *Age* and the *Australian* that the Federal Government is to freeze recurrent funding for 55 so-called wealthy schools. This freeze is in dollar terms and will therefore represent a reduction in real terms.

It also represents an increase in the Federal Government's hit list of private schools from 41 last year to 55 now. Seymour and St Peter's Boys are at present in that list and I am informed that at least two or three more South Aus-

tralian schools will now be caught in the net. Already the headmaster of St Peter's College, Dr Shinkfield, has warned that his college could become financially elite. The position for those schools is further exacerbated—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: This is a very important matter and I hope that all members in the Government do not consider it amusing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: The elite has turned out a couple of Labor Premiers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and the member for Torrens should not be side-tracked by them.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you for your protection, Sir. The position for those schools is further exacerbated by the State Government's decision that the least needy non-government schools in South Australia will only receive 50 per cent of the State's standard. I was informed today that the independent schools sector in South Australia is 'horrified at this turn of events'. The only result will be that some people in the community will pay more for their children's education and some schools will become less and less open to fewer and fewer people.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that the debate is advanced by terms such as 'hit list' and some of the other emotional language with which the member for Torrens couched his explanation of the question.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: And the honourable member went to one such school herself, too. She has a special interest in—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have thought that the needs base concept of funding non-government schools was very well established, well accepted and supported during the election. It has certainly been argued and put to the test over a considerable time. This Government and the Federal Labor Government were elected with a firm commitment, clearly stated and discussed, for needs base funding of non-government schools, and that is the policy which is being implemented. Talks of 'hit lists' and so on are just an emotional way of attempting to distort an argument on a very sound principle of public funding. The reason for public funding of non-government schools has been well debated and philosophically argued very strongly since the time our State education system was established over 100 years ago.

One will recall that in those days and in fact in the intervening years until the 1960s the concept was that there should be no funding to non-government schools. One either paid the premium to obtain special non-government style education as it was perceived or one took advantage of the system as provided by the State. Since the 1960s agreement has been reached that it is proper and appropriate for non-government schools to be funded. My Government supports that principle as does the Federal Government, but we have always supported it on the basis that those funds must be directed to needs, looking after the disadvantaged in the community, and those schools with a particular lack of facilities and finance.

I would suggest that, having shared the same education at the same school as the member who asked the question, I am surprised that the headmaster is saying that such a school could become elite. It has been a fact of life over the years that it is, but I would hope that schools such as that, which are very generously endowed indeed (and I readily concede that the education I was fortunate enough to receive at that school was one that I value very highly),

have particular responsibilities to the community. In other words, it cuts both ways. It is not a case of those schools stating, 'You must fund us or we will become elite.' It is surely a case of those schools stating, 'We have something special to offer in terms of endowment and resources, and we will try to make that available more generously to more sections in the community.' The obligation goes both ways.

STEWART COMMITTEE

Mr GREGORY: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy any information on the costs associated with the operations of the advisory committee on future electricity generation options, better known as the Stewart Committee, which ceased operating after a year of deliberation?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the member for Florey for some forewarning in this matter, which has enabled me to get together the necessary information to answer his question. First, I must say that, given the magnitude of the Stewart Committee's task, its work was completed at a bargain basement price. Total outlay for the full year of activities was \$56 892, comprising the Chairman's and other consultants' salaries, travel and other expenses, printing and support expenses from the Department of Mines and Energy.

On the credit side, sales of the committee's various reports have yielded \$3 685, leaving us with a net cost of \$53 257. The fact that most of the committee's membership comprised senior officers of Government departments and authorities obviously assisted in keeping the costs down, as these members were not entitled to any additional remuneration. As well, these departments and authorities made major contributions to the committee's work in researching various matters which needed to be addressed. I am proud to say that the net cost is a very modest outlay when considered in regard to the reports produced by the Committee and the benefits likely to flow from its recommendations.

TRANSPORT FARE CONCESSIONS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: My question is to the Minister of Transport. When Cabinet considered the State Transport Authority's fare increases for 1984-85, what was the projected operating deficit for the STA for this year, and did the Authority recommend to the Minister the abolition of free travel for pensioners and the unemployed? The State Transport Authority's operating deficit has escalated at an alarming rate. It has risen from \$63 million in 1981-82 to \$75 million in 1982-83, and now to over \$80 million, I understand, for 1983-84, although the Government is keeping the deficit for last year a very closely guarded secret. The Auditor-General's Report shows that the Government actually paid \$92 million to the operating costs of the STA in 1982-83, well above the deficit of \$75 million for that year. According to the Attorney-General's Report that sum of \$92 million was made up as follows: payment towards the STA deficit, \$65 million; payment for fare concessions, \$13 million; special grants, \$3 million; remission of loan liability, \$11 million—making a total of \$92 million.

An STA document provided to me in June indicated that the STA was proposing to abolish free travel for pensioners and the unemployed. So far the Minister has refused to deny that these people are about to lose their free travel. It is time that the Minister removed the anxiety that these pensioners and unemployed people now find themselves experiencing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the issue. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: All the matters that the member for Davenport has raised are under consideration by the Government. I suggest that the honourable member be patient and wait for the Budget discussion when he will find out the answers to all his questions.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

COMPUTER POWER

Mr FERGUSON: My question is to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Can the Minister inform the House of any contract that the South Australian Government has with the firm Computer Power? Will Computer Power provide services to local firms from data extracted from South Australian Government sources? What benefit to the South Australian Government is involved if a contract has been negotiated with this company, and can the Minister assure me that no overseas typesetting will be involved as a result of any contract taken with this company?

I have received correspondence from the New South Wales branch of the Printing and Kindred Industries Union informing me that a company called Computer Power is using a computerised legislation retrieval system from the Victorian, New South Wales, South Australian and Commonwealth Governments to provide a service to be sold to legal firms for investigation and research of various pieces of legislation. I understand that Dr Harry Rossiter, ex New South Wales Parliamentary Counsel, is employed on an advisory basis by the New South Wales Attorney-General in association with a Mr Dennis Murphy apparently to oversee the introduction of this service.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer it to my colleague and obtain a report.

TILLEY PARK LAND

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give me an assurance that I can in turn pass on to all concerned with Tilley Park, in Golden Grove, that the Government will provide additional land to that park? The Minister would be aware that I wrote to him some weeks ago on this matter, as I had been approached by many constituents, sporting organisations and representatives of the management committee of Tilley Park, seeking my assistance in having the Government grant a portion of the land that is presently held for the proposed Golden Grove development to enable the present park area to be expanded.

The land sought is immediately adjacent to Tilley Park and is part owned and controlled by the Government as a section of the proposed Golden Grove development. Tilley Park is used both for organised sport and various forms of individual recreation. It is also the site of the annual Golden Grove show, which attracts thousands of visitors each year. The present area of land is used completely when the show is held, purely and simply for the stalls, displays and organised competitions. The area is ill served in relation to car parking facilities and in the past competitors in and visitors to the Golden Grove show have been able to park their vehicles on the Golden Grove development land.

If the Golden Grove development goes ahead as presently planned, that land will no longer be available, and this will create tremendous problems for those wishing to park their vehicles adjacent to the showground. It will also mean that the quiet, attractive suburban streets surrounding the area will become virtual parking stations. This will undoubtedly

create problems for local residents because unfortunately many people are most inconsiderate when trying to find parking spaces as close as possible to public functions. Unless car parking space is made available it has been put to me that the numbers attending the Golden Grove show will drop significantly. Additionally, further space is needed within the park itself for the expansion of existing sporting facilities.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is supposed to be asking a question and he sought leave to give an explanation, not to go into debate. I hope the honourable member will refrain from going any further with a debate.

Mr ASHENDEN: It was not my intention to debate the matter. What I am putting to the Minister are the points that have been put to me by my constituents and these are points they have asked me to place before the Government as reasons for the Government's acceding to the request I am placing before the Minister.

It has been put to me that Tilley Park is adjacent to a very rapidly expanding area and that there will be an even greater demand placed on it over the coming years. Again, my constituents have advised me that the park is presently encompassed by open land which is partly controlled by the South Australian Government in its involvement in the Golden Grove development programme. It has been put to me that the Government has the power to ensure that some of this land—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not want to be hard on the honourable member for Todd, but he is going far beyond an explanation. He is going into great detail and debate. Unless the honourable member can come back to an explanation, leave will be withdrawn.

Mr ASHENDEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, the points I am raising are those that have been put to me by my constituents.

An honourable member: Did you write to the Minister?

Mr ASHENDEN: I wrote to the Minister weeks ago and I have not had a reply. I would make one further point—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member asks whether I can give him a guarantee in relation to the matter he has raised. The answer is, no, I cannot give a guarantee, nor am I ruling out the possibility that some or all of what he asks for will be granted. For the benefit of members, the area of land to which the honourable member refers is part of that large area of land earmarked for development as part of the Golden Grove venture, in furtherance of which the Government is currently in close discussions with Delfin Management Services with a view to a joint venture being negotiated.

Mr Ashenden: They have agreed to give the land.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have to respond to that unruly interjection; I am afraid—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister should refrain from answering interjections.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Perhaps I can take up the burden of the question the honourable member has asked in this way: the honourable member would not have known, I suppose, that only this morning, the Mayor, the Clerk and certain other councillors from Tea Tree Gully met with me to discuss a wide variety of matters in relation to these negotiations with Delfin which are very close to finality, and naturally this matter was raised. I checked and in fact Delfin have not agreed to the request that the honourable member has made, nor indeed is Delfin in a position to agree because the actor in this matter will eventually be neither Delfin nor the Government but a joint venture which involves both of those agencies in equal partnership.

I have said that I can give no guarantee at this stage in view of the negotiations that are proceeding, nor am I

ignoring the request which the honourable member, along with various other people, has made to me. I point out that in the normal subdivisional process a provision for a 12.5 per cent open space has to be made available and indeed the final shape of the joint venture would probably amount to something rather more generous than that. A good deal of open space will be made available to the City of Tea Tree Gully simply through the normal subdivisional process. However, I am aware of the concern that some people have expressed. We are not ignoring it in the continuing negotiations that are taking place.

HOUSING ACTIVITY

Mr PLUNKETT: Is the Minister of Housing aware of a report by the CSIRO into the impact of housing expenditure on employment, and in particular its conclusion on the beneficial effect that results from increased housing activity for the general work force?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, I am aware of the report and in fact read it with great relish. It was prepared for the Australian Housing Research Council by Siromath Pty Ltd—the CSIRO's Division of Mathematics. Its object was to determine the extent of job generation caused by increased expenditure on housing programmes. As stimulation of the housing industry has been a major plank in this State Government's economic platform, the information provided by this report was naturally of great interest to me. This was a most disciplined investigation, and the report, I am sure, will be duly considered as an authority on the matter.

While there are many valuable figures provided in the report, I believe the most important to note is the one which says that, for every \$1 million spent on housing, 112 jobs are created in the economy. The report says that, on average, every job in dwelling construction generates another job through production in supplying industries, and up to a further four jobs when spending of wages paid is taken into account. This obviously confirms what is happening in South Australia, where there has been rejuvenation of the housing industry through direct Government action and where unemployment has fallen and is now the second lowest of all the Australian States.

MARION BAY REEF

Mr MEIER: Will the Minister of Marine take immediate action to ensure that appropriate safety measures are instituted in the vicinity of the Marion Bay reef, in St Vincent Gulf offshore from Edithburgh, so that there is minimal likelihood of any further pleasure craft or fishing vessels running aground on the reef or the shoal? On 10 April 1984 the Marion reef lighted beacon or buoy was removed by the Commonwealth Marine Operations Division. The Federal Minister for Transport (Hon. Peter Morris) has stated that:

... The South Australian Department of Marine and Harbors was aware of the proposals to withdraw the Marion reef buoy and raised no objection.

He further stated that:

State Governments have responsibility for the safety of local pleasure craft and fishing vessels.

Within two months of the removal of the buoy, namely, on 10 June of this year, a yacht ran aground on the Troubridge Shoal, the occupants being unaware they were so close to the Marion reef because of the lack of the buoy. A police launch had to be brought across from Adelaide to aid the yacht, which thankfully was freed almost a day later.

This area has been renowned for shipwrecks over the years, with at least 17 major wrecks or groundings having occurred prior to the installation of the recently removed Marion reef lighted buoy and many lives being lost in earlier years. At a time when excessive emphasis on safety is occurring in industry, on the road, in the home, and at work, it is essential that appropriate action for safety in St Vincent Gulf is taken before an inevitable tragedy occurs.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for the question and appreciate his concern. I am not aware of the matter that he has raised, but I shall be happy to investigate all the details he has given and bring down a report as soon as possible.

HOCKEY GROUND

Mr WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport received representations from the South Australian Hockey Association in relation to the provision of a synthetic playing surface in this State?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The letter has nothing to do with the question.

Mr WHITTEN: Will the ignorant sod shut up! Recently, while attending the under-21 Australian Hockey championships on Hart Reserve, in my district, my attention was directed to the need for a hockey field with a synthetic surface in this State. I understand that, if South Australia is to attract national and international championships in the future, a hockey field with a synthetic surface must be provided. I am sure that over recent days the Minister has watched hockey being played at the Olympic Championships on the type of surface to which I refer. I am also sure that he will agree that, if South Australia can have an astro-turf hockey field, it will be an acquisition.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I have discussed this matter with representatives of the South Australian Hockey Association and I have also received a letter from the member for Hanson—

Mr Mathwin: How about me?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: —and others concerning the provision of a synthetic surface for hockey players in this State. This is a matter of priority for the Department of Recreation and Sport and we need financial assistance from the Federal Government before we can give a watertight guarantee concerning the provision in this State of such an expensive surface. Over the last three years the ISSF programme has provided part of the funding for the construction of the aquatic centre at North Adelaide. That is one of a number of achievements in respect of sporting facilities, and in a few weeks time there will be the international softball diamond, in which the member for Hanson is interested, at West Beach. In this regard we must assess priorities and much depends on the provision of finance by the Federal Government. Western Australia was able to get a synthetic surface funded by the Federal Government because of the diversification of the activities of the Federal Sports Institute. Victoria was also assisted financially by the Federal Government in the provision of a synthetic surface in that State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am surprised to hear the interjections from members opposite, because I thought that they supported the efforts of the Hockey Association in this respect. I am also surprised, because I thought that I was in their good books.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Although I should ignore the interjections, I must say that I thought I was in the good books of Opposition members.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am coming to the point where I will have to cross the floor because, as Secretary-Treasurer of the Enfield District ALP Club, I have received, on Legislative Council notepaper, the following letter:

I am writing to you—

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

An honourable member: Would you like an extension of time?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Perhaps I can bring the House to order!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is a reflection on the Chair.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): By leave, I move:

That one week's leave of absence be granted to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: During the absence on leave of the Clerk under Standing Order 30 his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant (Mr D.A. Bridges), and I have appointed Mr G.R. Wilson to carry out the duties of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That for the next two weeks the House meet at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, 11.45 a.m. on Wednesday, and 10.30 a.m. on Thursday; and, if the House be sitting at 1 p.m. on any of those days, the sitting shall be suspended for one hour.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I move:

That the draft Address in Reply as read be adopted.

His Excellency the Governor's Opening Speech outlined the programme of action that has been followed by this Government since its accession to the Treasury benches in November 1982, as well as the programme to be implemented. Indeed, his address to the Parliament was a continuation of work that was continued and outlined in his address to the Parliament in 1983. It was the implementation of policies that saw our Party win in November 1982. The people rejected the outdated policies that were outlined by the Party on the other side of the House. Unfortunately, when we regained office, we found that the Treasury was bare. I wish to remind the House of the following comments made by the Premier on 14 December 1982:

In August the previous Government brought down a Budget which it claimed aimed at a balance on the Consolidated Account. Admittedly, this balance was to be achieved after an expected \$42 000 000 deficit on recurrent operations was compensated for by diverting an equal sum from capital works funds, a pattern of financial juggling with which we have become all too familiar. However, the Treasury review now indicates that this forecast is hopelessly inaccurate, particularly as regards recurrent expenditure. Indeed, I must say that the picture is far worse than I had ever contemplated.

My Government now finds that the deficit on recurrent operations will exceed the estimate made by the former Treasurer in August by a minimum of \$30 000 000.

This was said only four months later. The Premier continued:

That is, without any additional calls on Government expenditures, without taking into account the commitments of the new Government, and assuming no increases in costs for the remainder of the financial year, the deficit on recurrent operations will be approximately \$72 000 000.

Any additional costs, either from price rises or increased wages and salaries, will of course add to this deficit. Unfortunately, the former Government seriously miscalculated the timing and the impact of movements in wages and salaries and, as a consequence, the round-sum allowance set aside for such increases was inadequate. It has already been fully committed and indeed it will require an additional \$5 000 000 to cover the rises already awarded by the courts.

Consequently, the blow-out of the deficit on recurrent expenditure could be as high as \$55 000 000, to give a recurrent deficit for 1982-83 of some \$97 000 000. Unfortunately, Treasury can give no indication that this deficit is likely to diminish during the next few years.

That was the legacy that our Party had when it gained Government in 1982. That legacy was created by an inept Party that went into Government on the premise that it was the natural money manager of the governments in Australia, that it knew how to do it and that Labor Parties did not know. When it came into Treasury it found that the stewardship of the Labor Party in nearly 10 years of Government before its election had been very tight. Its expenditure had been on essential items and few dollars if any had been wasted.

All that the Liberals could come up with was to sell off Government enterprises and to do away with Government works. They deliberately established the run-down of the Public Buildings Department. They gave contracts out to their friends whilst Public Buildings Department workers were sitting around in workshops idle. It was a policy based on the premise that they knew best and the rest of the people did not understand. When it is considered that that policy was applied to all the Government departments, it is easy to see why, when we were able to achieve Government, the State was nearly bankrupt. If we had continued on the course the Liberals had outlined in the 1982-83 Budget, this State would have been bankrupt: that is how much they knew and understood about money matters.

They have not learnt—they have not learnt one little bit. One only has to look at a press clipping from the *Advertiser* of 30 April reporting a promise by the Leader to sell off the road liner to save a million, to sell the inefficient River Murray Irrigation Service, which he said provided water to private enterprise; and to sell off the laundry. He also said that half of the Cabinet—and I assume that that half of the then Cabinet is still here—of the former Government did not have a clear idea of the plan and direction of that Government. I suggest that their policies were that crook that they would not want to have any idea of what they were up to. They were selling off Government enterprises to look after some people.

On 1 May the *Advertiser* has a report relating to statements of the Leader of the Opposition as follows:

Further plans to reduce Government involvement in private industry include:

- Examining the transfer of the Mapland Government map supply service.
- Disposal of significant sections of the Woods and Forest Department plant nursery and sales division. Mr Olsen said while certain plant propagation and research was vital, much of the present operation already was being provided by private firms.
- The disposal, on a case-by-case basis, of commercial properties by the South Australian Housing Trust.
- Calling of tenders to do all cleaning for State Government hospitals.
- Disposal of the State Clothing Corporation.

The amazing thing is that the Opposition wants to sell off Government enterprises which are essential to the well running of this State and which are running well financially.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: It is not nonsense, it is fact, and it is something that members opposite cannot understand. Bankrupt ideas are so engrained in them that they will be in Opposition forever. People have rejected the concept of selling off the farm. Members opposite want to give Mapland away because they think the people who take it up will make a bundle of money out of it, and they will slug South Australians for the cost of getting maps.

The Woods and Forests Department is very profitable. It operates one of the best forestry reserves in South Australia. It has most competent officers, and operates one of the biggest saw mills in the southern hemisphere. Its officers are so competent that they are in demand in south-east Asia, Japan and also the Middle East because of their expertise and experience in managing forests. Whilst it is true that the nursery *per se* in the Woods and Forests Department may not be cost effective, it provides a very good service to the people of South Australia. If it was not for the ability of the Woods and Forests Department to develop the propagation of native species of plants, we would not have had a growing demand by the population of South Australia for Australian native plants, because at one time the only place one could obtain those in any quantity was from the Woods and Forests Department, and that is not that long ago. What has happened is that private nurseries have got on to the band wagon, and those people who are interested in the propagation of native plants would know that the better quality plants come from the Woods and Forests Department. If this facility were to be taken away from the Woods and Forests Department it would just be economic vandalism.

Another aspect is that the farming community uses the Cavan facility of the Woods and Forests Department to purchase timber products and plants. It is a very profitable concern that operates extremely efficiently at a high profit rate. This contrasts with the situation when the Liberals were in Government. The Woods and Forests Department had a plan to set up a wood distribution centre in Victoria which it would operate itself. It meant that the contract it

had with Gibbs Bright would be cancelled. That would save South Australia in excess of \$300 000 per annum. The Government of that time made a conscious decision not to allow that to happen. In other words, it wasted \$300 000 of South Australia's money when it could have come back into our funds when we were running at a deficit, as I said earlier, into tens of millions of dollars. That is how careful the Liberals are in the stewardship of the funds of South Australia.

As I said earlier, without the Woods and Forests Department nursery, and the skill, experience and advice it gives to the people of South Australia, we would not be experiencing the greening of South Australia. One only has to appreciate that the more Australian plants that are planted in suburban gardens, the more food that is provided for Australian fauna, and the more we will see those birds in our gardens, displacing the exotic species that were introduced from overseas.

I would think that a previous Premier of our State, a person revered by people opposite, would turn in his grave if he knew the facts about the South Australian Housing Trust. Tom Playford's initiatives in establishing the commercial side of the Housing Trust to attract industry to South Australia and to provide jobs for South Australians were well received, because many South Australians worked in factories and commercial premises provided by the Housing Trust. Indeed, if the Housing Trust had not provided those commercial premises we would have seen many of those jobs disappear or not eventuate. Yet, the people opposite want to get rid of them. One can only construe that they are looking at getting rid of jobs in the State.

I turn now to hospital cleaning tenders. It has been shown that by proper management the services provided in hospitals are as cheap or efficient as those provided by contract. Our Government has insisted on proper management of those services. One only has to go to the schools and see the new contract cleaning system implemented by the previous Government and compare it with the previous arrangement to see the great difference in quality. It brings to mind the fact that when the previous Government was elected some of its friends raced around on the Monday morning and said, 'Let us do the lift maintenance contract.' When one looks at their quotes one sees that they were \$1.25 million and that the Public Buildings Department did the same job for \$600 000. Private enterprise people simply could not understand that. It meant that that area of Government enterprise was properly organised and encouraged to be efficient.

The Opposition also wants to dispose of the State Clothing Corporation. Let us think about that. When the Opposition was elected to Government, the State had a surplus in its coffers, but it did not take it long to run that down. The State Clothing Corporation was operating efficiently when the Opposition achieved government. However, the then Government deliberately set out on economic sabotage. Proper management of the Roadliner has reduced its outlay to the extent that it will become profitable. In reading, seeing and listening to the Opposition talk about how it would sell off these inefficient operations, I would have thought that it would welcome the closure of the Port Lincoln slaughterhouse because of poor throughput and lack of support by the farming community and also because of the huge deficits.

I would have thought that the Opposition would support privatisation of the sea link to Kangaroo Island but, no, its members ran around complaining about cost increases so that a reasonable return on money could be obtained. It seems that they have a double standard when it comes to these things. They want to sell only the profitable organisations to their friends so that they can create a monopoly and hurt South Australians. If they ever achieve Government,

they will deliberately go out and ensure that a number of Government organisations become unprofitable. That policy has been rejected by the people of South Australia as it has been rejected by the people of Australia, because the Opposition's Federal counterparts want to sell off bits and pieces operated by the national Government. All that policy would do is create a loss of confidence in this State, a loss of jobs and income, and cause irresponsible management.

Talking about irresponsible management, I now want to refer to drought relief. Members opposite claim that they support the farming community: they make a lot of noise about that. But, in the 1981 to 1983 period we experienced one of the biggest droughts in our State's history. It was very severe and caused considerable economic hardship, yet in this Chamber in 1982 during the Estimates debates, when the Minister of Agriculture was asked about provisions within the accounts for drought relief, we were told that an allowance would come from Treasury and that there was no need to provide for it. However, we were in the grip of one of the most serious droughts we had ever experienced in this State, so much so that during the summer following those Estimates Committees we had the Ash Wednesday fires throughout our State which caused considerable devastation.

I am not suggesting that that was caused by our friends opposite, but I mention it to illustrate just how serious the drought was. In the South-East, in order to determine the extent of fire danger, people generally take into account wind, temperature, moisture level on the ground and the moisture in a 50 mm piece of round wood on a tree. By January in that year they had to start taking into account the moisture content of a piece of round wood of 75 mm, because the content in the 50 mm wood was no longer measurable, which illustrates how dry it was. Yet, the Premier, in his address to this Parliament on 14 December, had this to say:

This latter category is most disturbing. In 1982-83 the South Australian Government will have to find \$9 000 000 for drought relief, yet no allocation was made in the Budget for such expenditure. However, the former Minister of Agriculture has made clear that this oversight was of no consequence to him.

In the *News* of 19 November he was quoted as having said:

'... the money was there—I had Cabinet approval.' ... 'The former Premier, Mr Tonkin, gave me an open cheque book.' I am not in any way suggesting that persons affected by the drought should not get relief. However, given the predictions of a poor season this year, any responsible Government should have made some specific provision for drought relief. However, the former Government chose not to do so. Also, as the Under Treasurer has now reported, the money was not as easily found as the Minister's 'open cheque book' attitude would indicate.

That illustrates just how poor members opposite are as money managers. They wonder why they are sitting in Opposition! They had no plan. It illustrates their careless management and incompetence. They have such poor memories that they do not even acknowledge that it happened: they pretend that it never happened. However, the Governor's address outlined some very important areas of action to be undertaken during the next sitting. I refer to page 4, paragraph 8, of that address, which states:

My Government believes that the next priority is the important area of the protection of the employee in the work place from industrial injury and disease.

That is a very simple statement: it will bring about significant change in the work place. It will eventually save our State and our country millions of dollars. The whole concept of industrial safety and health in the work place is not given enough attention in Australia or in the world. One only has to consider the triangle effect. At the apex of the triangle are recorded deaths and at its base are the near misses: in between is the severity of injury as one progresses towards the apex. It is fairly well established practice that if one can

reduce the near misses by a percentage there is a proportionate effect upon the other injuries that may happen.

There is no argument that information is available with regard to occupational safety and health which will help reduce the effect of traumatic injury down to the barest limit. It can be done. However, it is not being done for a number of reasons. One is that employers do not place enough emphasis on it; the other is that many workers are encouraged to think that being safety conscious is not manly and strong. In some areas the trade union movement has not placed a significant emphasis on occupational safety and health.

This legislative initiative by our Government will address those areas. It will place an onus on three groups of people to take an interest in this area: the employers, the workers and the Government. Indeed, the international labour organisation has made it quite clear in its recommendations and conventions that, in occupational safety and health, it is only with the co-operation of those three groups that safety in the workshop will improve. What is the benefit to be gained from increased safety? It brings about less injury, and it reduces the cost to social services and the cost of suffering for workers and their families. It also improves productivity in the workplace because there is no disruption in the production process: trained people are available, because workers do not have to be retrained to replace injured workers.

It also means that money does not have to be spent rehabilitating workers. When confronted with the high costs of workers compensation, members opposite could only produce a policy that reduced the benefits to workers by 20 per cent, thus reducing the cost to employers. Everyone was supposed to be happy with that. In fact, it simply ignores a very important problem. In reality, that policy simply reduces costs for bad employers and loads the costs of injured workers on the social services system. That policy has no compassion whatsoever for the citizens of our State. I am often reminded of a small anecdote that was told to me by an insurance industry consultant of his visit in October to an employer at Glynde, South Australia.

The company was concerned about the high incidence of injury in the workplace. When the insurance representative challenged the employer he said, 'What are you complaining about? We have lost only 34 joints this year.' The employer was not talking about 34 joints of meat that one buys at the butcher shop; he was talking about 34 joints off the hands of workers. Those workers are deformed for life and nothing will grow back. The policies of the Opposition will encourage employers like that and they will allow them to continue to exist.

I am quite confident that the present Government's legislation will be supported by the employers and the trade union movement. I am sure they will support the improvements that will give workers rights and ensure that workers, employers and their supervisors are trained in this very important area. We will all benefit from the spin off from that, because we will have less disabled people in our community and more people who are able to participate fully in the life of our community.

Another very important reform to be undertaken by the Government this year relates to workers compensation. As I said earlier, the Opposition's only response to that is that we should reduce the benefits to workers, which will get them back to work and, therefore, solve the problems. However, that will not be the case. The only real way to reduce costs associated with workers compensation is to reduce the incidence of injury. I have heard many people over a period of time proffer their views on how to reduce the cost of workers compensation. One of the major beneficiaries is a doctor who operates a clinic in the near western suburbs of

Adelaide. He made it very clear to me and some other people on one occasion that the 1974 amendments to the Workers Compensation Act improved the benefits to workers and forced employers to rethink their attitudes to workers compensation and injury. It meant that for the first time employers were forced, through the high cost of insurance premiums, to examine the incidence of injury and undertake initiatives to reduce it. Indeed, that doctor participated in those initiatives. He advised us that as a result of those initiatives the incidence of injury dropped significantly in many workshops.

The initiatives even reduced costs in real or dollar terms at that time (remembering that this was in 1974 and 1979) for those employers who put their minds to it. That illustrates that if proper care is taken in this area there can be a significant reduction in costs. The Workers Compensation Act should ensure that injured workers receive effective rehabilitation. The current Act does not provide that. All it provides is a very good form of compensation for persons who have a short term injury and/or an injury which does not result in the loss of function or disability. The legislation also has a considerable number of other defects.

The lump sum payments are inadequate. The legislation does not adequately compensate people who have injuries of a long term nature. The total system is inefficient and does not provide an efficient delivery of services to injured workers. The current Act seems to work against workers being rehabilitated and returning to the work force. One of the major complaints we get today from workers is that when they suffer injury they are not able to get back into the work place. Our Government hopes that our amendments to the Act will overcome this problem. I am quite sure that the proposals that have been put forward, which certainly will be subject to legislation, will result in the speedy return of workers into the work force.

It has been estimated by those experienced in workers compensation that, if a person is not well on the way to recovery within six months as far as rehabilitation is concerned, he will never return to his work place. The whole aim and thrust of our proposal will correct that. Our proposal will also do away with a lot of the arguing that goes on, much to the detriment of injured workers. In relation to these matters a number of people are of the view that in occupational safety and health some employers are negligent in the provision of safety and working conditions for workers and, indeed, in some cases criminally negligent. I have raised with leaders of the employer organisations in this State the possibility of employers (the persons right at the top of the company) being subject to penalties similar to those that criminals receive if they are shown to be criminally negligent and cause injury. Their view is that they would appreciate that, because they believe that some employers are criminally negligent.

Negligent employers cost the other employers a lot of money, because they all have to pay the same premiums. The employers believe that the negligent employers should be stamped out. That will require a complete change of attitude by all members in this House. I do not think that the Opposition's approach to this has changed since the Hon. Mr Rowe was Attorney-General. When questioned by a United Trades and Labor Council delegation as to why there was no increase in penalties for infringement of safety standards, Mr Rowe responded that there was no need for penalties because employers were basically good people who knew what had to be done, what to do to provide a safe workplace, and would do it.

History has shown that they have never done it, that some employers have never cared or had any feelings at all for their workers. Their actions have shown that to be very true. The Labor Government has been in office for only a

limited period in South Australia, but has taken many initiatives which I will now outline to the House. I am referring only to a period of 12 months up to May of this year. The Government has provided the following benefits: direct job creation funding of \$77 million—7 000 people have worked on community projects; a tourism budget of \$5.7 million, an increase of 39 per cent; pay-roll tax concessions for small business—the exemption level was raised to \$160 000 in May 1983 and raised to \$200 000 in July 1984; bushfire relief—\$38 million grant from the Federal Government, an \$11 million interest-free loan over three years to assist the salvage of timber destroyed in the South-East; the Port Adelaide Redevelopment Project, including \$1.1 million for the Maritime Museum and Park and \$983 000 to establish the port as a commercial, residential and tourist centre by 1986; and racing industry assistance—stakemoney increases of \$750 000 to SAJC as well as increased support for all racing codes of \$7.6 million from the TAB.

Government initiatives which will continue to assist the economic recovery in South Australia include: the GMH Woodville rescue plan; the South Australian Enterprise Fund; the \$27 million Porter Bay marina and tourist resort at Port Lincoln; the Small Business Corporation; the \$150 million development on the railway station site; the Jubilee 150 Project which includes the Grand Prix bid; the greening of Adelaide plan; the Wakefield Press, a public interest publishing house; the provision of \$8 million for educational, historical, sporting, nautical and artistic projects; and the support of private enterprise so that we can attract the Australian Navy submarine replacement at a Port Adelaide site which, if successful, would mean a significant boost to the economy of South Australia as it would involve 600 construction jobs and 300 maintenance jobs.

Furthermore, the employers in South Australia have indicated that the economy is improving. A survey showed an employment increase of almost 2 per cent during the March quarter this year. Another survey by the Confederation of Australian Industry and the Westpac Bank shows that South Australian manufacturers fared better and that their expectations were higher than the Australian average in most areas, including output, employment and capital expenditure. The survey found that manufacturing industry in respect of new orders and output continued to increase during the March quarter of 1984. A survey conducted in March by the Metal Trades Industry Association, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Bank, found that business activity among South Australian respondents was busier than in the other States. That report found that 70 per cent of South Australian firms were indeed 'very busy'. The report found that whereas national sales declined by 3.7 per cent in 1983, sales by South Australian respondents rose by 4.8 per cent. A survey of 108 companies, undertaken in March by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry SA Inc., reveals a strong growth in both employment and sales performance in the March quarter. The survey reported: 'Without doubt the most significant change recorded in the March quarter survey has been the continued growth in full-time manufacturing employment.'

What has been the State Government's role in all this? In the 1983-84 State Budget it had a capital works programme of \$860 million, representing an increase of \$80 million. It had a housing programme of \$224 million, which represented an increase of 18.5 per cent. Apart from those initiatives, we have also seen some fairly encouraging improvement in conditions in South Australia. Total employment has risen. As the Premier made quite clear in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, up to June this year there has been an increase of over 20 000 jobs in South Australia. Because of initiatives undertaken by the Government the number of jobs has increased. It has not continued to decrease as was

the case under the previous Government. Further, unemployment has fallen to a level that is just on the national average.

In the industrial relations area the Government has taken a number of important initiatives. I want to refer to those initiatives in the industrial area which were announced prior to the Government's election to office and which the Government has achieved. Right of entry provisions under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act have been strengthened to allow union officials to interview existing and potential members and also to allow right of entry on to all premises whether they are owned by an employer bound by an award or not. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act has been amended to protect worker safety representatives from victimisation and discrimination, and power to award compensation has been provided for in addition to existing rights of reinstatement for union officials dismissed by reason of their union activities. Support was given to the ACTU and the Federal Government in the July 1983 national wage case to reintroduce a centralised wage fixing system providing for the indexation of wages to reflect movements in the consumer price index. The 38-hour week has been extended to the majority of Government departments and working parties to introduce the 38-hour week have been set up to pave the way for the implementation of the 38-hour week in the few areas remaining.

A Women's Adviser was appointed to the Department of Labour in July 1983. The committee inquiring into apprenticeship training is looking at ways and means to provide for greater access and equal opportunity for women apprentices. The specific employment of women has been actively fostered under the State and Federal job creation programmes. For the first time in the State's history a woman was appointed as an industrial magistrate. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act has been amended to remove sections dealing with penalties for strikes and lock-outs, and the Act has also been amended to stop actions in tort being taken where an industrial dispute is before the Industrial Commission and the processes of conciliation and arbitration have not been exhausted.

Following amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the UTLC has been given general rights of intervention into any proceedings which may affect the interests of its affiliates. The State Government intervened in the case before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to strongly support the ACTU in its job security claim and has also intervened in successive national wage cases to support the flow-on of full consumer price index movements. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act has also been amended to transfer the wrongful dismissal jurisdiction from the Industrial Court to the Industrial Commission and to provide for alternative remedies of re-employment in another job and/or compensation if reinstatement in the former position is not practicable. During that period the Government supported the ACTU job security case. That decision has now been handed down and is a land mark. It provides protection for workers at the work place. The Government's support for that was a very significant initiative.

I outlined earlier the proposals introduced into this House and implemented by the Government in the safety and health area, which have occurred because the Government had the foresight to establish a steering committee which has reported on the establishment of a tripartite occupational, safety, health and welfare authority; the role, powers and functions of a State Institute of Occupational and Environmental Health; and the role and functions of trade union managed occupational health clinics.

In relation to the implementation of industrial democracy, proposals are under consideration to provide for union

representation on Public Service departmental decision making committees. A Labour Market Research Unit was set up within the Department of Labour in August 1983. The unit is involved in all aspects of labour market research at the local level. The unit is producing a quarterly report for use by Government, trade unions and other interested parties.

That is a short reference to initiatives undertaken up to May this year by my Government in industrial relations and if one wishes to examine all the other initiatives my Government has taken, they would fill a large book. I would suggest that the Government is on the right track. I am sure we are on the right track because when one looks at recent Gallup polls and examines the popularity of the Parties over a period it will be noticed that since 1981 members opposite have never had a popularity rating higher than 40 per cent. However, the Labor Party has had a popularity rating of over 50 per cent since February 1981 and in only three periods did it drop below 50 per cent and on each of those occasions it dropped to 48 per cent. The latest Gallup poll indicates significant support for our Party, 56 per cent for the Labor Party and 33 per cent for the Opposition. I would suggest that that shows that the Opposition is on the wrong track and we are on the right track and that our actions have the general approval of the public in South Australia. The same poll shows that at the moment the Leader of the Opposition has an approval rating of 38 per cent, a disapproval rating of 37 per cent and 25 per cent do not know what to do with him. My Leader has an approval rating of 53 per cent, a 28 per cent disapproval rating, with 15 per cent not having an opinion. The available figures show that the approval rating for the Leader of the Opposition was highest in the March/April quarter of 1983, when it was 47 per cent. Ever since then he has been working away at it and he has reached 38 per cent. It has been a steady decline and if it keeps on going down he will not be there much longer. I support the motion.

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): In seconding the motion I want to say that normally the member for Unley would be speaking in this position in the speaking order but he is not present in the House today because of illness and I am therefore taking his place. I would like to give the House an overview of Public Accounts activities in Australia which I think is not only interesting in terms of a compendium of events but because it indicates an evolution of Public Accounts activities and thinking over the years.

The history of Public Accounts Committees started in the 1860s with the Gladstone Government in Great Britain with what they called the circle of accountability whereby the Parliament, having approved of money being allocated to Governments to do certain things, then sent a Public Accounts Committee out to make sure that those things had in fact been done. That was followed in Australia in 1895 when the Victorian Government set up a Public Accounts Committee. The Commonwealth was next in 1913, 12 years after the Commonwealth was set up, and the interesting thing about the Public Accounts Committee in the Commonwealth was that it was suspended during the Depression as a cost-saving measure by the then Government.

The new committee at the Commonwealth level was not started up until 1951 and it did not hold its first public hearing until 1953. There was then a very considerable break until 1970 when Tasmania and Western Australia started Public Accounts Committees. The South Australian Public Accounts Committee is the baby because it was set up only in 1972. Queensland has no Public Accounts Committee but interestingly it has 83 Auditors-General, 82 of whom

are fiendishly masquerading as members of Parliament only to confuse the Public Service in that State.

The range in the development in the Public Accounts Committees is worth taking in reverse order, that is, starting with the least developed committee first because it is also a virtual portrayal of the development of Public Accounts Committees throughout Australia's history, and of course we have to start with Queensland, which actually has no Public Accounts Committee.

The Tasmanian Public Accounts Committee is the next least well set-up committee. The committee is called the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Accounts. It has averaged five reports a year and it has not yet published an annual report. The staff of the committee comprises a part-time officer of the Tasmanian Parliament. I think from memory it is the Clerk of the Parliament, who gets \$2 000 to \$3 000 a year extra to act as part-time secretary to the committee. Under those circumstances it is not terribly surprising that the committee seldom delves very deeply into affairs. It just does not have the skills or the staff to do so. That is the way in which most Public Accounts Committees started and the Public Accounts Committee in Tasmania is at least famous for one of its inquiries. That particular inquiry was into prison officer absenteeism which produced what is probably the most interesting question I have seen in Public Accounts Committee history virtually anywhere. The committee had in front of it a witness who was a hale and hearty young man in his twenties, very athletic looking, who was a prison guard at one of the Tasmanian prisons. The question reads as follows:

We are investigating overtime and the way the salaries are being made up at the prison. We note that, in your case, in the last year you have had an infected foot; migraine; stomach cramps; an investigation of the stomach pain; stomach cramps again; and then again; flu; bronchitis, and bronchitis again; flu; food poisoning; a sprained knee; flu again and again; a bruised tailbone; diarrhoea; a medical condition—I do not know what this is; a pinched nerve twice, a migraine headache, a pinched nerve in the back, twice; flu again, a gastro; nose bleed; dysentery; gastroenteritis; flu; vomiting and diarrhoea; severe headache; tonsillitis; swollen glands. I also notice that you have had six medical certificates. Could you explain why you are so sick?

The answer was:

I have just had a bad run.

The Public Accounts Committee in Tasmania ran a number of reports in 1983 on social security, school cleaning, restoration of Port Arthur, prison officer absenteeism (the report I have just mentioned), State Library disposal of material, and stock valuation by the Supply and Tender Board. There have been no changes in the committee for virtually the last 13 to 14 years.

The next committee in order of ascending importance is the West Australian committee, which produced five reports in 1983 after having produced 22 reports in its 13 years of existence. The staff comprises a part-time secretary, also an officer of the House, a full-time research officer and part-time secretarial services as required. The last few reports were on the Land Marketing Board, West Australian Film Council, Grain Pool of West Australia and its first annual report in its 14 years of existence. It is in the process of changing to a Public Accounts and Expenditure Review Committee, and recently the Government dropped a proposal for a new Public Accounts Committee in favour of amending the Standing Orders of the Parliament. As members would know, the South Australian Committee is set up under an Act of Parliament, not under Standing Orders of this House. The next committee, again in ascending order, is probably a tie between South Australia and New South Wales.

The New South Wales Public Accounts Committee is somewhat better served with staff than is the South Australian Public Accounts Committee, but changes are in the

process of being made. The New South Wales committee presents, on average, three reports a year, but it is aiming to present 12 this year. It has a permanent staff of two research and two clerical officers, while another research officer is seconded from the Auditor-General's Department. The latter position is permanent, although the personnel may change. That committee can request the services of advisers for specific inquiries, and it has four such advisers at present. The three most recent reports from that committee concern the 1981-82 Auditor-General's Report, the Grain Sorghum Marketing Board, and the accounting and reporting requirements for statutory bodies. The first annual report (issued after 14 years existence of the committee) and a report on the superannuation liabilities of statutory authorities are due to be presented.

The New South Wales committee is wrestling with a fairly common issue that has plagued Public Accounts Committees throughout Australia: how to follow up its own reports. The problem is that such committees can easily become paper tigers in that, after their report is presented and the Minister and the department are prepared to tough it out in Parliament for a few days, it is lost and nothing more is heard about it. The South Australian solution to this problem is probably the most satisfactory, so much so that, if I were talking about it in mathematical terms, I would probably talk about it in terms of elegance. The other interesting thing about the New South Wales committee is that it is considering joining with the Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee to inquire into tertiary education in New South Wales. There are major problems in inquiring into the tertiary education sector, because it is set up by the State but funded by the Commonwealth, so that sector tends to think that it can escape investigation by both State and Commonwealth Government committees.

The South Australian Public Accounts Committee averages four or five reports a year. Its most recent reports include an interim report on the Highways Department and reports on the School Dental Service and on the Treasurer's minute on the 19th, 20th and 23rd reports (part of the follow up to which I referred earlier when dealing with the New South Wales committee), as well as the committee's annual report for 1983. The committee at present is inquiring into the Highways Department, the Country Fire Services, the light motor vehicles of the Services and Supply Division, the post-implementation reviews in respect of computers, and light motor vehicles of the Department of Agriculture. The South Australian Public Accounts Committee is staffed by three research officers and one shorthand-typist, while at present it is also assisted by one short-term seconded officer. Major changes are possible in respect of this committee as a result of the deliberations of the Joint Select Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedures of Parliament. I cannot indicate the likely changes that may result because that Select Committee has not yet brought down its report.

In my opinion, the South Australian committee has managed to solve the problem of following up its reports. When it presents a report to Parliament, that report contains recommendations, and the Public Service Board then contacts the department involved and offers it help to formulate responses to the committee. The Public Service Board then reports on responses made by the department on its own activities, but it responds not to the Public Accounts Committee or to a member of Parliament but direct to the Premier. The Premier then responds by means of a report to the Public Accounts Committee, and the response from the Premier usually ends up in the annual report of the committee. That response to the committee's recommendations comes up annually for comment by the committee until the committee reopens the inquiry or discharges it.

The Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee is probably the best staffed of the Australian Public Accounts Committees, although it is not necessarily the most interesting. It produces six to eight reports a year, although it produced 20 in 1983, and has already presented one report in 1984. Its staffing is normally in a state of flux. There are about 12 permanent officers, headed by a secretary, and the current staff totals 16 or 17, including part-time and seconded officers. The staff includes a former judge, which indicates considerable legal back-up for the committee. The size of the committee is from 11 to 16 members, and the work of its subcommittees has increased. A subcommittee usually comprises six members. The Commonwealth committee has presented a report on HMAS *Tobruk* and has released follow-up reports on certain matters contained in the reports of the Auditor-General, such as defence, health, Norfolk Island, the Department of Primary Industry, and the rehabilitation services of the Department of Social Services. The Commonwealth committee is following up some of its earlier reports, and thus getting a second bite of the cherry.

The situation in respect of the Victorian Public Accounts Committee is probably the most interesting as a result of major changes made a year ago. Five investigatory Parliamentary committees were set up: an economic and Budget review committee, which is the nearest equivalent to our Public Accounts Committee; a public bodies review committee, which tends to look at Quangos or semi-government statutory authorities; a committee on social development; a natural resources and environment committee; and a legal and constitutional committee.

The Statutory Bodies Review Committee of the Victorian Parliament has produced interesting data. In South Australia, we have about 300 statutory authorities, depending partly on how one defines 'statutory authority', whereas Victoria has about 8 000, and they are composed in the most peculiar fashion imaginable. For instance, if a river in Victoria passes through more than one council area there will probably be a statutory authority in each council area dealing with the water flowing down the river through that area. Therefore, there may be up to 30 such statutory authorities for one river. Indeed, there was a wonderful situation where a council officer was also the secretary of the statutory authority dealing with one of the rivers. He would solemnly write a letter to himself, take it across the corridor, hand deliver it to himself, and sit down in his second office to carefully write himself a reply, picking up \$6 000 each year for that task.

While I was in Victoria, the Statutory Bodies Review Committee was inquiring into the approximately 34 ambulance services in that State. I was struck by the gentle and kind way in which the committee dealt with witnesses coming before it. For instance, a young man who had obviously misunderstood the role and intent of the committee was giving much evidence that was totally irrelevant to the subject of the inquiry. Indeed, had he appeared before the South Australian Public Accounts Committee he would have been metaphorically skinned and hung out to dry within minutes. However, the Victorian committee spent 30 minutes listening to him, kindly and politely, then dismissed him and paid no attention to what he had to say. The Economic and Budget Review Committee in Victoria is the nearest equivalent to the South Australian Public Accounts Committee. It has a staff of eight full-time and three part-time officers. Research staff tend to be seconded from various Government departments, and the committee has access to consultants and casual secretarial assistance as and when required. The most recent reports of that committee dealt with the Royal Southern Memorial Hospital and the rental of property by the Education Department, and there has been one of a series of reports produced on superannuation.

Ministers in Victoria are required to report back to the Government within six months of the report being tabled in Parliament. Reports that are due in Victoria are another superannuation report, a wine industry tax report, and the role of the Victorian Health Commission. It is a committee of 12 members which operates via subcommittees of three or four.

In all of these committees there are a number of generalised trends which I think are available to be looked at if one is interested in this area of work. The Public Accounts Committees do still and do still need to fulfil the Gladstonian role of checking on expenditure and making sure that expenditure has been dealt with.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Gladstone used to check up on many things.

Mr KLUNDER: Indeed, I am thankful to the honourable member for reminding me that Gladstone, 120 years ago, used to check up on many things.

Mr Olsen: I think the honourable member had certain things in mind.

Mr KLUNDER: I was trying to head him off! The Public Accounts Committee is different from a number of other inquiring bodies in at least three areas. The most important of these is probably the power to demand answers, and to demand those answers publicly. There are very few cases where public servants are required to face the full light of publicity and required to give answers to questions, and I think that it is an excellent way of making sure that they do their homework. It is also a committee which consists of both Government and Opposition members, and paradoxically that means that it tends to take a non-partisan line in its inquiries. Finally, of course, the committees are different in that they derive their power from the Parliament rather than from the Cabinet.

Another generalisation is the realisation by virtually all of the Public Accounts Committees that it is impossible to do comprehensive checks of the Public Service. For instance, in South Australia the Public Accounts Committee tends to look at fairly small parts of statutory authorities or Government departments. I worked out at one stage that it would probably take about 100 years to do the rounds and to have a comprehensive look at everyone. Consequently, if Public Accounts Committees wish to spread their influence more widely, they have to find different ways of doing it. The support, for instance, of the principles of programme performance budgeting, the support for internal audits or setting reporting and accounting requirements for statutory authorities are all indications of attempts by Public Accounts Committees to have a wider influence than just the particular section of the Public Service being looked at at any time.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think they need more teachers?

Mr KLUNDER: Definitely. It has been one of their problems for a long time, there have not been enough of them.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I understand in Victoria the Parliament is three-quarters full of teachers.

Mr KLUNDER: Yes, and is it not running well? Another trend is the move towards efficiency and effectiveness considerations in looking at departments and statutory authorities. In so far as I can discern a trend here, I think there has been a return to the basic issue of accountability and a retreat from the issues of efficiency and effectiveness. That is probably due to the fact that efficiency and effectiveness are what I loosely call second order concepts, and accountability is a much more primary concept.

After all, the first thing that one needs to establish is what a person, department or statutory authority is actually responsible for and, until one has established that, one cannot hold them accountable. It is only when this accountability and responsibility line has been established that one

is able to look at whether or not the accountability and the responsibility are being discharged in an effective and efficient manner.

Unfortunately, most Public Accounts Committees are finding that it is not possible to go to the second order of that concept. It is far too difficult often enough to establish whether or not a department or authority has clear lines of responsibility for which it can be held accountable, and that is obviously the first thing that Public Accounts Committees need to chase and to make sure has been done.

Other trends which are fairly nationwide at the moment are the increasing concern with QANGOS, the quasi autonomous non-government organisations, and I think there is a very correct increasing concern with these statutory authorities. If one, for instance, quotes the 1983 New South Wales Public Accounts Report on the Accounting and Report and Inquiries for Statutory Authorities, it states (page 1):

There are at least 300 significant statutory authorities in New South Wales. They employ four times more people than all Government departments. The 12 largest spend more than the Annual State Budget.

One has only to look at statutory authorities such as ETSA, in South Australia, to realise that the situation is probably not terribly different here.

Generally I think the trend over the past few years has been towards greater Parliamentary control, which reverses a trend towards the setting up of statutory authorities which has taken place over the past 80 years. Partly I think it is a response to tightening Party political control of Parliamentary activities. In earlier years Independents with the balance of power in their hands could demand an outrageous price for their support, and usually took their payment in terms of public expenditure on roads, railways and other public works within their electorates. Putting Government works of various kinds in the hands of independent statutory authorities was one way of coping with short term demands coupled with the threat of withdrawal of support by these Independents.

An interesting variation from this move towards greater Parliamentary control is occurring under the New Zealand Public Expenditure Committee, which is the equivalent of our Public Accounts Committee. If in New Zealand the Public Expenditure Committee is sufficiently impressed with the efficiency and effectiveness of a department it may give what is in fact a *de facto* commission for that department to roll over its budget into the next financial year; that is, to allow that department to keep any savings that it makes in the current year and to expend that in the following year within its own department rather than have to return the saved amount to Treasury.

It is somewhat difficult, I think, to predict what will become the next areas that the Public Accounts Committees of Australia are likely to become interested in, but there is nothing wrong with making some predictions and coming back in five years time to see what has happened to them. The South Australian foray into the post implementation review of the installation of computers has caught the interest of a number of other Public Accounts Committees, and I think that it is likely that they will follow suit.

It is possible that Public Accounts Committees will become interested in the fourth quarter syndrome, that is, the spending by Government departments towards the end of the financial year in order to avoid having their allocation for the next year diminished.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Do you think that they should be able to carry over funds?

Mr KLUNDER: There will have to be a great deal more attention paid to things such as the principles of programme performance budgeting before we can say that a department was efficient or effective enough to warrant that. I am not

sure that I would want to give my *imprimatur* to anything in this State at this moment. There is also the question of keeping revenue and expenditure rigidly separate and it may well be necessary at one stage to look at whether or not a net spending model may be a more useful one for certain departments than a revenue and expenditure model.

Finally, and perhaps punting rather widely at this moment, it would be nice to think that the Public Accounts Committee eventually would develop enough knowledge and skill to tell a department to put its budget in order of priority and to effectively challenge departments to defend the last 5 per cent of that budget.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I propose to deal with a number of issues of significance to South Australia. In particular I will discuss political consensus (where it is relevant and where it is an illusion); current levels of State taxation; the state of the South Australian economy and how we are faring compared with other States; whether the present Government is managing economic recovery as well as it should be; and the need for South Australia to broaden its economic activity away from domestic markets towards a more outward looking economic base.

Before proceeding to these important issues, I wish first to recognise the manner in which His Excellency the Governor is discharging his Viceregal duties. There is no doubt that in the two years since Sir Donald Dunstan took up residence at Government House, there are probably few towns in the State that he has not visited. Recently, he undertook an extensive tour of the north-west of the State with the Police Commissioner to acquaint himself with the work the Police Department is doing to improve liaison with Aboriginal communities in that area. This is very important and valuable work, initiated by a former Commissioner, Mr Salisbury.

The interest His Excellency is taking is appreciated, I am sure, by the Police Department. More generally, Sir Donald's desire to see people and places throughout South Australia can only enhance community appreciation and understanding of the important vice-regal role he is fulfilling. It is a matter for regret that many members of Parliament do not travel as widely within South Australia as the Governor is doing. It would certainly improve their understanding of the problems and the challenges facing South Australia if they did so. In recent weeks I have travelled widely in the Iron Triangle and the South-East. Before Christmas, I will visit Port Pirie and Mount Gambier again, as well as Clare and the Riverland, for shadow Cabinet meetings.

I suggest that some Government members should follow the example set by the Liberal Party because the tendency of this Government to ignore issues and needs in country areas of South Australia is causing growing anxiety and hostility. The way in which the Government has dealt with issues such as native vegetation clearance, the Kingston coal project, the closure of the Port Lincoln abattoirs, the abandonment of the Finger Point sewerage scheme, water and irrigation rates in the Riverland, and Kangaroo Island's transportation costs, to name just a few, has demonstrated complete contempt for the areas of our State which continue to underpin our regional economy, and to provide more than 54 per cent of our export income.

Country people are not the only ones being ignored by Labor Government policies. The people who paid the greatest penalty for the economic recession will now find that recovery also has its price. A wage fixing system which institutionalises cost of living increases as an automatic component of wage movements and last week's job security decision

by the Arbitration Commission are widening the gap between the haves and the have nots.

The current wage fixing guidelines and the job security decision are both fully supported by the South Australian Government. Government members who talk about consensus politics obviously cannot see beyond the four walls of this Chamber, because the growing divisions between the employed and the jobless and between the city and the country are just two examples of where consensus simply does not apply. In these cases, talk of consensus is rhetoric which ignores very many realities. The disciples of consensus—and certainly the Premier is one of those—claim copy-right for the use of 'strong recovery', 'renewed confidence in the future', 'reconstruction and rebuilding' and similar expressions about current economic trends.

The Premier talks about economic recovery as though he has just saved Crippen from the gallows. His attempts to puff up his own Government's contribution to recovery have all the originality of a Xerox machine. It is a fact that the Australian economy is on the move. But this is largely a result of the ending of the 1982-83 drought, the benefits of the 1983 wage pause which the Premier was noticeably reluctant to support, and the impact on activity resulting from international economic recovery.

The South Australian economy has followed the national economy along the recovery track. Whilst national recovery continues, South Australia will continue to benefit. That is to be greatly welcomed. The Governor's Speech nominated some of the projects which South Australia can point to as indicators of confidence in our economic future—projects such as accelerated petroleum exploration in the Cooper Basin; Roxby Downs; O-Bahn; the Morgan water filtration plant; the Adelaide railway station development project; Porter Bay; and the submarine project.

What is common to all these projects is that they were at least on the drawing boards, if not up and running, before the Premier took office. The best kept secret around town is that this Government has not had an original idea. So, if there is reason for confidence in our future now, that confidence has been justified for some time, and not just because the Premier took office in November 1982. At the same time, I commend the Premier for action he has taken to carry on with these developments, which were started by the former Liberal Administration.

Let us take the submarine project as an example. A group of South Australian businessmen had the foresight more than two years ago to see its potential for South Australia. The Chamber of Commerce and Industry moved quickly to undertake the initial research and other groundwork.

At a Government level, action has been taken subsequently to ensure that South Australia's case for this project is recognised. For that, I support the present Government. In doing so, I give it the sort of support which the Premier constantly denied to the former Government when we were trying to get Roxby Downs under way and when we were trying to get the Stony Point project off the drawing boards and into an actual development. While in Opposition, the Labor Party complained that the former Government moved too quickly on the Stony Point project. Now, the Premier cannot wait to get his hands on the massive increase in royalties the development of these liquids will generate.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They were a real impediment to progress!

Mr OLSEN: Well, we have had Roxby Downs as a mirage in the desert. It is a little more than that now. We had the Labor Party in Opposition voting repeatedly against that project and putting very significant hurdles in the way of major development projects brought on stream that they now champion. I do not deny that for them to see the light now is a good thing for South Australia, but let us put it in

perspective. The perspective is that all those major projects were the work of Liberal Ministers in a Liberal Administration. To date, we have not seen one original thought, idea, project or concept put into effect by this Administration.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They inherited it.

Mr OLSEN: They inherited a pretty good drawing board and plans in place and up and running to pick up and run with.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I will get to the Budget in a minute. I am glad that the Minister for Environment and Planning has raised the Budget and the figures of December 1982, which the Government continually ignores. I do not deny that these projects are good for South Australia. We, as a Liberal Opposition for the time being, will not act irresponsibly as indeed did the Labor Party when in Opposition.

I make these points because the Premier, in asking for consensus now, wants to ignore the fact that he refused it when he was on this side of the House. The sort of negative and disruptive tactics which the Labor Party adopted between 1979 and 1982 are not something which we, as a responsible Opposition, have repeated. We are not now turning a blind eye to some of the underlying reasons for confidence in the future of South Australia which we said were apparent while we were in Government. We have been proved correct by the passage of time. Some of the things I have said so far tonight demonstrate that we are prepared to support the present Government when it is acting in the best interests of the State. It is time the Premier recognised that.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: When it believes in equality of all citizens.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, yes, of all citizens of South Australia. It is also time that the Premier stopped pretending that consensus means agreeing with the Government all the time. We saw yet another example today in this House when we, as an Opposition, had a legitimate right to seek information from the Government. What did it do? Instead of giving the information as a responsible Government should—and a front bench has that responsibility to a Parliament—it attempted to turn the issue aside, because it did not know the answers, by making some point to the effect that the Liberal Party was trying to increase the numbers of protesters at Roxby Downs.

That is a fallacious argument with no substance or credibility. I suggest that if this Government is to act responsibly on the front bench it should get its act together better than that. One noticed, of course, that the Deputy Premier and Minister responsible for police services in this State was not capable of answering the question. The Premier had to prompt him repeatedly as to what sort of answer he should give as it related to the Roxby Downs project and the blockade which Young Labor is supporting quite firmly, not only in this State but around Australia.

Whilst that might be an embarrassment to them, they should not shy away from taking up the cudgels on behalf of this project. The fact is that it has received support at the ballot-box in South Australia on several occasions. It has now received bipartisan support, although belatedly on behalf of the Labor Party, for the project to proceed, and the Premier ought to have some strength. At least the Prime Minister is prepared to battle it out with his troops when he wants to get somewhere. However, this Premier is not prepared to battle it out with the Young Labor Association.

While I agree with the Government that the economy is recovering, for reasons largely beyond the control of any State Government, I ask the House to agree also that South Australia is not making the most of the economic recovery, and at a State Government level we are not managing economic recovery as well as we should be. In talking bullishly about the creation of 20 000 jobs in the last year,

the Premier does not go on to say that this rate of growth in employment has been below the national average. In the year to June, employment in South Australia increased by 19 900 or 3.7 per cent. The national growth was 3.9 per cent.

On the other side of the ledger, New South Wales had 3.9 per cent, Western Australia 5.2 per cent, and Queensland 5.7 per cent growth in employment. Our share of national employment growth was 8.1 per cent, which is below the 8.7 per cent it should be on a per capita basis. Nor should it be overlooked that, despite the advantages of the wage pause, the end of the drought and international recovery, South Australia still has 1 200 fewer people in employment than in November 1982 and 2 400 more registered unemployed than in November 1982, when this Government took office.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That doesn't sound like 21 000.

Mr OLSEN: It certainly does not sound like 21 000. Not only are we behind the national average but this Government has not got employment levels in South Australia back on the same keel as when it was elected. Now we have more unemployment in South Australia than when it took office, and I think that it should look at these figures and not pluck a figure out and ignore the reality of the situation.

At a national level, economic recovery will not be sustained unless wage restraint continues well into next year. This is absolutely vital if the recovery is to flow sufficiently into profits to encourage increased private fixed investment in the proportions necessary to create long term job growth. But as we know from previous experience in which our economic down-turns have been more prolonged than elsewhere, South Australia's economic performance does not perfectly mirror that of the rest of Australia. This is where State government policies are crucial, because, while we can continue to support wage restraint, we cannot by ourselves guarantee it. This is largely the function of national economic and political policies.

But there is much a South Australian Government, acting responsibly and realistically, can do to help industry in this State to position itself to firmly grasp alternative opportunities. In saying that, I do not believe that it is the role of a State Government to lay down what those opportunities are, although it must have a keen awareness of what they can be. Rather, the South Australian Government in the present economic climate should be taking every possible action to eliminate barriers to the ability of firms and entrepreneurs to recognise and grasp opportunities that arise. It should be creating an economic and political environment conducive to greater competition and greater entrepreneurship, for what is at stake is not just how South Australia benefits from the current economic recovery, nor even just how we cope with the effects of future fluctuations in Australia's economic fortunes.

What is fundamentally at stake is how we establish a basis on which South Australia's long term prosperity can be secured. The present Government has no answer to that challenge. For a number of reasons the Government has fumbled its chance. While the Premier, in his economic sermons to the people of South Australia treats us like an indulgent father giving his only child a chocolate, the reality is that his Government is not spoiling us with goodies. Rather, like a bottle of ketchup in a restaurant with a name for bad steaks, his soothing platitudes about recovery and reconstruction hide some major sins.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There will be plenty of indigestion at the end of it.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed there will, and in fact the community is experiencing that at the moment. I will deal first with taxation. In this House last Thursday, the Premier attempted yet again to misrepresent the facts about the largest tax and

charge hike in the history of this State—imposed by his Government, by a Premier who promised before the last election not to raise taxes or use charges as a form of backdoor taxation. But the facts the Premier cannot get around are these: State taxation increased last financial year by 21 per cent when Adelaide's c.p.i. rose by 3.6 per cent.

We have to recognise that the pay packets of South Australian workers rose by 3.6 per cent under a Labor Administration nationally, tying future adjustments with the c.p.i. movements. Therefore, wage packets went up by 3.6 per cent and will be tied to the c.p.i. in the future. State taxation went up by 21 per cent. In 1983-84, the average family also paid 26 per cent more in electricity tariffs, 18.4 per cent more for water and sewerage rates, and 36.5 per cent more in public transport fares. During the past 12 months, increases in State taxation and the major areas of State charges—electricity tariffs, water and sewerage rates and public transport—have cost the average family \$14.14 per week.

Mr Becker: They are starting to hurt.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, they are starting to hurt. They are really eating into the pay packets of South Australian workers. The Premier's abuse of the tax system is putting further pressure on our wages system. Governments are taking more and more of people's earnings. They have less and less of the money they earn to spend in the way they choose. In 1970, Federal, State and local governments' share of gross domestic product totalled 31 per cent. This year it is estimated to be 44 per cent. As governments get bigger, so they impose higher taxes and charges to fund their growth and so employees fight to maintain their after-tax incomes.

This escalating cost of government has serious implications for Australia's future economic growth because if wages cannot be contained our competitiveness will continue to erode and, with it, our standard of living, despite the Premier's obtuse denials last Thursday. Indeed, it will be difficult for the people of South Australia ever again to accept in good faith anything this Premier says about taxes and charges. He raised \$36 million more in State taxation last financial year than he budgeted for. There has never before been a miscalculation of such magnitude in this State's Budget. It is just \$5 million less than the total revenue the Premier estimated would be generated by increases in petrol, tobacco and liquor licences, stamp duty on insurance, the re-introduction of the gas tax and the new financial institutions duty.

What only compounds the Premier's financial mismanagement is the fact that very little of this tax bonanza has been applied to reducing the record Budget deficit that he has run up, meaning that Government departments have been allowed yet again, for the second year in a row, to exceed their budget allocations. The Premier's reply to all of this has not been to reject my figures or to address his failure to reduce the deficit, but to suggest that I am denying the Government the opportunity to benefit from economic recovery. The Premier says that as if his Government has created the pre-conditions for economic recovery in the first place.

As I have pointed out already, that is certainly not the case, but what the Premier is doing now is inhibiting that recovery by reducing the financial capacity of the private sector (the sector which employs 75 per cent of all South Australians) to translate recovery into investment in growth and jobs. It is clear that the Government's failure to limit its own spending is the paramount reason for rising taxes. The Premier has never challenged the figures I presented to this House in December 1982 (and neither has the Minister for Environment and Planning, I might add) to show that a continuation of Liberal Government would not have resulted in the enormous Budget deficit that he has run up.

The figures in the Treasury document signed by the Under Treasurer, Ron Barnes, that I tabled in this House in December 1982 clearly put beyond doubt that we did not leave the cupboard bare, and that we did not run up a massive Budget deficit. To this very day neither the Premier nor any of his Ministers have seen fit to question the figures. They know that they have no basis on which to do so and that we have documentation from Treasury which supports our position, apolitical impartial advice and documentation from Treasury which clearly supports the Liberal Party's contention. The massive deficit has occurred because Ministers and Government departments have run rampant; there has been no control on expenditure levels—and well the Government knows it.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: And it continues to mislead the public.

Mr OLSEN: Of course it suits the Government to try to create a public perception and to misrepresent the position and say that it is not responsible for the massive taxes and charges hike that has occurred in the past 18 months to two years. However, the public is becoming a little tired of the Government's passing the buck to us and recognises quite clearly who is responsible for the massive increases in taxes and charges inflicted on it. By some curious perversion of the democratic process, the Premier, in his increasing desperation, is now even attempting to deny the right of members of this Parliament to make representations on behalf of their constituents for Government spending on particular projects. That is one of his answers every time the tax question is raised. We got it again last Thursday.

The Premier conveniently ignores that it is the responsibility of elected members of this Parliament to make representations on behalf of their constituents and it is the responsibility of the Government to respond to those representations based on the priorities it is able to set within the finances available to it. During the time when the Labor Party occupied the Opposition benches, no-one made a greater contribution than did the present Premier to community misunderstanding about the capacity of Government to meet all the claims made of it. He constantly called for more spending on schools, hospitals, roads and other community services, and it was the Premier who promised that he could achieve that without raising taxes. Yet the Premier behaves now as if the fallacy in the claims he constantly made while in Opposition has only just become apparent.

The Liberal Party will be pleased after the next election to accept once again the responsibility for managing the State's finances. We have already shown that we can make a much better job of it than the present government. The mismanagement of Government finances is also showing up in Adelaide's rising cost of living as compared with that of the other States. A point overlooked in the latest consumer price index figures is that the contribution of State and local government charges to the total Adelaide consumer price index last financial year was almost three times higher than the average for the six capital cities. Policies of the present Government are also forcing up prices in other important areas.

The Real Estate Institute has just released figures which show that home prices in Adelaide are going up faster than in any other capital city. In 1983-84, home prices in Adelaide leapt by 25 per cent, according to the Institute's figures. In Melbourne the rise was 17 per cent, in Sydney 5 per cent and in Brisbane 3 per cent. The failure of the Government since its election to make available serviced building allotments in metropolitan Adelaide has been a major factor in forcing up home prices. Another factor is the ruthless determination of the union movement, supported by this Government, through inaction, to impose compulsory unionism on the building industry. One form of Government support

for this concerted campaign by the unions has been to require the Housing Trust to employ only union members on the building of houses under its Design and Construct Programme.

I shall now give the House some figures to demonstrate the extent to which this imposition of union conditions on building contracts is helping to significantly increase costs. Between May last year, and the latest design and construct tender call by the Housing Trust within the last fortnight, the contracted building cost for three types of homes has gone up by, respectively, 33.3 per cent, 26 per cent and 25.5 per cent. In one case, the dollar amount of the increase is more than \$12 000, and in the two other cases it is almost \$10 000. I am informed that while some differences between the specifications on these houses would increase the cost by just under \$1 000, a significant proportion of the total rise is due to labour costs. Of course, such rises are well in excess of the maximum home ownership grant of \$7 000 available from the Federal Government, more than wiping out its benefit. Young home owners have trade union officials, intent on forcing people to join a union, to thank for that.

What is even more reprehensible about this situation is the standover, bullying and blatant blackmail tactics being used. A number of cases have been referred to my office, but the employers involved have been reluctant to have them raised publicly because of their fear of further reprisals. Only last Friday a concrete pour costing \$15 000 was threatened when it was half completed, unless the on-site workers agreed to join a union. The previous week, a building site at Walkerville was threatened with a black ban unless subcontract bricklayers joined the union. Self-employed housing subcontractors are being denied the freedom to choose whether they should join a union. As I have pointed out, they are not the only losers.

More and more home buyers are being denied the opportunity to buy a home at a reasonable cost because of unacceptable and irresponsible union activity, supported by the Government, because of its silence and inaction. These cost rises seem to defeat the purpose of a recent campaign launched by the Department of State Development to attract more investment in South Australia. In the initial stage of that campaign the emphasis was on the lower cost of living in Adelaide, particularly in relation to home building.

In referring to the Department of State Development, I bring to the attention of the House the failure of that Department so far to be able to meet the objectives set for it by the Premier. Before the last election, the Premier promised to create as a flag-ship for his administration a single department to co-ordinate Government assistance for economic development in South Australia. However, in recent weeks, a number of business men have approached me to express concern about declining morale amongst senior officers in that Department. They have little access to the Premier. In fact, I detect growing discontent within the Public Service generally over the growth of another power elite within the Premier's Department, able to manipulate access to and influence with the Premier. We seem to be reverting to the old 'Policy Division' style of administration which was the hallmark of the Dunstan decade. This denies full involvement by the relevant department in regard to major decisions taken at Cabinet level.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Some of the Ministers at that time were not very happy, either.

Mr OLSEN: I know that during the Dunstan decade some of the Ministers were not very happy. We are now seeing a reversion back to centralised power—the filter system at the top. As Ministers well know, senior and middle management public servants in this State are not very pleased with the implementation of that policy. I assure

Ministers that this tendency will cause the Opposition to strictly scrutinise the Government's proposals for changes to the structure of the Public Service Board in this State. Any moves which will result in the concentration of too much power in one department must be firmly resisted.

So far I have raised a number of issues which demonstrate clearly that the State Government is not managing the economic recovery as well as it should be. My colleagues, I am sure, will give other examples. The central implication in what I ask the House to consider is that the focus of all Government policies at the State level must be on encouraging a broadening of our economic activity away from domestic markets towards a more outward looking economic base.

During my recent overseas trip, it became clear that there are growing opportunities for South Australian firms to compete in the Asian market place. While our participation in world trade depends to a significant degree on the policies and attitudes of the Federal Government, policies at a State level can assist in creating a stable trading environment which will encourage countries to our north to look to South Australia as a special region within Australia with advantages over other States. The opportunity is there but it has not been taken.

Figures suggest that, during the last decade, South Australia has failed to live up to the promises made about diversifying its economy by penetrating the overseas market place. The latest available comprehensive figures on exports (those for the 1981-82 financial year) show that in the preceding 10 years overseas exports from South Australia grew in real terms by 34 per cent. But this is only one-third of the growth of Australia's overall national export performance during the same period. When it is considered that our national export performance during the past few years has been relatively poor when compared with most other industrialised countries, South Australia's performance looks even less favourable.

The obvious result of this poor performance is a slip in South Australia's proportion of national exports. In the 10-year period South Australia's share of the national export return slipped from 8 per cent to only 6.5 per cent, while our share of the value of imports increased from 4.7 per cent to 5.8 per cent. In this period, Queensland and Western Australia surged ahead in the export league. Of course, their strength has been dependent on mineral development, and for far too long during the 1970s South Australia hesitated about developing its mineral wealth. In some respects, we are still hesitating.

I mention these facts not to preach gloom, or to seek scapegoats, but to establish the extent of the challenge facing South Australia. It is not only a challenge for government; it is also a challenge for South Australian industry. If South Australia is to prosper and develop, it must diversify its economy. That has been a catch cry for more than 15 years and, while some additional industries have been attracted to the State, a far greater diversification is required.

The style of growth to which Australia has been accustomed during the post-war period (based on protected, labour-intensive manufacturing industries targeted largely at the domestic market) is not going to sustain us in the decades ahead. These industries are vital. I do not suggest for one moment that we should turn our backs on the existing industrial and employment base of this State and this country, but they will not sustain us in the future in the way they have done in the past, if for no other reason than that, with fairly slow population growth, reliance on domestic markets will give little or no impetus to the growth of domestic industries. Rather, we must also look to the development of internationally competitive, export oriented manufacturing, rural and resource-based industries. This

adjustment will pose particular problems and challenges to South Australia because of our high dependence on industries such as whitegoods and motor vehicles, which enjoy significant protection.

Competition from overseas manufacturers in these industries is already occurring and inevitably over the next few years will lead to further job losses in some industries. It may be an unpalatable thought, but to ignore the problem is not to solve it. The State Government and industries within the State must look to the export markets in Asia and the Pacific region to expand and diversify, and it must not be left to Governments and managements alone. All South Australians must be prepared to take positive action to ensure that our industries are efficient and competitive, particularly in the areas of wages and other costs.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: With no union heavying, no thuggery.

Mr OLSEN: There is plenty of union heavying going on and blackmail being applied, and there are a number of cases which the Minister of Recreation and Sport could have heard case by case had he been in the Chamber earlier today. I gave an example of union officials in the last week heavying a number of small companies that had no alternative but to submit and pay the union dues. In the case of a concrete pour for a set of foundations to the extent of \$15 000, the builder had the opportunity of either paying the union dues or having the cement trucks withdraw, meaning that he would have to get jackhammers to remove the foundations that had been laid thus far, because they were half way through the concrete pour.

If that is not blackmail, thuggery or stand-over tactics, I do not know what is. That is not working in the best interests of industry or of the employees in this State. However, this Government has been deafening in its silence in relation to heavy union officials. For instance, when certain employees at the Mabarrack furniture factory did not want to join a union, this Government sat silently by and allowed the employer to grasp the nettle. I for one am happy that there was at least one employer in South Australia that was prepared to grasp the nettle, and all credit must be given to Mabarrack Brothers, who stood up to the union at personal anguish and cost to the company and to themselves.

We cannot expect members opposite, who have had no experience of drawing a cheque for a pay-roll, to understand the implications for the business man who has his back to the wall as a result of taking a stand that can lead to the bankruptcy of the business and to the total loss of jobs of the people employed by that business. Members opposite simply do not understand these things.

An honourable member: They laugh about it.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed they laugh, because their seats depend on the votes of union officials in a pre-selection contest held under the card-vote system, and they know that they must be subservient to those union officials or they will not be back here as members after the next election. The reason for their silence is clear.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Don't they have one vote one value?

Mr OLSEN: That method is used by the Australian Labor Party only in this place. As we have seen recently, Labor members do not use it in pre-selections. While in Opposition, Labor members asked questions about major projects and expected information in return, yet now that they are in Government they cast aspersions on legitimate questions being asked by members on this side, usually because they have little or no information to give in reply.

Mr Ferguson: What about—

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member has a raw nerve when it comes to the greatly increased taxes and charges

that have been imposed by his Government. If he doorknocks around his district, he will get the same message as Liberal members have received from their constituents: people have had enough of the taxes and charges imposed by this Government. Indeed, in the first weeks of this Administration the most fundamental election promise made by the Labor Party was broken.

We have heard much about the action of this Government in helping small businesses by means of a small business investment corporation and other measures. Indeed, members opposite have represented themselves as the friends of small business, but what is their track record in this regard? They are not being friends of the small business community when they impose a tax and charge hike of 21 per cent in 12 months, the greatest increase in South Australia's history, or by supporting before the Arbitration Commission the ACTU claim in respect of job security.

Mr Ferguson: What's wrong with job security?

Mr OLSEN: Over the past 18 months the honourable member's Government has supported the ACTU claim before the court. He is a member of the Bannon Government, although I can understand why he would not want to be seen as such.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition does not need the assistance of the Government Whip, the members for Light and Todd, or any other member. He is capable of making a speech off his own bat.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Last week, the Arbitration Commission handed down a decision which, while affording additional protection for the workers, who may be involved in the changing face of South Australia, did nothing to solve the long-term problem. By enforcing redundancy provisions on employers, a retrospective decision which means that financial provision must be made this year in the books of companies, those workers who are stood down for inevitable economic or business reasons will receive short-term financial protection. However, the same redundancy provisions will increase costs to industry and weaken the resolve of employers, especially in small industries and businesses, to take on additional staff.

If every small business had the capacity to create just one new job, unemployment would be wiped out overnight in this State and in this country. The benefits of the court decision will be of no good to people who cannot get a job in the first place, yet the present Government fully supported the case put by the ACTU to the Arbitration Commission, even though it admitted that it had not investigated the extra costs that would be imposed on industry as a result of the decision stemming from the claim. This was a complete abdication of responsibility.

It flies in the face of His Excellency's opening address and references to the uneven and fragile nature of the economic recovery and the need for South Australian industry to become more competitive, both interstate and internationally. This Government ignored its responsibility to cost the ACTU claims for job security before supporting them last year. We initiated some investigation which showed, for example, that in the case of an employee on the average wage who has worked for a company for five years, is under 35 years of age and is given two weeks notice, the company involved would have to pay \$10 763.60. I can understand the member for Brighton's interest in this matter, because she will be looking for some redundancy provisions after the next election.

An employee on a similar wage rate, who is 37 years of age, has 10 years service and is given two weeks notice, would be entitled to \$17 061.20. Although the ACTU has not been awarded everything it claimed, the decision still

carries no comfort for the many thousands of people who cannot get a job. Although at first glance this decision may have appealed to men and women in jobs, I believe that when they think it through they will realise that it will only widen the gap between themselves and the unemployed.

It would be distressing if firms took the negative step of standing down workers on State awards now before the likely flow-on of these provisions to all workers occurs. It is this type of additional cost to industry that has consistently dogged Australian industry over the past decade or more, and created handicaps for any serious penetration into the export market. It is that type of cost being passed on to the small business community that has been the greatest inhibiting factor to the maintenance of job opportunities, let alone the creation of job opportunities for other South Australians and other Australians. It is about time that Governments recognised that fact and recognised the impost that they are passing on to the small business community of this State and this nation.

It simply will not do to say that it can absorb these costs because, quite realistically, if one looks at the situation, small business simply cannot afford these costs. It has its back to the wall now! To impose a cost that has a retrospective factor will merely exacerbate matters. I think that we will see the true effect of this decision some 12 months from now when its effect will reach the community. Unfortunately, it will be too late then, because it will mean the loss of jobs in this State.

This decade, into the 1990s and towards 2 000, is going to see continuing change and adjustment to a new economic order. There will inevitably be further hardships and challenges, but there is potential to offset them by looking beyond our own shores to the international market place. Already there are signs of increasing interest in South Australia from overseas—particularly Japan. The previous Liberal Administration made it clear that it welcomed overseas investment where it was proposed in a manner which was mutually beneficial. For example, the acquisition of Chrysler Australia by Mitsubishi and Uniroyal Holdings by the Bridgestone Tyre Company ensured the continued viability of those firms.

There are now about 50 companies in South Australia which have at least 25 per cent Japanese investment. In many cases those companies would have struggled without the Japanese investment and management know-how. And, of course, the Cooper Basin producers have contracted to sell to Japan a significant quantity of l.p.g. from the Cooper Basin which is surplus to the current requirements of the Australian market. However, we cannot wait for Japanese and other international investment to strengthen our industrial base.

We must be prepared to adopt a flexible and adaptable approach and develop new and more imaginative strategies to meet the new challenges of the 80s. The practices and techniques adopted by South Australian industry in the past will not be sufficient to meet the changing national and international demands of the future. In the next 20 years massive consumer markets will open in Asia, and South Australian industry will need to be responsive and flexible to capitalise on this change.

If the present growth trends in Asia continue, Australia will, by the turn of the century, have the opportunity of trading with large, and in some cases, massive countries whose size and economic potential could make them global rather than regional powers. I refer particularly to Japan, China, India, Indonesia, and South Korea. As the economies in this region develop and strengthen, we are likely to see a major shift in the focus of the world's economic power to the western rim of the Pacific.

South Australian manufacturers are superbly placed to capitalise on the opportunity this challenge will create. We are situated almost centre stage. We have many resources including agriculture, energy, raw materials, an educated and skilled work force, and a stable political system. These are resources and benefits which in many cases, Asian countries cannot provide and which will be necessary for sustained growth in the region.

The implications of a massive new consumer market emerging virtually on Australia's doorstep are immense. It will further reduce Australia's dependence on the European market place, and secure trade ties will be an essential ingredient in guaranteeing Australia's security and cordial relationship with potentially the most influential trading and military bloc in the world. The emergence of this developing power in Asia will help shape Australia's future: South Australian industry should be planning now to seek the maximum advantages from that market.

Of course, the United States has recognised the potential growth in Asia. In the past 10 years Asia has replaced Europe as the United States major trading partner. If Australia does not move quickly and decisively, the Americans, with their political influence and their genius for marketing, will saturate a market which is Australia's for the taking. Another point of particular importance about market opportunities in Asia is that they are not only accessible now with skills and technology in which South Australia has a comparative advantage, but they are also accessible to small to medium sized firms.

The furniture manufacturers' recent exhibition at the Morphettville Racecourse and their access to the South-East Asian market is a clear indication of an industry that has looked to expanding its base, that has looked into expanding interstate and overseas. That section of South Australian industry is an example of how an industry with determination, foresight and initiative can capture markets. There is no doubt that we have captured major national markets for South Australian furniture manufacturing because of that initiative. We need to translate that initiative to other areas and industries and translate it to the export markets of South-East Asia.

The traditional view that we need to first establish large firms domestically before we strike out into the rest of the world is no longer valid, if ever it was. An added benefit of emphasis on smaller economic units is that they will make South Australia more adaptable to changing circumstances, and less vulnerable to structural rigidities. At a State Government level I believe we should be responding to those trends in our export markets by making some changes to our overseas representation arrangements.

I believe that the Agent-General's office in London could be restructured to place greater emphasis on trade and investment. While a presence in Europe is necessary and London remains the logical base, a close assessment must be made of the current operations of South Australia House to bring it more in tune with the changing face of trade and investment opportunities in this part of the world.

Our present arrangements for representation in Asia, based on the employment of agents as required in Hong Kong, Singapore, Manila and Tokyo, do little more than provide basic services such as the provision of interpreters and arrangement of meetings for Government Ministers and officers. Yet, as I have explained, the Asian region is South Australia's greatest potential trading and investment area and we must lift our profile and upgrade our representation.

I believe the most appropriate base for the location of a permanent South Australian office in the Asian region is Hong Kong. It is likely that a small office headed by a professional person attuned to the intricacies of the Asian investment area would cost about \$500 000 a year to operate.

I nominate Hong Kong specifically as the most desirable location because the current uncertainty about its future could be turned to our advantage in two distinct ways. I do not deny in the long term that the relocation of the office elsewhere might be appropriate. However, for the moment and for the next seven or eight years that potential is in Hong Kong. We need to identify potential investors anxious to take money out of Hong Kong and to sell them the advantages of investing in South Australia. We also need to investigate the possibility of encouraging specific business people with particular skills or investment capital to settle in South Australia. Of course, we have to get over the hurdle of the migration policy, but that is a market and investment capital that we need to attract to South Australia.

During my visit to Hong Kong, several business people emphasised how local business men were planning their strategies for the future now; they are doing it right now. Already, the Canadian Government, as an example, is advertising on radio in Hong Kong, urging professional and business people to obtain information dealing with immigration procedures in an endeavour to attract to Canada both expertise and capital. The direct approach is an indication of the environment which currently exists in Hong Kong. They are looking for other markets in which to invest. Australia has a stable political system, it has resources, it is a logical market. It is closer to that region than Canada and European countries. We have natural advantages to attract that investment to Australia. South Australia has got to be in there, getting its fair share of that investment capital and expertise. That is why I say that the establishment of a South Australian office in Hong Kong would assist significantly in a programme of bringing investment capital and expertise to this State.

There is no doubt that the other States of Australia, particularly the Eastern States, have recognised that potential and they are in there hard selling their States at the moment. Unless we want to let it slip through our fingers by default, we have to get into that market now. We have to have representation there now. It is a clear, unequivocal position—we ought to grasp that nettle and grasp it now: two years time will be too late. It has to be done now.

There is no doubt that our representation in that region to date, whilst giving basic services, has not been able to make a major impact. We need to recognise that, because I believe that the economic strategy for the next decade in this State is dependent upon issues such as the market potential in the region of South-East Asia.

That opens up a whole range of other questions, such as the railway line to Darwin, a transport link to provide access for our products to the port located on the doorstep of the South-East Asian region. What we ought to be doing is showing a little initiative and flair, looking down the track, not to the next election but to the next decade and to the turn of the century because, if we take that long-term view for this State, for the economy, and for the broadening of the economic base of this State, we will come to the logical conclusion that we have to open up those markets now—we have to get into them now. We must have representation in those areas and we must establish the service network to get into those markets. That applies to the direct shipping link which the former Minister of Transport had all but sewn up with the Japanese/Korean cartel prior to going to election.

I wish that the Premier of South Australia, at this time, would use some negotiating skills with his interstate counterpart, Mr Cain, to stop the undercutting of rates, to stop people from taking away the initiative and the needs of those cartels to have a direct shipping link to South Australia, because that is what is happening. The Premier ought to be using some bargaining strength with Premier Cain to get

him off our back and to stop him undercutting the establishment of that shipping link to the South-East Asian region, a shipping link that was all but stitched up on election day 1982.

Those areas have significant long-term implications for the South Australian economy. I have raised a number of issues that I believe are relevant to the current and future economic strategies of South Australia. The emphasis in the Speech made by His Excellency to open this session was on the economy and what needs to be done to improve our long-term prospects. In the run up to the next election the Liberal Party will be presenting a number of policies that will clearly demonstrate why the economic management of this State is not, at present, in the best hands and why, at the next election, that responsibility will be given to the Liberal Party.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Address in Reply. This is one of the traditional debates where members have an opportunity to say a few things on wide-ranging topics. First, I repeat my condolences to the families of deceased former members. On the opening of a session of Parliament, the Governor is required to read a speech that is written for him by the Government of the day and he really does not have much choice in the matter. I recall that on one occasion in New South Wales there was some embarrassment to the Governor on having to read a speech and he might have refused to read it, if my memory serves me correctly. Without putting too fine a point on it, I believe that the Speech is the Government's gloss on its record and what it intends to do. Of course, it has that inevitable gloss of over-statement of Government achievement and over-statement of the optimistic forecasts as the Government reads them. There are really only a couple of things in the Speech which excite me as being anything particularly novel or new and which may be of some value to the citizens of this State. I intend to deal with the Governor's Speech as it is presented and comment on it in the light of some of the experiences I had while overseas.

At the start of my remarks I observe that those people who are critical of the experience gained by members of Parliament travelling overseas are ill-informed as I believe members take seriously the business of gathering information when overseas. It would be a service to the State if the boards of some newspapers saw fit to send some of their senior editors and reporters overseas at the paper's expense to see what is happening in the world outside Australia. Quite frankly, the impressions I have gained from my overseas trips—I have been fortunate enough in my 15 years in Parliament to have four trips, one being a private trip—are that we in Australia are a bit insular. On this last overseas trip I gained that impression again. I have a great sense of pride in coming back to Adelaide and I still think that it is the best place in the world to live. Nonetheless, one gets a much broader perspective of the issues that we are trying to settle in South Australia after a serious attempt—and I am not talking about junkets—to gather information while one has an opportunity of meeting people in the world scene. I will make some reference to one or two of the contacts I made during the course of my remarks.

First, dealing with the Governor's Speech, my comments will not be complimentary to the Government as the Speech is full of padding and overblows the current situation. The Government talks about its wonderful employment record. There are fewer people employed in South Australia now than when this Government was elected. I remember when the now Premier and his Deputy used to sit on this side of the Chamber and it was always doom and gloom—every time they opened their mouth they talked about 'This shocking employment situation', this appalling tweedle dum and

tweedle dee. They were going to do something about it. The fact is that there are fewer people in employment now in South Australia than when the present Government was elected. So much for paragraph 3 of the Speech.

There has been much talk about economic recovery. It is qualified, of course, with words like 'uneven' and 'fragile'. But what is this recovery all about really? It is all about the Government, with Federal Government initiative, pumping enormous sums of taxpayers' funds into housing and thereby building up record deficits, both State and federally. Sir Arvi Parbo calls it borrowing from the future.

I read something written by Sir Arvi Parbo following my return last week. In a very succinct way he sums up all these questions. He made the point that Australia cannot go on borrowing from the future, which is what the Governments are doing. The day of reckoning is down the track. So, this is what the recovery is all about. It follows a record rural season after an almost record period of drought. We will watch with great interest just what develops from here on in because Governments, both State and Federal, will have to come to grips with these very large deficits that they are building up. The Premier continues to talk about the main thrust of his Government's economic development strategy. He said:

... will continue to be directed towards encouraging South Australian industry.

There is only one way (and if it has been said once it has been said a thousand times in this place) in which South Australian industry will have a flicker of a chance of surviving in the Australian scene, and that is by maintaining a lower cost structure here than exists around the rest of the nation.

It was true during the Playford days, but the Dunstan Governments did their best to destroy it. They then wondered why the white goods factories that had been built up were falling on hard times. At the end of their period in office we had not only the record but the highest mainland unemployment compared with our competitors in the Eastern States. Yet, here we have the Bannon Government making noises about 'continuing to be directed towards encouraging South Australian industry to become more competitive both interstate and internationally'. The only way to do that is to do the sorts of things that the Leader of the Opposition has been talking about for months. We must be a low charge, low tax, low cost State.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: A base from which to work.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, and that was the position that we had gained during the three years of the former Liberal Government. We became the lowest taxed State. We had signs of a turnaround, certainly in regard to the white goods industry. But here is the Premier sounding off about doing all he can to encourage industry to be competitive. It will not be competitive while he slaps on a whole range of taxes, as he has done in the past 12 months, irrespective of what he promised in the last election.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it was way up. The Government also talks about its industrial relations record. It should be said that the most peaceful period in recent years, in terms of industrial relations, was the three years under the Liberal Government. Statistics will bear that out. There were one or two spectacular events like the teachers marching up King William Street, and so on. They were headline grabbing.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Inspired by the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They were well orchestrated and well supported and, of course, the compulsory unionism policy is the pay-off to the unions for their massive support (both white and blue collar unions,

particularly white collar unions) at the last State election. Nonetheless, if one examines the figures relating to the industrial record in terms of man days lost during the three years of the Liberal Government, one sees that they were superior to anything else that we have experienced in recent days. But, overall the industrial record in South Australia is something of which we can be proud, irrespective of Government. This may stem from the ethnic background of the State and traditions that have been built up. Our record is recognised overseas.

I met a Mr Louis Cochet (whose title escapes me at the moment) at an appointment relating to transport arranged by Mr Allan Rodda. I have his card here, no doubt, amongst the voluminous piles I have which relate to people I met. He was in charge of marketing in the wool and sheepskins department in France. I do not know whether members realise it, but our largest market for sheepskins is France. It has a very large trade. Most of our sheepskins go to France. Mr Louis Cochet was a very interesting character, who is about to retire. I also met the man who is taking over from him: his successor is an intelligent young man named Mr Michael Smewing.

Mr Louis Cochet said that one of the big advantages—and he knows the Australian scene well—going for South Australia is its industrial relations record. He believes that it makes a lot of sense that Adelaide should develop as a major shipping service port. That is what my colleague the Minister of Marine was saying and it is what successive Ministers have said. It is recognised at least overseas, in Paris, that Adelaide would be a logical place as a major port of call for international ships and as a place to handle cargo. One of the points was our industrial record. Not only is it central, but also it was recognised that we had an excellent industrial record compared with the rest of Australia. That might not be saying much, but it is saying a fair bit for South Australia.

The Speech then goes on to talk about some amendments to the Electoral Act. The Government talks about these electoral changes. I guess the Liberal party, without my speaking for the Party on this occasion, will find that some of these things will have appeal and that some obviously will not.

The Speech talks about Aboriginal land rights. We know that the Minister of Community Welfare managed to come out of the Maralinga land rights legislation claiming some credit for what was really an enormous fight by the Liberal Party to bring some sense into that legislation. The only comment that I make there is that it is quite clear that the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation needs some amendments so that it has conditions similar to those that apply to Maralinga. I trust that that will happen in due course.

I thought that a couple of things here sounded as though the Government might be on the right track. Paragraph 10 of His Excellency's Speech talks about action being taken to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Government administration, the initial report on Public Service management being made public and the principles outlined being endorsed by the Government. Legislation to establish a new basis for public sector management will be presented to Parliament. I will be very interested to see how that turns out in the form of legislation and what it does to improve the efficiency of the Public Service. We are fortunate in South Australia and have been for many years in having a Public Service which is second to none. We in government sought to improve the efficiency of the Public Service and to increase productivity in areas where it could be done. I for one will be very interested to see what the Government intends to do to improve the efficiency of the Public Service. I hope that it is not the Labor Party's normal method of doing things: simply putting more people on the pay-roll.

The way in which it solves most problems is to raise taxes and employ more people. I hope that they will be productive and efficient proposals.

The other thing in His Excellency's Speech that appealed to me—and there was not much—on page 5 under paragraph 17, was the following:

My Government is also concerned that the present Valuation of Land Act provides only for an appeal to the Supreme Court against rating and taxing valuations made by the Valuer-General. Legislation will be put before you to amend the Act to provide for a process of independent review to ensure a more practical, less formal and less expensive avenue of appeal for the average home owner, small business person and primary producer.

I applaud that. Then the Speech gets on to mining and the processing of resources, and if there is one area in which the Government has an appalling record it is in relation to what has happened to the initiatives of the former Government, initiatives which were dear to my heart and in relation to which I believed the State had a real future. As I have said before, as a result of a Ministerial visit I made to Western Australia (I took the weekend off and the following Monday and flew around Western Australia and looked at the onshore developments), I came back convinced that we had a great future in resource development if we grasped every opportunity at the earliest possible moment. That is the key to it. If one does not grab the chance when it is there one is likely to lose it, and we are about 15 years behind Western Australia.

I refer to the sort of developments in the Pilbara (and they are enormous), the offshore gas, onshore facilities, the pipelines, the major mining operations in Kalgoorlie and Kambalda and so on, which I might say were initiated by Sir Charles Court when he was Minister responsible for industry. He was the driving force in the initial stages of a lot of those developments. I reckon that we are about 15 years behind. With the advent of this present Government, of course, we have lost some of those things. I do not know whether we have lost them for all time, but we have certainly lost a lot of time.

Let me give one illustration. We have closed down the Honeymoon and Beverley mines quite unjustifiably. They are the sacrificial lambs on the altar of this continuing nonsense of a policy which is the Labor Party's uranium policy. Wherever I went in relation to the uranium question and wherever I had appointments dealing with uranium overseas, they had a copy of the Labor Party's telex of the statement made after the Federal conference. They had bits underlined in texta colour marking out the qualifications and gobbledegook which tried to accommodate the anti-uranium lobby, which is so strident in the Labor Party.

The Labor Party has closed down two mines which could get us into selling yellowcake gradually and sensibly (and the yellowcake from Honeymoon and Beverley would be no different from the chunks of yellowcake from Roxby Downs) and which could be a billion dollar investment in this State.

One of the appointments I had was at Marlow, south of London, which is the headquarters of Urenco, people well known to the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. Their connections with South Australia go back to about 1973 when then Premier Dunstan, before there was a change of heart in the Labor Party (one of the innumerable flips it has done on uranium), was in favour. In 1973, these people started coming to South Australia and we got to know them well. I went to see Dr Brian Kehoe who has been to this State probably a dozen times. We were on the eve of securing for South Australia a uranium enrichment facility which would have meant upwards of \$1 billion invested in this State.

Mr Lewis: Outstanding.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Outstanding. If there was a \$100 million project I imagine that there would be likely to be headlines. But in regard to a billion dollar project that we were on the point of securing for South Australia, Brian Kehoe said to me, 'I am afraid you've lost it.' There was a window and a need, and it could have been built now. The next chance is likely to be years down the track.

That is the result of this procrastination, indecision and lack of breadth of vision in the Labor Party. It is a pity that all members of the Labor Party could not be loaded up and trundled overseas so that they could see what is happening in the real world. I made the point earlier about the insular view of people in Australia whose emotions rule their heads, who are not in possession of the facts and who do not know what is happening in the real world. As a result of the Labor Party's messing around and procrastination we lost for the immediate future any prospects of a major development.

That was one of the casualties of the Labor Party's nonsense of a policy which, to his credit, Prime Minister Hawke has been trying to change for many years. Before he went into Parliament I knew perfectly well what his views were in relation to uranium. Of course, at that time he was muzzled in order to get preselection, but at this time with a commonsense approach he is working desperately hard to change the policy with some sensible Ministers behind him in trying to bring his Party to terms with what I believe is the truth of the matter. Nonetheless, owing to the ignoramuses in the Party and those who do not know the facts the Labor Party has ended up with a qualified policy, and this means that opportunities are being denied to this nation and to this State.

One of the appointments that the member for Eyre and I had was with the Central Energy Generating Board in London where we met Mr Jenkin, System Planning Engineer, Central Electricity Generating Board, Mr Harvey, who is the Group Head of Development Plans, and Mr Andrew Clements, Manager of the Uranium Policy and Assessments at the British Civil Uranium Procurement Organisation attached to the Central Electricity Generating Board. It is perfectly clear that Australia has lost a valuable market in terms of selling uranium to that organisation, which had written contracts with two of the Northern Territory mines. The organisation had written contracts falling due, one of which was with Namibia, which it did not intend to renew. The safeguards in that country do not in any way match those that apply in Australia.

In regard to the contracts with Northern Territory mines, I think one was with the Jabiluka mine and the other with the Koongarra mine, mines that are about to be developed. Those mines were chopped off as sacrificial lambs, as were Honeymoon and Beverley in South Australia, and those contracts too, have gone. I am sorry that the member for Eyre is not in the Chamber, because it was he who set up that appointment and I went with him to talk to the people whom I have mentioned. When he speaks in this debate I am sure that he will make some comments similar to those that I have made in relation to this matter.

We asked those chaps where they would buy their uranium for fuel for Britain's nuclear power stations, and we were told that in all likelihood they would buy it from Canada. So, we have lost possibly hundreds of millions of dollars of trade as a result of the stupidity in regard to a policy that stipulates that some mines can go ahead while others cannot. The present Minister of Mines and Energy has put forward the absurd proposition to this House that the markets are not there. The Minister ought to get off his backside and go off to find markets for, and talk to the people about buying this commodity from South Australia.

Mr Meier: Meanwhile our taxes keep going up.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course; yet the more one gets in royalties, the more trade, employment and revenue one can develop, the lower is the base of tax needed to support Government services. The discussions that we had were very enlightening indeed and reinforced what we had been saying in relation to this question. Interestingly, yesterday a booklet turned up from the Department of Foreign Affairs under the name of the Minister for Foreign Affairs. A stamp on the booklet states 'Produced with the authorisation of the Minister'.

The booklet is called 'Uranium—The Joint Facility, Disarmament and Peace'. This booklet was issued with the authority of the Minister—it has Hayden's name on it. I do not know what the member for Henley Beach is so amused about.

Mr Ferguson: I find your references wonderful.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What is being argued here is what we have been saying for years about uranium. I am arguing that we have lost opportunities because the Labor Party is in such a mess and still has not sorted itself out. This State has lost billions of dollars in investments, as has this nation, because of the stupidity of the Labor Party. Some of the realists in that Party have to drag others along. It must be a hard job trying to be a leader in the Labor Party. It must be worse than the law of the jungle trying to bring people to a rational point of view, yet here we have Hayden making statements in this book that we have been saying for years in relation to this issue. He talks about the 'Nuclear non-proliferation treaty' and says the things that we said while in Government. He says in this book that we have a responsibility to provide material. And so it goes on!

Under the heading 'The Export of Uranium', the booklet states:

Cutting of the supply of uranium will not have any effect in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world. It will seriously damage arms control and disarmament and it could deal a serious blow to the single most effective arms control and disarmament measure in effect at the moment—the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

If I have said what is said there once I have said it half a dozen times in this House in answer to questions when the Labor Party was on this side and did not know where to jump. The only reason it did jump was that it thought if it did not endorse Roxby Downs it would lose the election.

Having endorsed that, what about the other mines, which are less dangerous in terms of mining techniques? The Labor Party has cost this State tens of millions of dollars in relation to these mines. I think that the Democrats (and thank goodness we do not have any in this House now) would do well to talk to Dr Blix, the Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. I was not rude enough to take notes while talking to him, but I made notes soon after I left my meeting with him. I went to that meeting with His Excellency, the Hon. John Kelso, the Australian Ambassador in Vienna. His was an excellent appointment by Foreign Minister Hayden. He has only had his job for about three months. However, he was in charge of nuclear affairs for the Fraser Government for a long time.

John Kelso was a most agreeable companion at that meeting with Dr Blix, who is, as I have said, Executive Director (I am not sure of his title) or the head man in the International Atomic Energy Agency. His background is that of former Minister in the Swedish Parliament (and he is a socialist, by the way). He told me that he was previously on the left of politics, was a socialist, and that the socialists had been in charge in Sweden for many years. He was a Minister in the Government, was now out of Government and had been appointed in recent days as Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

He said that he is pro-uranium on environmental grounds. It would do the Democrats good to talk to people like this. We ought to ship them to Europe to wander around Europe and Britain (anywhere they can speak the language) to talk to people about how to generate energy in this day and age. We would get nitwits like Chipp, who are on an emotional trip, coming back with a different view entirely about what is an acceptable risk in a modern technological society, what is non-polluting and what is polluting. He said that he is basically an environmentalist. We ought to send Dr Coulter, the local fellow, because it would do him the world of good if we took up a fund and sent him to talk to some of these people. Dr Blix said that he had taken the job simply because he was an environmentalist and because acid rain from coal-fired stations in Europe and Britain is an enormous problem (not so much in Britain because it blows across the sea to Sweden and the Nordic countries). Czechoslovakia is one of the satellite countries in which they evacuate children for part of the year from one locality to escape the effects of the pollution caused by the enormous amounts of material thrust into the atmosphere as a result of burning coal.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Generally, acid rain is the major problem. Oxides of sulphur and nitrogen are the major chemicals, but they actually have to evacuate these children for some months of the year so that they can breathe clean air. There is a major swing to nuclear energy on environmental grounds because it is by far the least polluting of all major forms of electricity generation. Only hydro power generation is non-polluting as a source of electricity generation but, of course, there is a limit to what one can do in this respect.

The safety record of nuclear power generation is the best of any system in the world, including hydroelectric power. If a dam wall bursts, one cannot stop the water flow. A few hundred people could be drowned downstream and it is out of control. One job of the International Atomic Energy Agency is to monitor the safety record around the world in respect of the civil nuclear programme. That agency puts out an annual report on that programme. Certainly, it is irrefutable that nuclear power has the safest record of any programme.

I was interested to learn that Blix himself was a convert to the nuclear generation industry on strong environmental grounds. Certainly, I hope that our friends the Democrats take the time to really go and find out the facts. He also made an interesting point in respect of the morality of this question. He thought that, if there was some sort of moral precept that applied in Australia in relation to the nuclear issue, surely it must be universal. He put it to me (although I did not need conversion) that, if one is in a country where one has to make a choice between nuclear energy and no energy at all, then the choice becomes fairly clear. He said that that was the case in a number of instances.

Therefore, when one starts talking about morality, we have to forget the insular position of Australia where we are energy rich and look more at the world scene. We should put ourselves in the place of one of the developing nations that are energy hungry. We should forget about America, Australia and the developed world where we are lavish in our use of energy (particularly the Americans) and look at the nations that are energy hungry where the options are limited and where it may get down to nuclear energy or no energy at all. In that situation the moral question takes on a different aspect. That is the point we have been arguing in this place for years.

Members such as the member for Salisbury, who is against nuclear development, were vocal when we were in Government. We told him to go back to England and look at the

position and suggest to the people of England that they close down their nuclear generation establishments that have been operating successfully for 30 years. We told him to argue that point in England. If one is going to argue from a moral stance, one must look at the world scene and not just argue from our own insular view in South Australia.

Also, we discussed with Dr Blix the question of safeguards. He made the point that there is a wide and increasing acceptance of the inspection regime by the International Atomic Energy Agency. It has an inspection regime in place around the world accepted by Russia, the satellite countries, Western nations and developing countries, and it has no reports of uranium being diverted from civil programmes in breach of safeguard agreements. That was the view of Dr Blix six weeks ago. About 200 inspectors are employed on this work travelling throughout the world. I have already referred to the safety aspects. The International Atomic Energy Agency reports annually on the industry's safety record, which is exceptionally high in terms of reactor operation.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Prior to the dinner break I spoke about the Government's appalling record in mining and resource development, pointing out that the vacillation in its uranium policy has cost this State billions of dollars in terms of the lost uranium enrichment plant. There is also the loss of markets in Australia for the Central Electricity Generating Board of London, which had mining contracts with two mines, Jabiluka and Koongarra, in the Northern Territory which the Labor Party closed down, as it did Honeymoon and Beverley in South Australia, at a cost of a billion dollars to this State over time.

I refer now to the provision of energy for the State, which has been the subject of a lot of the Government's attention in recent months. It set up the Stewart Committee to examine the next source of power supply to the State. This was an interesting development after a period of inactivity from the Government. That committee is now charged with finding the next source of low grade coal deposits in South Australia for generating electricity. I was interested in this development because I had received, when in Government, all sorts of advice from the Electricity Trust. One of its preferred options was that black coal be imported from New South Wales for generating electricity in this State. This was not particularly attractive, because South Australia would have been at a disadvantage in terms of cost if it had to pay the cost of transport around the coast of Australia, which is not inconsiderable. It is probably as expensive to move anything around the coast of Australia as anywhere else in the world.

However, I had been told that none of the low grade coals in South Australia were suitable for generating electricity; in fact, nowhere else in the world was coal of the quality that we have in this State burnt for generating electricity. I guess that is true in that no two samples of coal are identical. However, I had been told that in Greece low grade coal was burnt for the generation of its electricity. So, the first port of call for me on this trip was to talk to the Greek Generating Authority about its generation of electricity by burning low grade coal.

I had made these arrangements before South Australia suddenly decided that it could burn these low grade coals. I had been told definitely that we could not do that. Anyway, I had arranged appointments in Greece, and I have cards here—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Don't pull out the wrong card, whatever you do.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am in no trouble whatever. I do not know what the Minister is referring to, but my wife accompanied me on these trips and I would not stray from the straight and narrow, even if I wanted to (not that I would want to). In Greece I met the Deputy Governor of the Public Power Corporation of Greece (Mr Nicholas Geroyannis); the Planning Director for the Public Power Corporation of Greece (Mr Constantin Stelakatos); the Manager of Engineering and Construction, Thermoelectric Projects, Department for the Public Power Corporation of Greece (Mr E. Stamatopoulos); the Director of Thermal Production (Mr Alexander Milonakis); and the Mining and Metallurgy General Director, Exploitation (Mr Doganis).

When I met these people I took notes during the interviews. In Greece I noted that the Greeks have been burning low grade coal, some of it of a low calorific value, for many years. Therefore, there appears to be no problem in burning the low grade coals which have caused so many headaches in South Australia over the years. One of the advantages of some of the coals in Greece is that they are alkaline, and impurities like sulphur do not pose the problem they do in South Australia. As I understand it, sulphur is a major problem with our coal.

I was also interested to note that Greece imports high quality coal and mixes it with low grade lignite to make a shandy, so to speak, which it finds useful for improving the combustibility of its coal. This would be more sensible than importing all our coal needs from New South Wales. It was seriously put to me that we could perhaps improve the combustibility of our low grade coal—only about one-fifth of our coal is mixed—by mixing with other high quality coal. Greece is currently calling tenders for this coal and it was interesting to hear that 20 Australian companies had shown an interest in exporting coal to Greece and that eight to 10 companies had actually placed bids. The prices quoted for coal landed in Greece was \$41 to \$43 per tonne.

When I was Minister of Mines and Energy in this State I was advised that we could not land coal from New South Wales under about \$50 to \$55 per tonne, yet companies were bidding to land Australian coal in Greece at \$41 to \$43 per tonne. This seemed strange considering the relatively short distance around the coast from New South Wales to South Australia compared with the distance from Australia to Greece. I received much detail concerning the variation in the deposits that Greece is developing.

I asked about plans for nuclear energy. Greece obtains power across the border from some of the satellite Communist countries and does not plan a nuclear commitment in its own country. The consumption of electricity in Greece would not be high by European standards and it shares electricity across the border from Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, where electricity is generated in part from nuclear reactors.

There are no problems associated with generating electricity from nuclear power in Russia or other satellite Communist countries, as I have pointed out to this House on numerous occasions previously. It always puzzles me that some left wing members of the Labor Party who are fond of telling us about what happens in those parts of the world cannot understand that it is only a small minority in Europe who are opposed to nuclear power on conservation grounds. That is changing fast because of the effects of acid rain. However, the issue of nuclear power is certainly no problem in satellite countries, Communist countries or in most of the enlightened Western world.

The Greeks share power across the border with Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. The big announcement by Premiers Cain and Bannon in recent days that we will investigate sharing power across the Victorian border is nothing new. There was a big fanfare as Cain left the State last Friday. I heard on the radio that power costs in South Australia were likely

to fall as a result of a wonderful scheme to share power across the border with Victoria. That was first recommended by the Ziedler committee (set up by the Fraser Government) which sat for some years. I think that Ziedler, who was chairman of the committee, is now a Knight of the Realm. That committee suggested that power be shared across the Victorian border. The Liberal Government endorsed that concept. Of course, discussions have been held at officer level in relation to that scheme. There is nothing brand new in what Premier Cain said when he left the State, and there is nothing new in what Premier Bannon is saying, except that he suggested that electricity tariffs could fall which, of course, is nonsense.

I think that the Minister of Mines and Energy pointed out that there is no hope of that interconnection being in place before 1990, anyway. It is only at the planning and talking stage. To suggest that electricity tariffs in this State will fall as a result of this brand new announcement is absolute nonsense and is another attempt by the Bannon Government to delude the public. The public will not be deluded, however, when they receive their electricity bills which will incorporate the steep increases that are inevitable as a result of having to burn low grade coal and the like in South Australia for our power generation because we sold our gas to New South Wales and that will run out in 1987.

There is nothing new at all in the Premier's announcement about a scheme of sharing power across the border. I endorse it. It is a sensible idea. If there is excess capacity to generate electricity across the border, by all means share it. But, to suggest that this is a brand new initiative and that power costs will drop is quite ridiculous and, to put it bluntly, plainly dishonest.

Another matter in the Governor's Speech to which I refer relates to the proposal to filter water for the northern towns. I certainly hope that the Barossa Valley is included in the scheme. Since I have represented that area I have continually drawn the Government's attention to the fact that in one of the major tourist areas of the State the water supply is absolutely awful. In the Barossa Valley one almost gets pure mud out the tap on occasions, particularly at the onset of summer when the flow is reversed and a new supply is brought into the system. I hope that that scheme is incorporated in this proposal. A subsidiary scheme was to be implemented. I hope it incorporates filtering water to the northern part of the State.

I was also pleased to read in the Governor's Speech that the Government has been compelled, following pressure from the Liberal Party, to do something about video classification. The Government was particularly inactive in that area. Parents were rightly concerned about the sort of material that was falling into the hands of young people in this State. Of course, it is not clear what the Government will finally do in this area, but at least there is a reference to the fact that it intends to do something about that matter. Of course, the Governor's Speech also contains the usual self-congratulations with which they are often replete, as they are written by the incumbent Government.

Mr Ferguson: What were they like from 1978 to 1982?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They were factual, very good, and pointed to an excellent record. Paragraph 26 offers a little of this self-congratulation for the Minister of Tourism who, quite frankly, is simply carrying on the excellent work done by the Minister of Tourism in the Liberal Government. During a time of straitened financial circumstances we made more money available for the promotion of tourism than had been the case for some years, and that was starting to bear fruit. The present Government is simply continuing on that excellent groundwork—in a fairly halting fashion—that was laid down by the former Minister of Tourism.

Mr Trainer: There are sour grapes on the other side.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There are no sour grapes about it at all. I even said that there were two good things in the Speech; they were hard to find, but I found them. Finally, I refer to paragraph 28, which mentions that the Commissioner of Police will introduce the first of a series of annual strategic plans to direct the approach of his officers to the task of modernising and improving the Police Force. I was one of those invited to attend a half day briefing by the senior police into their activities. A number have been held for members of Parliament, and I suggest that those who are invited should avail themselves of the opportunity of going. I was certainly interested to know what the police were planning in terms of protecting the citizens of this State.

I point out to the Government that one of the more alarming features of modern life was referred to in the weekend press, I think, in relation to the muggings, bashings and so on that now occur, it seems with increasing incidence, in South Australia. If the police can come to grips with that, we will be doing the citizens of the State an enormous service. The Liberal Party was proposing to do something about police powers, without any encouragement at all from the Government. I read with interest that the Government intends to do something in this area. I certainly hope that it will not detract even further from the ability of police to apprehend and detain people who are suspected of committing crimes.

Over the years police powers have tended to be weakened by successive Labor Governments. I remember the glee of a former Premier when Bills passed this House in the 1970s to amend legislation that was not to his liking. One of those Bills related to the ability of the police to move people on. I understand that it was the result of an experience that he had had some years previously that coloured his judgment. Nonetheless, the whole tendency over the years of Labor Administrations has been to weaken the powers of the police and to focus attention on the plight of the accused and the convicted rather than on the plight of the victims of crime. Their plight always tends to diminish when one gets on the band wagon on behalf of an offender.

I certainly hope that nothing the Government plans will weaken further the ability of the police in South Australia to do their job effectively. I certainly hope that the Government takes up the suggestions of the Liberal Party, contained in a Bill moved by the Hon. David Wotton in this place, in relation to enhancing the powers of the police to do their job. If it can do something in terms of the violence, muggings and so on that seem to be increasing in our community, it will do a very great service indeed. It is one of the unfortunate aspects of modern life that citizens no longer feel free to walk around parts of this State and this city after dark unless they are accompanied by a number of other people. This is a most unfortunate occurrence for Adelaide, where we have been by world standards law abiding citizens. I will watch this area with a great deal of interest.

I have spoken for rather longer than I had anticipated. I simply repeat the note with which I started, because there were some adverse comments in the media about junkets at about the time I was going overseas.

I think that some of the media barons would be doing the State a great service if they could find it in their hearts, at the deliberations of their boards, to finance overseas experience for some of their senior people so that they could see what is going on around the world. I know of one senior journalist who was fortunate enough to have that experience and I think that it gives a breadth of vision which is essential to all leaders in the community. I could go on and talk about other appointments that I had. I have not run through half the visiting cards, and I do not do this with any self-

justification. I simply point out that it is an invaluable experience if people are to make informed judgments not only on local issues but also on issues that affect the whole nation. I certainly commend to those who have the opportunity and those who wish to get to the heart of many of these matters that they take the opportunity if they cannot go overseas to at least make contacts with people who can give them facts as to what happens in other places.

I say again that we are in danger of becoming insular. A phrase used by one of the people I met was that, if Australia goes down that track (and that was in relation to the uranium question), it will be regarded as being eccentric. I think that the last thing that we as a State or a nation want to do is to be branded eccentric. We are in that danger if we allow some of the more strident voices in the community who are opposing developments which are accepted almost universally around the world to have too much exposure and too much publicity. Therefore, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I support the Address in Reply, not because of the content of the Speech, which, of course, as I said previously, is simply a self-congratulatory document churned out by the Government, but because this is one of the traditional debates in this House during which a member has the opportunity of addressing a wide range of issues of importance to the State.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion and I wish to take the opportunity to express sympathy to the families of the late Mr Charles Wells and Mr Claude Allen, former members of the Legislative Assembly. I did not know Mr Claude Allen, but his record shows that he had a long and distinguished career in this House and my sympathies go to his immediate family. I had the honour of knowing Charles Wells fairly well, especially during his career with the trade union movement. He served with distinction in the trade union movement as Secretary of the Waterside Workers Federation for many years and he represented the workers in this State in the United Trades and Labor Council and on various committees of the council for many years. I knew him as a vigorous and fearless advocate, especially when dealing with the lives of workers, and I extend my sympathy to his immediate family.

During the Address in Reply debate I wish to turn my attention to the problems relating to superannuation schemes, especially in regard to my constituents and employees in general in the State. The problems relating to superannuation are many and varied and I hope that, by my drawing attention to this matter in the House, the country in general and in this State in particular, we can move to reforms that are vitally necessary in this area.

It is interesting to note that other States have already moved in this direction and that there is a Senate inquiry in the Federal Parliament which, I believe, will soon provide a series of reforms that will be necessary for the States to follow in order to cover the whole legislative process. I am not alone in suggesting that reforms are necessary in regard to the private superannuation schemes that are available to employees throughout this country. It is interesting to note that the management consultants, Palmer, Trahair, Owen and Whittle, Towers, Perrin and Foster and Crosby recently provided a series of problems to be tackled and published in the *Australian* the results of a survey of workers on the question of superannuation. That article, headed 'Workers baffled by their company super schemes', states:

Recent studies undertaken in Australia show many superannuation fund members:

Have no idea of the amount contributed by their employers.
Would not have joined the fund had membership been optional.
Do not understand the benefits available to them . . .
A staggering 90 per cent of the employees surveyed demonstrated poor comprehension of their superannuation schemes.

This contrasts with management assumptions about employee views and preferences . . .

Many super fund members viewed their contributions only as 'forced savings'. Where fund membership was compulsory, many employees felt they could have done better by putting their money elsewhere. The increased tax on lump sum benefits had caused many employees to assume 'super isn't worth anything any more'.

Most employees had only nominal amounts of life insurance apart from their employers' provisions. Both male and female members were outspoken on the need for equality in funds for non-dependent wives and husbands. According to the consultants' head of human resources, Mr Richard Bevan, employers must effectively communicate information on superannuation.

'There is a limited relationship between the quality of superannuation plans and the level of appreciation demonstrated by employees,' he said.

Mr Bevan said in one study the consultants found a highly competitive but poorly communicated plan was viewed negatively.

One of the greatest needs of reform in the superannuation area relates to the vesting requirements. Many of the superannuation schemes were designed in pre-war times or in the early post-war era when expectations of employment were quite different to those applying these days. Private consultants have informed me that on average an employee changes his employment seven times during his working life.

Mr Lewis: They need portability.

Mr FERGUSON: Exactly. That is the point I am making and I am suggesting that private superannuation schemes ought to be reformed in that respect. I acknowledge the interjection and appreciate the fact that members opposite understand the need for reform in this area. During the recent recession in South Australia we were able to see many reasons why this should occur. The restructuring of industry that was the result of the downturn in the manufacturing industry quite often meant that employees who had had many years of service with a manufacturing company found themselves on a retrenchment list or in a situation where they had to change their employment from one company to another. Many problems arise because the design of most superannuation schemes prevents full payout until the time of normal retirement.

The normal retirement age is usually stated in the following way, and I quote from a superannuation scheme for Hayden Engineering Pty Ltd, which states:

It is the policy of the company that all male employees will retire on reaching their 65th birthday, 60th birthday for females, and this will determine your normal retirement age. However, early retirement, up to five years prior to these ages, may be arranged with company approval.

The last sentence, which contains the reference with company approval, is the nub of one of the bones of contention of people seeking changes to their superannuation requirements.

Mr Whitten: Why should there be discrimination in favour of females?

Mr FERGUSON: Exactly, and that is one of the reforms at which private superannuation schemes ought to be looking. I ask that, when the life assurance offices read this speech (as they have done with all my previous speeches on superannuation), they do not send their representatives to see me. I know how good some of their schemes are. Rather, I ask that they consider introducing the reforms contained in this speech.

As I mentioned earlier, it is quite possible these days that an employee, in order to keep himself or herself in work, must be prepared to change that employment as time goes by. To be bound by a requirement that full benefits will not be paid until such time as an employee reaches his or her 65th or 60th birthday, as the case may be, or five years earlier with company approval, provides room for much complaint. An employee who is lucky enough to reach the full retirement age would receive the following from a typical superannuation fund. I quote from the staff superannuation

plan of an engineering firm in South Australia, which reads as follows:

A multiple is arrived at by multiplying $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent by the number of your years of service prior to 1 July 1964 or prior to your latest membership joining date, plus $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent by the number of your years of membership after 1 July 1964 or later joining date to your normal retirement date.

This multiple is then applied to the average of your five highest annual salaries and the resulting amount is payable as a lump sum. Expressed another way, you will receive on retirement one years salary for each $13\frac{1}{4}$ years service prior to 1 July 1964 or your latest joining date and for each eight years as a contributing member of the plan. On the other hand where an employee, for one reason or another, is forced to leave the company, his pay on withdrawal is described as follows:

If you leave the company service prior to the earliest retirement, you will be entitled to the return of all your own contribution to the plan with a compound interest of three per centum per annum. If you were a member of the plan prior to 1 July 1964 you would receive an additional amount of 7.5 per cent of your latest advised annual salary for each year of service prior to 1 July 1964.

I draw the attention of the House to those percentages and refer to my previous statement that most superannuation plans were designed in the pre-war or early post-war era, and that view can be justified by the sort of percentages that superannuation plans are discussing at 3 per cent and 7.5 per cent. An employee finishing earlier than normal, either for his own or for other reasons (often relating to retrenchment), is entitled to receive his own contributions plus a compound interest in many cases of 3 per cent, although this varies from policy to policy. Sometimes the compound interest is 4 per cent, and sometimes interest rates are as low as 2 per cent.

In any event, an employee leaving a firm and the superannuation fund can find himself in a situation where he has substantially contributed much of his own money to the superannuation fund and he is leaving in a situation that can be quite unfair in regard to superannuation benefits.

To be fair, it is often the case that where retrenchments are made in an industry special provisions are made to provide superannuation benefits for the people retrenched fully comprising the amount of the employer's contribution, the employee's contribution and the interest rates that have accrued to that date. However, there is a problem, and this is where legislation needs to be tightened. I refer to the position where it depends entirely on the trustees of the superannuation company whether or not a payout is made. If the employee has been a model employee in regard to the company, such a payout is generally made. However, if in the opinion of the trustees there has been some difficulty with past employment payments quite often are not made to the extent that I have earlier suggested.

Certainly, I know of a case where two employees of similar length of service finished earlier than the retirement age stated by the trustees. One worker received \$15 900 from his superannuation fund after 22 years service. The other worker received only \$4 856.53 from the same fund with the same trustees after 25 years of service. I might add that I was involved in negotiations for the latter person and, after some consideration by the trustee following correspondence from me, the amount received by the latter worker was increased to \$9 713.06. However, that amount is still considerably lower than the amount received by the worker who was looked on favourably by the trustees of that superannuation fund. I have taken the opportunity to consult a superannuation consultant about these problems and have been advised that the control of superannuation is bound by the laws of trust and contract. It was his opinion that there is protection under common law against trustees who take discriminatory action of the type to which I have previously referred and that a successful action could be taken by this employee under common law to provide more money than the \$9 713 that he received after 25 years of

service. It is extremely difficult for employees to take common law action against trustees, especially when the trustees are well known within the industry, if the employee will be seeking employment in that industry in due course.

I really think the time has come for legislative action to provide for a sliding scale of payments that pays out all superannuation after a specific time, and I would prefer that specific time to be a maximum of 14 years.

I believe that all superannuation policies should be so designed that a pay-out commences on a proportionate basis after, say, two years (and I would be willing to listen to argument on that), where the employee contribution and the employer contribution is commenced on a percentage basis and that percentage is increased until the expiration of 14 years, a time long enough in any circumstances for a full pay-out up to the amount of money already invested by both employee and employer funds.

This practice seems to be fair when one considers that quite often it is part of a contract of employment that an employee join a superannuation fund and that his employment depends on his joining that fund. There is a need to change the benefits payable in most private superannuation schemes.

Another area that needs to be looked at in superannuation funds relates to the actual investment of the funds. Information about the investment of the superannuation funds by the trustees is quite often difficult to obtain. I know of instances where requests have been made for details of funding, and the details have been received only after great difficulty.

I am aware that the Income Taxation Assessment Act requires a company to disclose details of investment but notwithstanding that I know of instances where the investment results have been most difficult to obtain. Independent superannuation consultants have from time to time published investment results of certain superannuation schemes. We are able to judge that some funds do very well from investments, others are satisfactory, and some superannuation investment returns are not very satisfactory at all. I quote from remarks published in the *Advertiser* of Monday, 14 May, 1984 by Mr Jeffrey Tidswell, an independent adviser on superannuation funds, as follows:

Most employers are unaware of how their investment return compares with other institutions.

And I would add that most employees are also unaware. The remarks continue:

For example, I spoke to some people recently who were thrilled that their fund made 26 per cent last year. What they did not know is that 18 other companies made more than this, some almost double.

In a year when the share market rose by more than 50 per cent, it is not hard to make this kind of return. Another area employers may consider for employees is to make the superannuation form part of the salary package.

I believe that investment results and returns should be made available to the members of the fund. From this they are able to judge how well the fund is being managed and, if the fund is not being managed well at all or there is a need for change or the results are not as good as they should be, the members of the fund ought to have the opportunity to seek a change in direction from the trustees in relation to the investment of their money.

I know that the trustees of some superannuation funds have reinvested money back into their own firms with very poor results. I know that the law has now been changed to ensure that any superannuation funds from employees funds that are invested by the trustees back into the same firm shall produce an interest rate in round figures of 17 per cent. This was not always the case. Members of funds should always be careful to ensure that when the trustees of superannuation funds are the executives of a firm—and

this is usually the case—their funds are not being reinvested back into the firm at a return that is less than they can receive from any other investment.

In its final report the Committee of Inquiry into the Australian Financial System recommended that summaries and meaningful details of the investment spread in all life insurance funds be made known to policy holders. Specifically, the committee stated:

Accordingly, the committee recommends that where life offices do not already do so they should be required in sending their premium renewal notices or annual bonus certificates to provide policy holders with a short summary of their annual reports. These summaries should at least contain meaningful details of the investment spread of the relevant statutory fund.

That is a very sensible suggestion, and I believe that all superannuation funds and life insurance policy holders should have the right to review their investments and take whatever action they wish in order to ensure that the fund is receiving a proper return for the money that policy holders have invested.

This matter is now part of the inquiry by the Federal Government. I thoroughly approve of the Campbell Committee of Inquiry Report on the Australian Financial System, that members of a scheme should be provided annually with a simple and straightforward summary report containing information of the financial position of any superannuation scheme. This report should include a table of investments and the various types of market values. Members of the fund should have access to a copy of the full report if they wish it, and should be provided annually with a statement of accumulated contributions and benefits.

Mr Becker: Does SGIC do that?

Mr FERGUSON: So far as I know SGIC is involved only in term insurance and is not involved in superannuation. It is my hope that SGIC will quickly become involved in superannuation and, if it is able to do so, the added competition will right some of the wrongs to which I have already referred. The sooner that SGIC comes into the field, the more members on this side of the House and I will be pleased as more funds will then be reinvested back into South Australia instead of some funds in life insurance offices being invested out of the State and offshore.

I would support any moves that the member for Hanson might make to ensure that SGIC enters this field of superannuation as soon as is practicable. I also believe that the trustees of the superannuation fund should include an elected employee representative.

Mr Becker: Most of them do.

Mr FERGUSON: I correct the member for Hanson. I have had much experience in this field. In many parts of industry no employee representatives have ever been included in the trustees of superannuation funds. Submissions made to trustees of superannuation funds are often based not on employee interests but on employer interests. As I mentioned earlier, it is quite possible that decisions made by the trustees may appear to be unfair. When earlier retirement and other considerations are being taken into account, for example, in determining whether someone is unable to continue work or whether he should receive full payment from the fund, there should be an elected employee representative amongst the trustees of any superannuation fund.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I hope that members opposite who are interjecting will support any legislation that is introduced along those lines. It is interesting to note that the Campbell Committee made a similar recommendation. It suggested that the trustees provide for an annual election of at least one representative of non-management employee members as a trustee of the fund. I sincerely hope that that is the

sort of legislation that all members in this House will support. This would enable an aggrieved employee to appeal to his representative so that that representative could make a direct representation at a trustee meeting.

In relation to the provision for long service leave, I believe that superannuation should be treated entirely separately. It is still possible, and it still happens, that superannuation payments are made as a payment for long service leave. It is time that this practice ceased in South Australia. In many cases where an employee expects to receive a fairly large superannuation payment, he sometimes finds not only that he receives a minimum payment as required by the trustees, but also from that minimum payment is extracted the long service leave money requirements. So, provided that the employer's contribution in superannuation funds amounts to as much as or more than his obligation under long service leave requirements, a very small payout indeed is received. This is often at a time when the employee's morale is low because of dismissal or retrenchment. The lowering of his expectations of a payout figure is a blow that is very hard to overcome.

Mr Becker: Which industries do this?

Mr FERGUSON: It is happening constantly in the metals industry. I am prepared to provide the member with copies of superannuation plans that make this provision. They are still legal and it is still happening. Many people from the metals industry who have been retrenched as a result of the recent downturn in the economy are prepared to testify that this has, in fact, happened to them. Many people have already provided evidence to the Federal committee of inquiry along these lines. Plenty of evidence is available if the member requires it.

Mr Evans: Should the Government have to invest wisely the funds that it holds to get the best return possible?

Mr FERGUSON: My personal opinion, so far as investments are concerned, relates to all superannuation funds. I would like to see legislation that makes superannuation and long service leave two totally different entitlements, and therefore an employee can and should expect to get both. Many of the problems to which I have referred are now the subject of a Senate inquiry in the Australian Parliament, and I understand that this report will be available within the next six weeks. I also understand that problems of much greater magnitude than those to which I have referred today have been referred to that committee. It appears that any legislation arrived at federally to right some of the wrongs that superannuation schemes now contain would need complementary State legislation to cover any loopholes.

The Government of New South Wales has introduced an Act called the New South Wales Employment Protection Act, which provides for legislative protection for an employee who has been dismissed through retrenchment or through no fault of his own. The Act gives the power to the New South Wales Industrial Commission to direct certain payments for superannuation in certain circumstances. Section 14 of the New South Wales Employment Protection Act, 1982, in effect gives power to the Commission over an employer who dismisses 15 or more employees. Before dismissing or giving notice of dismissal to one or more of those employees, where the employee has been engaged for a year or more and is not a casual employee, where the employee is covered by an award or industrial agreement made under the New South Wales Act, where the termination is not for misconduct, where severance pay is less than the scale provided in the regulations to the Act, such an employer must lodge a notice of intention to terminate the employment of such employee with the Industrial Commission Registrar. Such notices ultimately come before the Industrial Commission to be considered.

In considering the notices the Commission, by reason of section 14 (1) and (7) of the Act, may order as to all or any of the following matters:

(a) Requiring the payment of severance payments to the employee concerned;

(b) Requiring the payment of security to the employee;

(c) Specifying the amount or the method of calculating the amount of any such severance payment or gratuities;

(d) Requiring of payment of benefits from a superannuation scheme of which the employee is a member as if the benefits ordered to be paid were provided for by the scheme;

(e) Requiring the payment of an amount to the employee to compensate him for any loss of accrued benefit under a superannuation scheme of which he is a member;

(f) Requiring the employer concerned to give preference to the employee for employment in a position for which the employee is or may become qualified in the event that the employer requires additional staff;

(g) Requiring in special cases the retraining of the employee and requiring the payment by the employer of any costs of such retraining;

(h) Requiring the payment of an amount to the employee by way of reimbursement of salary or wages lost by him in so far as the loss is in the opinion of the Commission attributable to a failure on the part of the employer to serve notice on the Registrar in accordance with the requirements of section 7; and

(i) Requiring the payment of any sums or the doing of any other act, matter or thing in consequence of the termination of the employment of the employee as appears to the Commission to be just and proper.

Mr Lewis: That is only going to increase the cost of production.

Mr FERGUSON: I acknowledge the interjection made without much thought by the member for Mallee, because the superannuation benefits are already paid for. If the superannuation benefits have not been paid for, we are considering some funds that need to be investigated thoroughly. There will be no increase in cost under this legislation. It would mean that an employee would be paid to the time at which he was dismissed. He would get his contributions, the employer's contributions, plus the proper interest rates and the proper pay-off figure applying to the date of his dismissal, and nothing could be fairer than that. I am not asking in this proposition that anyone should make additional payments. All I ask for under superannuation schemes is that people get paid what is due to them.

If they leave early from superannuation schemes, under the present legislation they are contributing in many cases (and this is the situation for a majority of people) to funds some of their own money. They are making these funds bigger and bigger at their expense. I suggest that they get the money that is due to them, and legislation of this nature in my thinking is absolutely fair and proper. Hopefully, recommendations will come out of the Federal inquiry and we will follow that with complementary South Australian legislation. We are talking about loopholes. I do not think that members of this Parliament are put here to make the life insurance offices and the superannuation funds much more profitable. Surely we are seeking the protection of our own constituents.

It would appear that the contents of this legislation may result in much argument before the New South Wales Industrial Commission, but at least under this system in certain circumstances a member of a fund will have the opportunity to put argument before an arbitrator in lieu of taking action under the tort law. This would appear to be a step in the right direction. There is no doubt in my mind that the law relating to superannuation payments and benefits is in general need of overhaul. At the moment, the scales are balanced

well and truly on the side of employers. Superannuation schemes have been designed by employers and there is a need for this imbalance to be corrected.

From representations made to me following my previous speech in Parliament about superannuation, I understand that life insurance offices are quite willing to design superannuation schemes that are more equitable and balanced on behalf of both employer and employee, but as yet the desire in industry to provide these schemes is not particularly strong. I hope that in due course we will see both State and Federal legislation aimed at correcting the existing situation.

I refer briefly to paragraph 23 of the Governor's Speech, which states:

My Government will continue to ensure that the laws of the State provide adequate protection to consumer interests. In line with the policy of truth-in-lending, amendments will be introduced to the Consumer Credit Act to require banks, building societies and credit unions to comply with the disclosure requirements under that Act.

I applaud that proposal. Members may recall that I brought this matter to the attention of the House in April of this year, and I referred to the fact that certain building societies, without reference to their membership, increased payments in regard to monthly rent rates, alleging that under their rules they were able to do so. We have found that, following a reduction in interest rates, some building societies were able to take the kudos, following announcements in the local press that interest rates had been reduced, and were able to announce reductions in monthly rent rates. However, very quietly and secretly they then increased those payments by way of an administration fee added to the cost of monthly rent payments.

Of course, as yet, I have not had an opportunity to study the proposed amendments to the Consumer Credit Act, but I hope that the legislation will mean that as far as possible a borrower from any lending society (and I am aware that interest rates must rise and fall from time to time, depending on market forces) will know when he signs a contract exactly what payments he will be up for. I am very proud to say that in regard to this truth-in-lending legislation South Australia leads the rest of the Commonwealth. I hope that the proposed legislation will ensure that a proper statement must be provided to anyone taking out a housing contract to show what that person will be up for during the term of credit, apart from the rise and fall in interest rates, the control of which is limited. I support the motion.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I support the motion. I think it is appropriate in the mid term of the Government to reflect on the achievements of South Australia over the past 14 years. The Bannon Government is in obvious need of guidance and direction lest it place this State in the same situation as did the previous Labor Administration which presided over the economic decline in the South Australian community from 1970 to 1979. Before discussing the economic misfortunes caused by incompetence and negligence, I want to refer to part of the Governor's Speech, and in doing so I shall discuss the proposition of economic lags, booms and busts. The Premier took some credit for the upsurge in the building industry in South Australia. I am sure that all members noted the reference in paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech.

Today the Premier went further and claimed that the Opposition was jealous of the achievements of his Government. I thought that we had come a long way in the past 10 years and that we understood a few simple economic propositions. I did not believe that we would hear the innane comments from a Premier that we heard today. As anybody who reviews the history of the building industry will find, a boom period is always followed by a bust period.

To take credit for the massive escalation in the building industry that is happening today is, I believe, shortsighted and shows a complete lack of understanding of what will be the result in a year or two.

Mr Lewis: I believe it is utterly conceited, in fact.

Mr BAKER: In some ways it is conceited, but for all the wrong reasons because this Government has nothing to be conceited about. It is not responsible for the conditions that exist today and it will claim that it is not responsible for the downturn that must inevitably occur, whether it be in six months or in 12 months. I am not trying during this debate to depress the fortunes of the building industry; let us be quite clear about that. However, if anybody wishes to study the figures for the past 20 years, they will understand that this is what will happen, and that the fortune we reap today will be lost tomorrow. Let me not hear a Premier of this State say, 'Look how well we have done, we have got the housing industry to a state where its activity has increased 50 per cent and that is something to be proud of.' It is nothing to be proud of.

If we were, in fact, showing a gradual increase of 5 to 10 per cent per annum, I would applaud the Government's management. However, as I have said before, it has very little impact in this area. I would then say that we have a positive growth pattern. For the edification of members, I will explain a little of the history of the housing industry in South Australia. People can reflect on the figures produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, which show that the most propitious time for housing was from the late 1950s to 1970. However, there were some preconditions for that: steady growth in the economy; low interest rates; low inflation rates; and, of course, full employment. Also, we had a building industry which was vital, which met the needs of the consuming public and which provided the range of skills necessary to build good houses.

That situation has changed, as everybody is aware. We have none of those preconditions today that existed during the 1960s. We have none of the influences which were very healthy and which, in fact, took South Australian home ownership to the highest level of any State in the Commonwealth. Over that period home ownership reached over 80 per cent in South Australia. That was due to the economic programme of the then Playford Government. We all know that there are difficulties for an important segment of the population today in relation to housing. It is not only those people on social security who cannot afford their own houses; there are many others who live quite close to the breadline and who cannot afford their own housing because their income level is not sufficient for them to be able to afford housing repayments.

Let us look at the situation that has evolved over the past 12 months to ascertain what positive benefits it has had for South Australia. As people are well aware, particularly those in low income areas, houses at the lower end of the market have increased in value by 30 to 50 per cent in the past year. How does that help lower income families achieve home ownership? Quite simply, home ownership is getting further and further away from those people who desire to own their own home and to have their own element of security to enable them to experience the capital appreciation that can occur with an asset such as a home. In the past 12 months about 10 000 families have been effectively excluded from owning their own homes.

Let us not talk about the value of a housing boom. Of course, it has been a boom for the State Government, which has conservatively taken \$15 million in stamp duty alone from that section of the population that has purchased houses or land. How has that helped the process of home ownership? As members would be well aware, the costs

associated with housing inevitably finish up in the amount that needs to be borrowed by a home owner.

Mr Plunkett: Why did the Liberals abolish the Land Commission and increase the cost of homes in the lower paid working class areas?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am confused as to who is speaking in this debate. I understand it is the honourable member for Mitcham who has the call.

Mr BAKER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. In fact, the Land Commission did go broke, to use the vernacular. It did overextend itself. It purchased far more land than it could possibly manage within the time frame it intended to manage it. It was poorly advised, poorly funded and failed to meet the needs of the community. Finally, the Federal Government had to come to the aid of the Land Commission.

That is the history of the Land Commission. It purchased land during the 1975-77 boom period so that by the time we came out of that extraordinary growth period there were massive amounts of land left idle, and someone has to pay for that. It is essential that sufficient blocks of land are created so that the demand for land does not increase its cost because of the constraint on supply. One of the things that the member should recall today is that it is the supply situation that is causing the escalation in land prices and the present Government can take some responsibility.

I return to the point about the bonanza reaped by the State Government. The extraordinary amount of money that has flowed into the Treasury coffers as a result of the housing boom has not been repaid by service. There was mention today by the Premier, who was obviously very sensitive about delays in a number of areas of Government, that the Government was doing more than ever to reduce those delays. However, those delays do exist, and for every month that a subdivision is held up, for every month that water cannot be supplied, for every month that electricity cannot be supplied, there is a cost to the home owner.

Mr Lewis: He was a bit touchy about that, wasn't he?

Mr BAKER: Indeed. He was touchy about that because he knows that the housing situation is beyond the control of the State Government and, as a result, very large imposts are being made on the community.

I wish to deal with the very important part of the benefits resulting from the housing boom, that is, the increase in employment. I refer again to the situation pertaining between 1975 and 1977 when South Australia had, as I have stated, a large increase in a number of areas besides the provision of housing. South Australia had a great movement of tradesmen and people with skills into the industry. Employment in the industry increased by about 30 per cent. However, many of the people who entered the industry did so for short-term profit. They did not have the required skills of the people who had grown up in the industry.

In the period 1975-77 there was an increase in house prices and land values. There were increased house building costs, because the supply of labour was not adequate to handle the excess demand. There were delays in State Government services; there were significant increases in costs; and there was shoddy workmanship. Many houses built during that period are now showing the deficiencies of the workmanship undertaken. Honourable members may recall the stories in the press of the mid 1970s about some of the gerry-built houses, when everyone was rushing to build a house.

There is a cost in booms and the things that happened then are happening today. There is an entry into the market of semi-skilled and unskilled people who have perceived an area of employment or profitable return yet who lack the qualities of the tradesmen in the market place, the people

who have survived the tough times because of their skills, experience and dedication to providing a good product. All those things are happening today and we will again experience many of the effects.

In regard to the employment situation, as everyone knows, whilst the improved conditions continue employment will be provided, but what happens when the boom goes off the boil? We lose employment in that industry. In the same way as we lose employment from that industry we lose employment from other areas of the South Australian industry. Anyone with a fundamental knowledge of economics will understand that there is a multiplier effect, and the building industry has one of the highest multiplier effects of any industry. I noted today that a member from the other side of the House mentioned that for every \$1 million spent in the building industry 112 extra jobs were created. I do not wish to argue with that figure, because there are varying opinions on the multiplier effect, but certainly it is near that mark. We can get multiplier effects of the order of two additional jobs for each job already in the industry. In the same way as jobs are being created, if the market subsidies then employment subsidies. For every \$1 million that is not in the market next year we lose 112 jobs, which is why I say that we should not worship the boom: let us talk about steady growth and the management of steady growth. I propose that the industry needs a healthy and vital market, a market which shows slow, gradual, manageable improvement. What is the net effect of the past 12 months? We have effectively disenfranchised those people at the lower end of the scale from ever owning a home at least until an effective mechanism comes in at a later stage to allow them to do so.

The Government can then look forward to an increase in the number of people on the Housing Trust waiting list. I will explain to members why I say that the Bannon Government has no particular responsibility for the sudden improvement in the building industry. It is a phenomenon that has occurred because of the bringing together of three vital elements—none of them orchestrated by the State Government. The first and most significant element is that interest rates on housing loans fell from 15 per cent or 16 per cent to 11 per cent or 12 per cent. The second element was the home ownership scheme of the Federal Government where up to \$7 000 could be made available to first home buyers, which caused this massive escalation at the bottom of the market. The third element is that South Australia has been through a very long period of depressed conditions in the housing market. Most people understand that after 1977, when housing construction had reached nearly 15 000

dwelling, it slumped to almost half that figure over the following few years.

So, what happened was that there was a deferred demand situation and everyone knows that that impacted on the rental market. I have heard comments from the other side of the House and from members of my Party that the rental market is tight, rates are going up, the cost of rental accommodation is getting out of hand and that there are more people on the waiting list for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation. That is true, because the supply of rental accommodation diminished as people were deferring home ownership.

It is important that people understand those phenomena. Of course, if the State Government is to take any credit for the conditions it could probably say that it went to the Prime Minister and said, 'We would like some money for public housing.' Quite seriously, the State Government has done very little for the housing industry in this State. It has been successful in obtaining funds from a Federal Government that was only too willing to set in train a series of events that not only placed funds at the availability of various State Governments to provide public housing but also provided the home ownership scheme. Comment has been made about the future costs of such a scheme. I do not wish to reflect on that, as one has to understand that it is important that people have affordable shelter. What I have said about the housing industry is an excellent example of lagged impacts.

After a boom there is always a bust which can last for some five to seven years, as it has in this case. If one goes back to the Second World War one can see the cycles of development in the housing industry. This is nothing new. Anyone who wishes to look up the information can see that these cycles occur. The reason why the cycles are so violent today is due to economic conditions. Cycles occurred during the propitious periods of the 1950s and 1960s, but the fluctuations were of the order of 5 per cent or 10 per cent—nothing of the order of 50 per cent as we see today. So, there are lags associated with a boom and bust cycle.

I now turn to one of the most important subjects close and dear to my heart—the future economic development of South Australia. I said at the beginning of my Address in Reply speech that I hoped that the Bannon Government had learnt a few lessons from its predecessor's Administration during the 1970s.

I seek leave to have inserted three statistical tables in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

LABOUR FORCE STATUS, SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND AUSTRALIA, 1971-1984

August	Employed Persons				Unemployment Rates		
	SA (^{'000})	% Growth	Aust. (^{'000})	% Growth	SA/Aust %	SA	Australia
1971	500.2	↓	5 515.7	↓	9.1	2.5	1.7
1972	514.1	2.8	5 609.9	1.7	9.2	3.2	2.5
1973	541.0	5.2	5 783.0	3.1	9.4	2.5	1.8
1974	549.4	1.5	5 855.2	1.2	9.4	2.8	2.4
1975	549.3	—	5 841.3	-0.2	9.4	4.9	4.6
1976	564.2	2.7	5 897.8	1.0	9.6	4.2	4.7
1977	568.0	0.7	5 995.4	1.7	9.5	6.3	5.7
1978	553.4	-2.6	5 969.6	0.4	9.3	7.4	6.2
February*							
1978	555.0	↓	6 040.6	↓	9.2	7.6	7.5
1979	558.6	0.6	6 050.7	0.2	9.2	8.2	7.0
1980	552.2	-1.2	6 207.2	2.6	8.9	8.1	6.7
1981	560.1	1.4	6 356.5	2.4	8.8	7.7	6.3
1982	567.6	1.3	6 432.4	1.2	8.8	8.3	7.1
1983	550.6	-3.0	6 264.1	-2.6	8.8	11.1	10.7
1984	552.1	0.3	6 366.0	1.6	8.7	10.5	10.4

*Revised Labour Force Levies based on 1981 Census.

Source: ABS—'The Labour Force' and associated releases.

POPULATION ESTIMATES—SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND AUSTRALIA, 1966-1983

June	South Australia		Australia		S. Aust.
	Number	% Growth	Number	% Growth	% of Australia
1971	1 200 100	↓	13 067 300	↓	↓
1972	1 214 600	1.2	13 303 700	1.8	9.1
1973	1 228 500	1.1	13 504 500	1.5	9.1
1974	1 241 500	1.1	13 722 600	1.6	9.0
1975	1 265 300	1.9	13 893 000	1.2	9.1
1976	1 274 100	0.7	14 033 100	1.0	9.1
1977	1 286 100	0.9	14 192 200	1.1	9.1
1978	1 296 200	0.8	14 359 300	1.2	9.0
1979	1 301 100	0.4	14 515 700	1.1	9.0
1980	1 308 400	0.6	14 695 400	1.2	8.9
1981	1 318 800	0.8	14 923 300	1.6	8.8
1982	1 328 700	0.8	15 178 400	1.7	8.8
1983	1 341 500	1.0	15 378 600	1.3	8.7

POPULATION ESTIMATES—SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND AUSTRALIA, 1966-1983

June	South Australia		Australia		S. Aust.
	Number	% Growth	Number	% Growth	% of Australia

AUSTRALIA
GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT AT 1979-80 PRICES

	Farm	Non-Farm	Total	% Increase	% Farm
1971-72	6 293	85 982	92 275	5.1	6.8
1972-73	5 454	90 564	96 023	4.1	5.7
1973-74	5 789	94 539	100 328	4.5	5.8
1974-75	6 475	95 404	101 879	1.5	6.4
1975-76	6 990	97 452	104 442	2.5	7.2
1976-77	7 178	100 179	107 357	2.8	6.7
1977-78	7 040	101 170	108 210	0.8	6.5
1978-79	8 393	105 456	113 849	5.2	7.4
1979-80	7 449	108 218	115 667	1.6	6.4
1980-81	6 633	113 307	119 940	3.7	5.5
1981-82	7 659	115 845	123 504	3.0	6.2
1982-83	6 179	115 517	121 696	-1.5	5.1

Source: ABS—Estimates of National Income and Expenditure.

Mr BAKER: The first table shows information about the labour force status of South Australia and Australia from 1971 to 1984. It gives a picture of South Australian development of which we cannot be proud. It is nothing to be excited about. Perhaps it needs to be looked at coldly and soberly to find out where we went wrong. Whilst members on the other side of the House might posture about the demands that they wish to see made through the State Government Budget, let us be quite frank. The State Government has only one responsibility: to oversee the economic health and well-being of the community. It can do so by being non-interventionary or by being totally supportive. It cannot do so by expanding its influence, whether in the form of regulations or controls; nor can it do so by expanding the public sector faster than the private sector.

From 1971 onwards the picture is quite clear. I quote some information for members to consider. Employment growth in South Australia was far better than the national average for the period 1971-75. There is a very simple reason for that. It was pumped up by Federal funding. We can all remember the Whitlam Government's moments of largesse which spread the dollar very thickly in South Australia compared to other States.

It is significant that in 1975 our employment growth was zero, yet the national growth was minus .2 per cent. We were then paying for the largesse of the Whitlam Government years which were marked by enormous inflation and escalating unemployment rates. For example, the Australian unemployment rate increased from 1.7 per cent to 4.6 per cent. The South Australian rate went much in line with

that. It started at 2.5 per cent and finished at 4.9 per cent for that five-year period.

Let us remember that we were still getting the benefit of the Whitlam dollars. I am talking about the lag effect. Members would know that the benefit of a dollar input into the economy will flow for a number of years. However, most of the effect is dissipated within the first two years. In 1976 we had a greater growth in employment, but by 1977 we were starting to pay the costs of an Administration which had failed to realise that South Australia's economic base was indeed very fragile. We had a Government which made no attempt to address some of the fundamental deficiencies in the economy and a Government which was more intent on its particular programmes rather than providing for the economic wealth and social well-being of the South Australian community.

For example, in 1980, we had an employment growth rate of minus 1 per cent whereas the national experience was a positive growth rate of 2.6 per cent. The South Australian economy was left in absolute tatters by a non-caring disinterested Dunstan Government. It paid no attention to the fundamentals of providing employment opportunities. The Liberal Government that was elected in 1979 faced that economy. No-one can tell me that suddenly unemployment rates increased because there was a change in Government.

There is always what I call the lag effect. It can be two or three years in certain cases. It can be within six months in other cases, depending on what is happening in the other sectors. So, South Australia's employment opportunities in

real terms did not improve after 1975 because of the Dunstan Government's mismanagement. It did not take the opportunity to take stock of the South Australian economy, and by 1979 we had the loss of jobs and of population, and I will deal with the population situation shortly.

From 1975, as everybody realises, unemployment escalated both in the Federal sphere and at the State level, and South Australia's unemployment rate was far higher than the national average for the very reasons that I have explained.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: They were the years of the Fraser Government.

Mr BAKER: My uninformed friends over there say that they were the years of the Fraser Government. Obviously, they have not listened to some very important points that I have made about the lag effects of the economy. So, by 1979, when the Liberal Government came to power in South Australia the South Australian unemployment rate was 8.2 per cent and the national rate was 7 per cent. This differential was maintained right up until recently when the South Australian and the Australian rates have come together. I make the point right now that when I was employed by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment back in 1982—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: You were working for a socialist organisation.

Mr BAKER: —when I was working as a non-political public servant of the Government, we predicted exactly what has happened today, because it was totally predictable, and this is the point that I have been making about the housing boom situation. South Australia's economic opportunities had wound down; we had seen an exodus from the State of a large number of employees who were going interstate, and it had reached a certain base.

At the same time that this was happening other States were going through a minerals boom that we did not experience here in South Australia. The regional economies of those States, particularly New South Wales and Queensland, were being pumped up by massive amounts of capital. Which States are now bearing the highest rates of unemployment? Those very States, because once that investment capital was taken away we had the multiplier effect working in reverse again, and the South Australian economy looks relatively well compared to the national average. It is no secret; there is nothing magical about an understanding of those phenomena. It is a simple proposition that the booms that one has are always repaid by busts, and steady growth is one of the most laudable expectations that we can have.

I reiterate that I am ashamed that the Premier is now trying to take credit for something for which he may not wish to take credit in about 12 months. So the South Australian economy has turned around. We are now providing more employment opportunities; the unemployment rate has actually fallen significantly. The Premier has said in the House that 20 000 jobs have been created in South Australia in the past year. I am not sure whether the Premier is incompetent, whether he tries to mislead this House or whether he receives poor advice.

Of course, 20 000 jobs have been created, but more than half of those have been part-time jobs. The impact is far less than the bland employment figures indicate. For example, the estimated part-time employment creation over the past year is 10 800. The total employment creation is about 20 600.

Mr Lewis: So he is really incompetent.

Mr BAKER: I do not know whether he is incompetent or whether he just does not understand. However, at the national level, where the employment growth has not been quite as significant, 232 200 jobs have been created but only 62 400 of them are part-time, so only a quarter of them are part-time jobs.

I am delighted that we have experienced a turn-around in the employment figures and I do not want to detract from that situation. However, let us be a little honest about the achievement, and that is that we are now probably not as well off as we were in 1976 as far as employment is concerned. So, we have a long way to go and let us never forget that fact.

I suggest that some facts do emerge from the figures and an analysis of the economic performance of South Australia over the past 14 years, more particularly in relation to the recent changes. One is that the improvement in the South Australian employment situation would have been far better if the tax increases in this State had been less. The Premier does not seem to accept that simple proposition that, as soon as one puts up taxes, one costs jobs, but let me assure the Premier that that is the case. Let me assure the Premier that, if the Federal Government took up the challenge of assessing the economic impacts of its taxation policies and those of the States, we would start to get a rational debate on the impacts of taxation to the benefit of all Australians. We have to devise those tax measures which are least disruptive to employment opportunities.

I have already made the point that half the extra jobs are of a part-time nature. I have said that the previous outflows of people to other States took many of our best skilled workers away from this State, and that is a great shame because we have lost the talents of those people. It is a great shame because the Dunstan Government failed to understand that it had to take a new direction in the 1970s with regard to some of our industries. I have made the point that South Australian employment levels are sustained by a high level of part-time employment, and we are three per cent above the national average. I have also said that the building industry has been the propitious industry in a short-term context in the past year, and this position has also been assisted by the Commonwealth employment programmes, which have pumped up employment levels in South Australia.

I suppose that the most disappointing aspect of the past year is that the Australian economy has experienced a 6 per cent to 6.5 per cent real growth in gross domestic product. However, the employment growth is equivalent only to an increase of some 3 per cent and there are warning signs there. The wealth we are creating is not revealing itself in terms of jobs.

I am hoping that a lag effect will occur in that regard and that we will start to pick up further employment opportunities during the forthcoming year and, further, that some of the investment opportunities referred to today will be taken up, because the national and State economies need another stimulus. We know that the American economy will suffer a severe down-turn following the next election in the United States. The United States Government can no longer prop up its massive budget deficits without that having an impact on all facets of the economy, particularly on those relating to interest rates. At some stage the deferred debt will have to be paid for.

I want to refer briefly to the population situation to indicate the parallel experience of population figures in South Australia and the economic circumstances that have prevailed over the past 14 years. Western Australia now has a greater population than South Australia. In future publications we will see that South Australia in comparative population terms with other States is lower down on the list than was the case previously, being somewhere above Tasmania, the ACT and the Northern Territory. In 1971, South Australia had 1.2 million people, while the Australian total was 13.067 million. South Australia's population was about 9.1 per cent of Australia's total population.

Since then we have progressively gone downhill, as our growth rates have failed to increase as has occurred elsewhere. For example, from 1972 to 1976 the population growth rate fell from 1.2 per cent per annum to .7 per cent per annum. It was only in 1983 that we returned to a unitary percentage growth rate, but that was due to special circumstances which are unlikely to be repeated. At the national level, the growth rate has fluctuated but it has always been more than 1 per cent. From the position of having 9.1 per cent of the nation's population in 1971 South Australia now has only 8.7 per cent of the nation's population.

We have failed to provide for the economic health and welfare of our population. This is graphically illustrated in employment opportunity and labour force statistics as well as population estimates. The sooner the Government understands that it must pay attention to some of the important issues facing Australia, and South Australia in particular, and appreciates that every time an extra dollar of taxation is placed on goods or services an extra job is lost, the better off we will be.

It is clear that a certain level of taxation is needed to sustain services provided, but the only impact on consumers from the spending of taxation dollars on public sector wages not being economically utilised is that one is paying for nothing. That is the challenge that all western governments face, namely, to optimise resources at their disposal and reduce the taxation burden on the population, because the more taxes there are the less is the incentive to create wealth in the form of profits and the lower is the probability of ever getting back to an economically healthy situation.

I refer now to table 3, which shows the gross domestic product at 1979-80 prices for the period 1971-72 to 1982-83. This table tells a sorry tale of lost opportunities. Unfortunately, we do not have the figures for South Australia, so we cannot compare them. In 1971-72 there was a growth rate of 5.1 per cent in the gross domestic product. That was under a Government that was providing for the people of Australia. That Government was replaced (one does not know for what reason) and thereafter the decline set in. Let us be quite clear that, until 1971-72, we were well provided for. Unemployment was at a level of 1.7 per cent—a far cry from the 10 per cent of today. In fact, the latest unemployment figure for South Australia is 9.3 per cent.

We reached a 5 per cent growth rate in 1978-79 after achieving a growth rate of only 0.8 per cent in 1977-78. Of course, in 1982-83 there was a minus 1.5 per cent increase in the gross domestic product. The relevance of these figures, for the information of the uninitiated, is that we need at least a 3 per cent growth in the Australian economy to cater for the number of new entrants to the work force each year. If we fail at any stage to get a 3 per cent growth rate in the economy in a year, there will be an increase in unemployment. That has happened on a number of occasions since the early 1970s. Every time there is an economic downturn there are more people joining the unemployment queues. One point I wish to highlight to the House is the critical nature of farm produce to our gross domestic product.

I wish to mention that particularly because members on the other side of the House on certain occasions have been wont to downgrade the importance of the rural economy. They have a penchant for taxing the rural economy. They also have a penchant for not supplying services to the people who form part of the rural economy. In fact, under Labor Administrations they become the forgotten sector of the population.

The two most serious downturns of the past 10 years have caused the greatest hiccups in unemployment rates since the Second World War. Both of those have been consequent upon adverse rural conditions. Let no-one tell me that the rural economy is not one of the most important

ingredients of the State's economy and the national economy. That is quite fundamental. Every time the rural economy sneezes the Australian economy sneezes. That fact is little appreciated by Labor Administrations both in South Australia and in Canberra. I close on that note. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I wish to talk in the brief time available to me tonight about the concept of equality of opportunity in education or, rather, inequality of opportunity. I do so by referring in the first instance to the function I attended on Saturday night at Marryatville High School. A musical evening was presented by the students and staff of that school and it showed beyond doubt that that institution has attained an admirable standard of excellence. It was one of the finest presentations that I have ever seen from a school group.

As such, it was an answer to some of the criticisms levelled at the State system by Mr Partington and others. It was a superb performance. However, last night I attended a meeting of parents and staff of Gilles Street Primary School and I hope that both the Deputy Premier, who is the member for the District, and the Minister of Education will take note of what I have to say about that school. I believe that the students of Gilles Street Primary School do not have equality of opportunity as it applies to many other students in our State system.

I know that I am comparing a primary school with a high school and perhaps that is not a correct means of comparison. Nevertheless, there are primary schools in South Australia which have the facilities and the staff whereby the children have equality of opportunity. Certainly, I believe that the students of Gilles Street Primary School do not have that, and that applies for several reasons. Most members will have passed by Gilles Street Primary School at some time, because it is centrally located. Members will have noted the restricted site of that school. I will say more about that site in a minute.

First, I want to deal with the complement of the school and some of the difficulties that they suffer. The school has a total enrolment of about 191 students, but of that total about 19 per cent are itinerant students, and that creates many problems. Further, 68 per cent of the students are children of single-parent families and of the total number of students 29 have emotional problems, some very severe. Also, 56 per cent of the children live outside a 3 km radius of the school.

Of the students, 152 (or 79 per cent) are involved in after hours care where the school provides under the most difficult circumstances an after hours care programme. Of those students, 32 (or 17 per cent) require special education and the school has an allocation of 0.4 or two days a week teacher time for special education. Anyone would realise that that is painfully inadequate. I am informed that at least one of the students, who because of severe emotional problems is a voluntary mute, should have a one-to-one teacher/student situation.

Itinerancy itself brings problems. At the beginning of the year 170 students were enrolled at the school; there are now 191. Last year the number went up to 205. The enrolment can vary by 30 students over a very short time, and one

can imagine the pressures that that puts on the teaching staff.

Further to that there is a women's shelter close by, and the children of those women living in the shelter attend the school. We all know that some of the children from women's shelters have very severe emotional problems and that in itself causes a problem for the school, because some of those children, not all of them, can be disruptive in the normal classroom situation—further pressures on the principal and on the staff. I have mentioned that 17 per cent of the students require special education and I have mentioned the allocation. The school obviously needs a full time special educationist. There are very few areas of education more important than special education.

Of the staff at the school half are contract teachers. Last year there were four contract teachers out of the eight at the school, and this year those four contract teachers were moved elsewhere and another four contract teachers were brought in. The situation is, of course, that there is no stability in the staff. The very least that could have happened was that the four contract teachers who were there last year should have remained. And so the story goes on.

There are certainly other schools in this State that are very badly off—priority project schools which need special attention. However, I mentioned the site, a very cramped site. However, also on that site is a language centre, a literacy centre, which this year has had to relinquish from its very important programme one classroom to try to meet the needs of the primary school. There is just no room on that site for two education institutions. I also understand that a Baptist child care centre occupies one room and conducts an after school care programme on the premises as well. No doubt that classroom is shared, but that site is so cramped that it is impossible to provide an educational environment for those children that will enable them to reach their own educational plateau, if I can put it that way.

Last night at the meeting the Principal, Mr Green, made an impassioned plea, as did the representatives of the parents, for the Education Department to do something about this school, and the Principal of the language centre, Mr John Phillips, who is one of the most articulate people I have ever heard in education, made an impassioned plea for the language centre.

No Government over the past 10 years can be proud of the present set-up at the Gilles Street Primary School. The Minister of Education will visit that school next Monday. I have no doubt that the parents will put to him a very impressive case. I make this speech tonight so that education officers will be able to tell the Minister—and unfortunately he is not here tonight—the serious problems that exist at that primary school. I make a plea on behalf of those parents and teachers, and, particularly the students, that the Education Department somehow will find some way of alleviating the distressing situation at the Gilles Street Primary School.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): In this debate I will refer to a topic that I raised in this House on 11 April 1984: that is, the question concerning the company Sincerity Products. At that time I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate, first, the recruitment, payment and conditions of employment of employees of the company and, secondly, the quality, cost and value for money of the product sold. I went on to discuss the product and the note attached to the back of the product, which states:

Notice to intending purchaser of this set of writing paper. The young people selling our products are independent agents. Apart from gaining experience working in the sales field they have the foresight to use their spare time gainfully and not spend it idly in a group at the local shopping centre. For this reason alone we request you give them your support.

Time has gone on and, in the intervening period, I have received a number of phone calls and letters from not only my constituents but other constituents around Adelaide who share and have heightened my concern. I shall take the time of the House to refer to some of these complaints.

Two women contacted me, one from Henley Beach and one from Magill. The woman from Magill stated that recently a young girl of about 11 years of age and wearing a brace on her back had knocked on her door about 7.30 p.m. to 8.00 p.m. in the evening selling this writing set. When this constituent found out the price she said that she felt it was too expensive. I will go into that in a moment. This girl (aged about 11 years, remember) asked to use the toilet and was allowed to do so. When she came back this woman made her aware of the dangers of coming into someone's property, not knowing them, and being prepared to use their private facilities.

The girl said that there was someone in the street who had dropped her off. This woman looked in the street but could not see anyone. She then took the emergency telephone number and telephoned the company, explaining that she felt that it was very dangerous to have children on the streets at that hour of night. The gentleman on the other end of the phone replied that in the five years he had been in operation no child had been hurt or abducted. I am delighted to hear that! This woman continued to voice her disapproval, and the man ended up by making a rude remark and hung up. She then proceeded to look up the yellow pages of the telephone book for a phone number but could not find one. Indeed, I had a similar experience when I tried to contact the proprietors of this product.

Another person who contacted my office came from Christies Beach. She was told by a young girl of about the same age that she was doing it for work experience and to aid charity. Another person was told that it was for work experience. She bought the product because she felt sorry for the young girl. She also suggested that this person was on her own and that she could not see anyone else in the street.

One of the most frightening experiences related to me came from a constituent of another member who lives at North Haven. Apparently, last November on a Saturday afternoon a young lad of about nine or 10 years of age called with a Sincerity product. He said that he wanted a reference from those people so that he could get a job. I find that quite incredible at his age. That same afternoon another lad of about 14 or 15 years of age also called. He was in a terrible state. When the woman refused to purchase the product he started to cry because he said he needed a reference for a job he was going for on the following Monday. She suggested that he obtain a reference from his headmaster. This person contacted the Port Adelaide police because she was so concerned about the situation.

Another person from Bellevue Heights rang me about a boy between 10 and 12 years who knocked on her door in the dark. Again, she bought the product because she felt sorry for him. Finally, a teacher who taught at a northern suburbs primary school some years ago in year 7 told me that she noticed that several boys in her class were not performing very well. She talked to them and discovered that they were selling Sincerity products after school and were going to bed very late in the evening. They were 12 years of age and came from a deprived socio-economic background which was often not supervised. This person pursued the matter with the Youth Bureau. Many other constituents have contacted me. They have taken up this matter with the Youth Bureau and with Consumer Affairs.

As members will remember, I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate the complaints that I have

received. I refer to a letter sent to me by the Minister during the Parliamentary break, as follows:

Sincerity Products places advertisements in the local *Messenger* newspaper in the Salisbury/Elizabeth area for persons interested in part-time employment and engages people over the age of 14 years as commission agents. The sales people operate on a door-to-door basis selling packs of stationery for \$3.00 each and receive 60 cents (20 per cent) commission per pack. The Door-to-Door Sales Act applies to contracts in excess of \$30.00 where goods other than books are involved. In a contract for \$3.00 there is therefore no breach of the Act.

The letter further explains that these sales people or young students are picked up by a mini bus, usually between 4 and 4.30 p.m., in the northern part of Adelaide and they work in pairs. They are collected by the mini bus and are usually deposited at their homes by 9 p.m. I like the word 'usually' because obviously it means that they are not always deposited by 9 p.m.

The letter further states that because there is no price control on the type of goods sold by Sincerity products, obviously little can be done. The firm has admitted that the \$3 pack would retail for \$1.20 elsewhere and that the students get 60c for each pack sold. This is gross exploitation of our young people who are working in the winter, in the dark and in areas with which they are not familiar. I believe that in many cases they are in grave moral danger as well as being exploited through their labour. They will not complain because the small amount of pocket money that they get is better than none. However, we should find some way to protect them.

Therefore, I suggest that the Government considers either of two options: first, amending the Door-to-Door Sales Act so that goods sold for less than \$30 are covered by the Act. If that were done, it could not be suggested that these people are independent commission agents. Secondly, the Government could legislate for minimum rates of pay for workers such as these young people who are not covered by any award or agreement which could be covered by State or Federal legislation.

We must look very seriously at one of these two options because at the moment this company is able to exploit our young people and to expose them to grave moral danger and get away with it. I am very angry, as indeed are many of my constituents and many other people in South Australia, about this situation.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I will draw attention to two matters tonight. Before I do that I want to say from personal experience how much I would regret the consequence of the remarks made by the member for Mawson if they resulted in young people being precluded from the possibility of obtaining some income from hawking. When I was in primary school and secondary school I would not have been able to make myself independent in my schooling from my parents, as was necessary, being a member of a family of 10 children, had it not been for the income that I obtained in total, part of it coming from hawking. I served householders in the district of what is now called Paralowie—what was then Salisbury—and other areas such as Enfield and Klemzig, selling them, not stationery, but fresh food such as fresh fruit and vegetables, and flowers. That was the only way that my brothers and I could obtain the money we needed to get an education.

Tonight, I address two matters that concern me. The first relates to the consequences of the Flood Management Act, which passed this Parliament in the previous session, and its implications outside the Torrens and Sturt Creek watershed of the metropolitan area and in the district that I represent, and in the District Council of Tatiara in particular. Over the years every so often huge floods have come from across the border in Victoria through the creeks to

Cannawigara and Mosquito Creek into the South-East and spread on frontages of many miles. These floods completely inundate large areas of farmland, houses and farm-yards.

I refer to a letter from the Tatiara District Council, the District Clerk, Leo Dempsey, addressed to the Hon. Jack Slater. I drew attention to this matter during the course of the debate on the Flood Management Act of 1983. The letter states:

On 21 March 1984, I wrote to you seeking your comments on certain aspects of the Flood Management Act, and on 8 June 1984 you replied advising that you were seeking the comments of the Attorney-General.

That was on 8 June. It took him three months to get around to doing that. The letter continues:

As this matter is of major concern to this council it would be appreciated if we could be advised of the Attorney-General's comments as soon as possible.

The major concerns of this council are as follows:

(1) Water courses in our council area are not easily defined as the country is flat and the water spreads over a wide area in flood times. Over a period of many years there have been many arguments over the correct course of the water which have not been resolved.

(2) It appears that in some cases a whole property could be classed as a water course [and indeed that is so] in which case the operation of the property would be severely restricted if council applied the provisions of the Act [as it stands].

(3) It appears that if council fails to enforce the Act it could be held liable for damages to a person who claimed he suffered damages as a result of council's inaction.

(4) Drainage work under part of our council area is controlled by the Tatiara Drainage Trust which operates under the Tatiara Drainage Trust Act, 1949-1975. Council wishes to know whether the area controlled by the Tatiara Drainage Trust is exempted from the requirements of the Flood Management Act or whether the Tatiara Drainage Trust becomes redundant.

I alluded to that problem at the time the Bill was before the House. I was assured at that time that it did not apply. I want to know. I suspected at the time that it did and we were creating more problems than we would solve by not specifically stating that it did not apply to those circumstances outside the watershed of the metropolitan area. Therefore, it is creating uncertainty and I believe that the Government's dilemma is illustrated by the fact that it is unwilling to respond quickly to the inquiries made by the council. It must act and act quickly to define and determine whether that Act does make the Tatiara Drainage Trust redundant.

I now wish to turn to the second matter, that is, the consequence of the off-road vehicle ads which I regard as being stupid, immoral and irresponsible. The increasing advertising trend to show motor vehicles in off-road situations, be they family sedans, four-wheel drives or motor bikes, tearing around the countryside is very disturbing and distressing to me and many of the people and interest groups I represent in the District of Mallee.

If one stops and thinks about this for a minute, one appreciates how utterly stupid, grossly irresponsible and immoral such behaviour is. It does not sell one extra vehicle. It merely promotes a form of driver behaviour which is against the practice of all common sense and good civic manners. Vehicles are depicted in those advertisements in gutsy, macho style, tearing up country roads and destroying natural bushland habitat. What is worse, these advertisements encourage bad driving behaviour and bad road manners. This is not only in the current generation of drivers but the next generation as well who, as children, may be watching the advertisements on television or seeing the coloured pictures of selected frames from them in a variety of glossy magazines which reinforce the message.

Worse still, it is the kind of behaviour which illustrates the very worst aspect of the public image of corporate big business; that is, the vehicle manufacturer/distributor, the advertising industry and the media which put the advertisements to air or published them. We all have to meet the

increased tax burden to offset the damage which is done by encouraging this kind of behaviour.

Let me explain what I mean by 'damage'. First, by encouraging aggressive driver behaviour in general, they contribute to the development of bad driving manners on the road (as well as off) and therefore to an increase in the property damage and the personal injury of the road toll. The increased road toll means even greater cost to provide the medical, paramedical, and hospital health care services which are used up to treat the resulting injured. In addition, there are the costs incurred by the other people involved, such as the police and other emergency services, who have the hapless task of 'cleaning up' afterwards.

Secondly, rural roads are already deteriorating faster than we can repair them with the pitiful sums of money presently made available by State and Federal Governments to maintain them. We just do not need this kind of stupid, impulsive driver behaviour to be encouraged in the minds of a few thoughtless members of the motoring public to add to our present problems.

Thirdly, when country people (and they are the people I represent) see these ads, and the resulting consequences to their roads, safety, property and livestock, they get very angry. That is understandable. In spite of what tourism promoters and politicians alike (me included) tell them, that the stranger is a tourist who will bring prosperity and benefits to their children and other unemployed people in their communities, they still identify the people who misbehave on their roads and the industry which promotes that misbehaviour in the countryside as tourists and 'townies'. Mistakenly so perhaps, but the result is an increasing division and reduction of tolerance between country and city people. It is regrettable, but understandable, that country people

therefore see their city cousins and tourism as bad things for their district.

Mr Becker: Who wrote this?

Mr LEWIS: I did, and I am quite proud to be able to put before Parliament the consequences of this kind of behaviour for those people responsible to address it. Fourthly, whenever I see a vehicle or a motor bike tearing through paddocks or bushland, carelessly ripping up the soil and plants which grow in it, gouging out grooves and gutters which become a fast-track run-off for water (thereby creating the genesis of gully erosion) I am shocked, and other members should be, too.

Furthermore, the consequence for sand dunes everywhere is equally devastating. This thoughtless, impulsive behaviour of the thrill seeking off-road driver denudes the dune of the vegetation canopy over it and destroys the roots which anchor it. The dune thus becomes prone to wind erosion. The increasing number of these irresponsible off-road freaks who drive out into the countryside, bumptiously, irresponsibly and, without permission, opening gates and driving their vehicles into farmers' paddocks, regardless of whether any stock are there or not, are ignoring private property rights of the farmer. Accordingly, their actions are pushing an increasing number of farmers to the point where they tell me they are on the brink of retaliating with violence. I regret that, as I think we all do.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 9.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 8 August at 11.45 a.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 7 August 1984

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**SERVICE TO YOUTH COUNCIL**

6. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Was the letter signed by the Premier endorsing the recent appeal for funds by the Service to Youth Council distributed to all homes in South Australia and, if not, in which metropolitan suburbs and country towns was it distributed and what cost, if any, did the Government incur for the printing and distribution of it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There was no cost to the Government. The other matters raised in the question should be directed to the organisations concerned.

INDO-CHINESE REFUGEE RELIEF FUND

7. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Was the letter signed by the Premier endorsing the recent appeal by the Indo-Chinese Refugee Relief Fund distributed to all homes in South Australia and, if not, in which metropolitan suburbs and country towns was it distributed and what cost, if any, did the Government incur for the printing and distribution of it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There was no cost to the Government. The other matters raised in the question should be directed to the organisations concerned.