

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 August 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1987.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 1 694 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution and uphold present laws against the exploitation of women by prostitution were presented by Messrs Abbott, Payne, Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Blacker, Eastick, Gunn, Hamilton, Klunder, Lewis, Tyler, and Wotton and Mrs Adamson.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 1 269 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Duigan, Ferguson, Gregory, Gunn, Lewis, Oswald, and Payne.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 10 and 35 to 47.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Sewerage Act, 1929—Regulations—
General Penalty.
Registration Fees for Plumbers and Certificates of Competency.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Random Breath Testing, Operation and Effectiveness in 1985. Report by Department of Transport.
Highways Department—Lease Approvals, 1985-86.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Schedules of Alterations made by Statute Revision. Commissioner of—
Adoption of Children Act.
Building Act.
Mining Act.
Rules of Court—
District Criminal Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926—General Rules.

Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act, 1935—Overseas Evidence.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Fisheries Act, 1982—Regulations—
Western Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.
Central Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.
Southern Zone Abalone Fishery—Licence Fees.
River Fishery—Licence Fees.
Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Pot Fees.
Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Pot Fees.
Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery—SAFIC Fee.
Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery—SAFIC Fee.
Miscellaneous Fishery—Licence Fees.
West Coast Experimental Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.
Investigator Strait Experimental Prawn Fishery—Licence Fees.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Racing Act, 1976—Betting Control Board Rules—Bookmaker Risks.

QUESTION TIME

WORLD THREE DAY EVENT

The **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY**: In view of his attempt publicly and in this House last week to distance himself from any responsibility for the financial difficulties of the World Three Day Event, will the Premier indicate to the House precisely what commitment the Government gave to the organisers of the event relating to its funding?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I have not attempted at any stage to distance the Government from the Three Day Event. In fact, the active financial support of the Government, the action that it took in March when flagged with the possibility that the whole event would have to be aborted if emergency assistance was not given and the active role of promotion that a number of people (including myself) took in trying to ensure that there was not a pall of gloom surrounding the Three Day Event all would indicate, I hope, how positively and strongly the Government supported the event.

However, I have consistently pointed out that, unlike the Grand Prix, which is run by a statutory body of the Government and where the Government is the entrepreneur, the Three Day Event was organised by an incorporated body, an organising committee which was not a Government committee. There were some senior public servants on the committee; in fact, the committee still exists, not having been wound up yet. There were also on the committee members of Parliament—the member for Light, in whose district the event took place, and the federal member for Wakefield, Mr Andrew—and a number of leading businessmen.

So, an organising committee was established for the purpose of running and staging that Three Day Event with some financial support from the Government. In the course of attempting to attract that event naturally the Government also assisted the committee very strongly in saying how welcome was the event, in saying what sort of support we could provide and generally assisting with the promotion of it. I would like that put clearly on the record.

The question that arises in the current instance relates to the financial failure of the event—and I set its financial failure against its success as an event, which should not be overlooked as it was staged extremely successfully and was a credit to South Australia. We certainly got a considerable

amount of favourable national and international attention. It certainly generated a lot of expenditure in South Australia. All those things having been said, the fact is that the financial failure of the event is not something for which the Government can simply write a blank cheque and say, 'Isn't that bad luck! Tut, tut, what a pity!' That is just not on and the taxpayers of South Australia surely could not tolerate such an attitude on behalf of the Government.

I ask members to recall what the Government has done: first, it did support, through the Jubilee 150 Board, the staging of the event; secondly, when the budget of the event was under some question and doubt was thrown over whether or not the sales of tickets could reach the fairly optimistic hopes of the organisers, the Government said that if, on the basis of the budget that had been presented there was some major shortfall in ticket sales, the Government certainly would attempt to assist in that matter.

That was back in 1984. It was only in March 1986, with the horses in quarantine and the publicity and arrangements all in place, that the gravest financial problems were signalled, along with organisational difficulties attached to the event. The Government again reacted very promptly. Fortunately, we have in South Australia an organisation called the Grand Prix Board, which has very successfully demonstrated how events of that nature can be staged. On behalf of the organising committee we asked whether its expertise, on a fee for service basis, could be brought into play to assist the event, and it willingly complied. Thank goodness it did, because there would have been even more problems than financial ones. I suggest also that the event that was staged so successfully would not have been so staged if the Grand Prix Board had not been involved.

In addition, based on a comprehensive reassessment of the budget, the downgraded estimates of revenue and the upgraded estimates of expenditure, I asked the committee, 'What is the bottom line? What extra support on underwriting do you need?' We arrived at a figure of around \$700 000 to \$800 000. Even in that context I was assured that, with the way the organisation was working and the way the event could shape up, it may be that all of that amount would not be called on. That is where it ended—at the close of the event itself. Only subsequently we discovered that, far from the \$800 000 being adequate to ensure that the event could go on with assurance, in fact there was an even greater shortfall. I am still waiting to see the true nature and composition of that shortfall.

As recently as today the organising committee met to look again at these issues, and I am very happy to see Mr Fricker, the Chairman of the organising committee, and to listen to his case when he can come to me with a set of figures and some propositions that the Government can seriously consider. I repeat again, as I did last Thursday, that I am not treating this with a legalistic approach. I certainly can see that a number of people in good faith supported the event with their goods and services, firmly believing that they would be paid. If they had asked me, I could have given them that assurance, based on what I had been told and based on the substantial extra money that the Government had provided. However, that has not proved sufficient but I suggest there is some moral obligation which has to be sorted out.

What I will not accept is that an organising committee, which established and devised the event, given all the assistance which it had from the Government, at the end of the day simply throws up its hands and says, 'There is nothing more we can do, it is over to you.' Those days are finished. While I remain Premier that is certainly not the way I would treat those events. For these things which we have

direct 'hands on' responsibility, we will accept that responsibility; for events like the Three Day Event, where there is a case to be made, we will listen to that case, but there is no way we will write a blank cheque or accept that an organising committee, or anybody, is simply going to opt out when the going gets tough.

MITCHAM-GLENELG BUS SERVICE

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Transport ask the State Transport Authority to review the imminent withdrawal of the 652 bus service, which runs across the city from Mitcham to Glenelg? A number of constituents who work at Glenelg have put to me that the withdrawal of this service will cause considerable hardship. As the Minister will be aware, there is no direct service from my electorate to Glenelg and the only way these people can get to work is by a north-south service to catch this east-west service. In light of these representations, will the Minister ask the State Transport Authority to review its decision?

The SPEAKER: I call on the Minister of Transport, this question being of particular interest to the Chair.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have asked the State Transport Authority to reconsider the decision to discontinue service 652. In fact this morning, Mr Heath, the Chief Traffic Manager, met with me and the Town Clerk, City Engineer and the ward councillor at Mitcham to discuss the Mitcham council's opposition to an appropriate turning circle for that service when it comes to the end of its route at Mitcham. As a result of those discussions, council will reconsider its opposition to the STA proposal to use the current turning circle, and at the same time the STA will continue to see whether a more appropriate turning circle is available.

Whilst those discussions and investigations are proceeding, the service will continue. I think it is fair to say that more than considerable public dismay has been expressed as a result of that decision. I have certainly had strong representations from the member for Walsh, as you, Mr Speaker, would appreciate. My colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy would understand the representations that I have had from the member for Mitchell. I have also had representations from—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member should wait his turn. I have also had representations from the candidate for Hawker, Ms Liz Harvey. I have had letters and telegrams from the member for Morphett, all supporting the continuation of the service.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, the member for Mitcham reminds me that I have already had a letter from him opposing the present turning circle. I understand that the honourable member would be representing constituents who had contacted him. As a result of those approaches and the Mitcham council's decision, the service has been placed in jeopardy.

I think I should give some background to the decision. For some seven months now, the STA has been negotiating with Mitcham council to determine an appropriate turning circle, and 13 different propositions have been looked at. All had been regarded as unsatisfactory by the Mitcham council. The service itself is said—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member should check with his council, and I think he will understand the fallacy of his statement. I do not know what he has been told, but

13 propositions have been looked at and all have been regarded as unsatisfactory by the council. In fact, I have a letter from the City Engineer stating that fact. The decision was based on two factors: first, the appropriate turning circle could not be arrived at, and, secondly, the service itself is not well patronised. It certainly provides a very essential service for people who have been using it for a long time, and they have become accustomed to it.

I am not saying that this is the worst patronised STA service in Adelaide, but, putting the two together, the difficulty in convincing the Mitcham council that it should allow streets to be used, plus the fact that it was not well patronised, encouraged the STA to decide to discontinue it. I should say that the STA has authority to override a council's decision if it wants to run buses along certain streets, but the STA has an instruction from, I think, succeeding Ministers that it needs to be a good neighbour to councils and needs to work with councils where that is appropriate.

If on this occasion no resolution can be found with the Mitcham council, I will certainly encourage the STA to use its authority to determine the appropriate route. I might say that I have been over the route and around the turning circle, and the one that is currently being used is, I suggest, the most appropriate in the region. I was there this morning and it certainly has a lot of open space along the route. I want to make one other point, because I think it is important that all members of Parliament and all people in the Adelaide community should understand it.

The STA cannot go on for ever continuing to operate the bus services that it now operates. If the patronage of a bus service decreases to the stage where on any judgment it cannot be justified, while at the same time other growing areas are under serviced, a decision must be made whether or not that service can be continued. If the decision is made to discontinue it, a small number of people will always be gravely disadvantaged as a result of the decision. But, where we are running with a deficit of \$100 million a year at cost to the taxpayer, difficult decisions must be made sometimes, because the alternative is to leave the current services running and to superimpose on those services other services that will increase the deficit which will have to be met by the taxpayer.

Discontent will always be expressed when services are changed or discontinued, and I accept that. However, members here and the community generally should understand that we cannot go on forever keeping the services that we have and superimposing over and above those services other services. There must be a rationale in this matter. On this occasion, I will accept that the decision should be reviewed. In my judgment, I believe that the service will remain, but I cannot guarantee to members of Parliament and the community that my decision will be the same if and when it is found that other services are under patronised and due for discontinuance.

WORLD THREE DAY EVENT

Mr OLSEN: My question is addressed to the Premier. Why have you persistently attempted to blame the organisers—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has been in Parliament long enough to know that he should not refer to another honourable member as 'you' and that he should use the third person.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Why has the Premier persistently attempted to blame the organising com-

mittee for the financial difficulties of the World Three Day Event when the Government deliberately excluded that committee from preparation of vital budgets for the event?

The Premier's whitewashing and half truths do not wash with the facts, which are as follows. In March, the Premier made a number of decisions in relation to the organisation of this event, including the appointment of Ms Davis as Executive Director and officials of the grand prix office to advise and assist on various aspects of organisation. These Government appointed officials prepared a budget dated 24 April. They specifically excluded the organising committee from knowledge of that budget. They refused to meet with the organising committee in the six weeks leading up to the event.

The Premier received a document on 21 July which showed that the budget prepared by the Government appointed officials on 24 April had blown out by almost \$800 000 due to income from the event being over-estimated by almost \$440 000 and spending being under-estimated by more than \$330 000. The Government has to take responsibility for this budget result because it occurred directly as a result of decisions taken by the Government, estimates prepared by Government appointed officials and expenditure incurred by those officials without the knowledge of the organising committee.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier to answer the question, I remind the honourable Leader of the Opposition that the explanation attached to a question, in order to establish the context in which the question is being asked, is supposed to consist of factual material and not comment or opinion.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the Leader of the Opposition had been in the House at the beginning of Question Time and had heard the question that was asked by the Deputy Leader and my reply (and I apologise that I took five minutes or longer)—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader is saying that he was not here, yet he is interjecting. What an extraordinary performance—absolutely extraordinary! Had the Leader been here, he would have been able to get the answer to a considerable amount of the material that he has traversed. I simply suggest that, if the Leader of the Opposition really wants to start raising the ante in terms of the public dispute over this event, he is treading on very dangerous ground indeed. I suggest that he talk to a few people about the possible liability into which he is leading them. However, I suggest that it is in the interest of the Leader, of members of his Party and of those who support the event itself to stop trying to stir the pot in this way and to let us try to deal with it systematically.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition the fact that all members are constrained by the Standing Orders of the House. Even though a certain tolerance is granted to the Leader of the Opposition, the Chair believes that the Leader is going past that position.

WEST LAKES SAND DUNES

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say what further assurances he can give, on behalf of the State Government, that further erosion of the sand dunes in the Tennyson-West Lakes area will be stopped? On 25 July I wrote to the Minister enclosing a list of questions. Those questions were replied to expeditiously on

31 July and, at a meeting held last evening, my constituents were most appreciative of the quick action of the Minister and his staff on this matter. However, at that meeting, which was held in the West Lakes Primary School, local residents, after considering the Minister's response, asked the following questions.

First, will the Government oppose the extension of Sea-view Road through the sand dunes in the Tennyson-West Lakes area? Secondly, will the Government, if the pushing of sand seaward will further damage the vegetation on the existing sand dunes, consider purchasing the existing sand dunes that are now held under private ownership? Thirdly, what is the long-term future of Ru Rua (the Estcourt Nursing Home) if it is no longer needed by the Health Commission? Finally, 19 of my constituents who attended the meeting last evening have requested that the Minister at the earliest opportunity, either in Parliament House or outside Parliament, meet with local residents to hear and respond to these and many other concerns that they have concerning conservation of the sand dunes along the western seaboard of Adelaide.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government is not in a position to acquire, nor should it acquire, the land to which the honourable member refers. As I understand it, a proposition was put to the Tonkin Government for the acquisition of some of this land. That Government rejected the proposition and, had I been in the same position, I think that I would have done the same thing. It is not a matter of its being undesirable that it be in the hands of someone but, if the Government has limited dollars, there are many areas of the State that are of greater environmental significance in which such funds could be invested.

I point out that the fore dune area, which is very well vegetated, is in public ownership. Certainly, my department and I will be very vigilant as to any sort of development that could in any way impinge on the environmental health of these fore dunes. I am told that at this stage no proposition is formally before my department. Much of the proposition does not have to come to us. Delfin has a right under the West Lakes indenture to develop this area, which is zoned R3C, but it is necessary that it go to the Woodville council in order to get building permission. However, if any road development is associated with such a subdivision, it would have to come to the South Australian Planning Commission for approval.

Obviously, my officers, in the preparation of advice to the Planning Commission, will look closely at the environmental impact of any such proposition. So, it seems to me that short of acquisition, which is something that we could not contemplate, the Government has only a limited role to play in this matter along the lines that I have indicated. I am quite happy to have further discussions with the honourable member and/or his constituents at times and places that are deemed appropriate.

WORLD THREE DAY EVENT

Mr INGERSON: Will the Premier stop misleading the House and the public and admit that as far back as 28 November 1983—almost three years ago—he gave an open-ended and unequivocal commitment to the organisers of the World Three Day Event that the Government and the Jubilee 150 Board would fund that event?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the honourable member for Briggs has implied that I was responsible for the leaking of documents relative to this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The member for Briggs just indicated that it went further than an inference. I have been a member of the organising committee throughout, and I have all the documents that have been made available to that organisation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. What the honourable member is doing at this point does not appear to me to be taking a point of order but making a personal explanation that would be best delivered at the end of Question Time. The honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: Since the bad news has been revealed about the financial difficulties of this event, our Premier has persistently attempted to deny any responsibility on the part of the Government. However, I now reveal that on 28 November 1983, a letter to the Secretary-General of the International Equestrian Federation from the Premier states:

My Government, together with the South Australian Jubilee 150 Board, has committed itself to funding this proposed World Three Day Event championship here in South Australia, and therefore I can assure your federation that the decision to be taken at your General Assembly in December next should be based solely on the confirmation of the previous decision taken by your General Assembly—

in other words, guaranteed funding. In the run-up to and during the event, the Premier and his Government sought kudos whenever they could find it, and the Government was directly involved in the organisation as well as the promotion of this event. In the *Advertiser* this morning, Mr Bob Barnard states:

We believed we had the full financial backing of the Government for the necessary work.

In these circumstances, the Premier's attempt over the past week to distance himself from the responsibility for funding this event can only be seen as being in complete conflict—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. For the benefit of the member for Bragg, I repeat that explanations of questions are supposed to be based on factual material, not on opinion: members are not entitled to comment or debate. If the honourable member cannot follow that path, I will withdraw leave for him to continue his explanation.

Mr INGERSON: In recent days the Premier has obviously made comments completely in conflict with the commitment he made back in November 1983 and with Mr Barnard's comments in the *Advertiser* this morning.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is not true at all. The letter to the International Equestrian Federation stated what indeed was the fact. We had made an allocation of support through the Jubilee 150 Board. Indeed, I explained the situation when the event was on the brink of being cancelled because of the problems being experienced. I am being fairly careful in the words I choose, because I do not want to be taken into this game by the Opposition. Members opposite do not really know what they are getting into. I do not believe that we should be on about hanging people from here in Parliament over what has happened in relation to a particular event.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will choose my words, and I suggest to the Leader that, if he is to retain any credibility, he should stop interjecting as well.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition knows that he has stepped right into the middle of this, and his interjections indicate that. Of course the Government

was backing the Three Day Event. Of course, as I said to the Deputy Leader, at all stages we were aiming to promote it to the maximum degree possible in order to ensure the success of that event and, indeed, it became a successful event because of that. We did not at any time provide an open-ended underwriting of the total event, and the committee knew that; the committee knew that our support was based on budgets that it had formed. In fact, we went a lot further than could have been expected, both in cash and kind, in order to ensure that the event took place.

I certainly will not accept that we did other than what we were obligated to do. In relation to Mr Barnard's comments, I point out that it is certainly true that the Grand Prix organisation was asked to step in, but on the basis of a fee of contract to the organising committee. Also, and most importantly, part of the assessment of accounts made by Mr Barnard and others, which displayed an appalling state of affairs, indicates that many debts were incurred well before the Grand Prix organisation took over. Indeed, the Grand Prix organisation was stuck with a very difficult situation before the event even began. They are the facts. I simply draw members' attention to the statement I made in reply to the Deputy Leader. I accept the extent and the manner in which the Government was involved, but I will not cop people, who get into trouble, suddenly running for cover over the whole thing, washing their hands of it and then saying it is back on the Government. That will not be tolerated.

ABORIGINAL HOMELANDS

Mr RANN: My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. Is the Department of Housing and Construction—through the Housing Trust, Aboriginal Housing Board and the Aboriginal Public Works Unit—committed to supporting the Aboriginal Homelands Movement and will the Minister approach the Federal Government to accelerate its water drilling program to assist the Homelands Movement? It has been put to me by Aboriginal elders that the Homelands Movement could be fundamental to the survival not only of traditional Aboriginal culture but to the health and long-term future of tribal Aborigines.

I have been advised that this Movement—which involves Aboriginal families moving away from the problems of established centres such as Amata and Ernabella, back to smaller settlements in traditional areas—is a direct response to problems such as petrol sniffing, alcoholism and the breakdown of tribal and family authority. Indeed, while visiting these areas with the Minister of Housing and Construction a fortnight ago, I was also told that the Homelands Movement was being frustrated by a lack of coordination and stop-start policies at the federal departmental level and by the fact that the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs bore drilling program has been unable to keep up with the movement of families back to tribal lands.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr RANN: It is like feeding strawberries to goannas, when it comes to the member opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mallee just interjected when I was calling the member for Briggs to order. The member for Briggs should be aware that his last remark constituted comment and not explanation. The honourable Minister of Housing and Construction.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Briggs for his question. I certainly support the Homelands

Movement. I am pleased to say that over the past three years the Aboriginal Housing Board has supported the move by people away from large communities. I also believe that this should be supported without any takeover by various Government departments, which often seems to occur in the early stages of the Homelands Movement. I recognise that a Federal Parliamentary Standing Committee is reviewing the Government's approach to the support of homelands, and I look forward to that report. Its views in due course may differ from mine, but many social difficulties existing in these communities are now being resolved because the people concerned are deciding that they do not want to live in welfare communities but that they will move back to their homelands and lead a life mixing elements of tradition with elements of our twentieth century.

They do need our support, and I thank the member for Briggs for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. These people need water and elementary housing. They need normally expected services, such as those involving schools and health, on a basis that meets their needs and not those of the service providers. I certainly support these changes and will be raising the question of water bores and pumps with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and the Federal Minister, Mr Clyde Holding.

MONARTO HOMES

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise whether it is a fact that the Government has constructed housing for National Parks and Wildlife rangers and zoo staff at the Monarto Zoo to the value of more than \$1 million, and is it also a fact that the houses have been unoccupied since construction was completed because the relevant Government departments cannot raise the several thousand dollars required by the Electricity Trust to connect power to the houses?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I shall obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

MOUNT LOFTY DEVELOPMENT

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning assure the House that all aspects of the Mount Lofty tourist development concept will be subject to the strictest environmental scrutiny and consultation with environmental groups and local government? On 27 May the *Advertiser* revealed plans for a \$40 million project to redevelop the remains of historic St Michaels College monastery as a multi-purpose tourist facility with an associated \$13 million cable car which, according to an artist's impression, would cut a giant swathe through the hills face zone and Cleland Conservation Park. The concept was greeted with alarm in many quarters, with descriptions in the *Advertiser* of massive black pyramids out of scale with surrounding features, giant cable car pylons dotted with 170 cable cars, and the anticipated rape of Cleland Conservation Park and Waterfall Gully.

The District Council of Stirling has written to members of Parliament, including me, expressing serious reservations about the concept, and alarm has also been expressed in letters to the editor by various environmental bodies such as the Nature Conservation Society and the Natural History Society. On the other hand, the South Australian President of the Conservation Council, Mr John Sibly, is reported in the *Advertiser* of 28 May to have said, after viewing the

Mount Lofty plans, that he saw merit in what was proposed although he envisaged some problems with the cable car component but did not think that the cable towers would be 'horrendous'. It has been put to me that revegetation of the Mount Lofty summit, the walking trail link with Cleland Conservation Park and key elements of the tourist development envisaged for the St Michaels site have much to offer visitors and Adelaide residents alike—

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, earlier in Question Time you ruled in relation to other members asking questions and commenting. I draw your attention to that rule and suggest that the honourable member is commenting.

The SPEAKER: The Chair was not of that opinion, but at that stage my attention had been diverted elsewhere. Would the member for Eyre care to draw attention to the particular words that he believes were comment?

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, I have been in the House for a long time, and I suggest that, if you are of the view that the honourable member was not commenting, we could debate the matter tomorrow when we have the *Hansard* pulls.

The SPEAKER: I will call on the honourable member for Newland to complete her question.

Ms GAYLER: The project has much to offer visitors and Adelaide residents alike, provided it proceeds with maximum regard for the outstanding site and for the surrounding environment.

The SPEAKER: I must concur with the member for Eyre that there was a certain amount of comment in that last remark.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order. The honourable Minister for Environment and Planning.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Members will recall that the Government acquired this site for the specific purpose of trying to arrange for a tourist facility to be built there. This was as opposed to rebuilding the kiosk, restaurant or something like it on the Mount Lofty summit—a proposition previously floated. We felt on environmental grounds that it would be better to allow the Mount Lofty summit to revegetate. We were also aware of the fact that it was necessary to spend a good deal of money on getting rid of what remained of the ruins of the kiosk and platform at the summit. The proposition floated is in relation to the consortium that has been successful in attracting negotiations with the Government. What the Government has agreed to at this stage is this and this only: that the Touche Ross consortium should be given 12 months exclusive right of negotiation with the Government to see whether it can come up with a proposition.

There were, as I recall, four propositions put before us, and we believe that of the four the Touche Ross consortium showed the greatest promise of being able to deliver in the way that we would expect. As for the actual details of the development, a great deal needs to be negotiated, and all of it has to run the gamut of the processes set down in the Planning Act and, in particular, those processes which relate to environmental impact statements and assessment. The current work involves the preparation of an environmental impact statement with input from the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Assessments Branch and a good deal of discussion with Commonwealth and State Government agencies about the communications issues.

The unresolved issues involve the cable car, the route and nature of the proposal—or even, indeed, whether a cable car is appropriate to such a development; the rela-

tionship between the development and the Cleland Conservation Park and, in particular, the wildlife zone therein; the communications systems which involve a proposition for co-masting between the various towers which currently are on the skyline of the hills; and also the tenure for the development, with some discussions as to whether a freehold or leasehold arrangement is more appropriate. I can certainly give the honourable member an assurance that all the proper procedures will be gone through and that, of course, involves ample opportunity for public participation in the process.

As the honourable member would know, the EIS would have to go to public exhibition and all the comments that it would attract would have to be taken into consideration in assessment of the EIS. Any amendments that had to take place to the Cleland Conservation Park plan of management would have to go to public exhibition, and that would be subject to review by the Reserves Advisory Committee. I anticipate that the public exhibition documentation would occur later this year.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister of Labour indicate what has caused the enormous increase in the cost of workers compensation claims, between 1984 and 1985, of 47.6 per cent in the Education Department; 62.8 per cent in the Engineering and Water Supply Department; 44.5 per cent in the Police Department; and 75.6 per cent in the Correctional Services Department, and what responsibility is taken by the Government for this lack of care and safety?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will get those figures analysed for the honourable member and bring back a reply for him.

LEGAL AID

Mr GREGORY: My question is addressed to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Attorney-General investigate a matter of double dipping with respect to the provision of legal aid? I have been contacted by a constituent with respect to a situation where her son found himself in one of the local courts answering a summons relating to a number of alleged offences. The matter was adjourned so that her son could contact the Legal Services Commission to arrange for legal aid; this he subsequently did. The son was then contacted by a firm of solicitors and advised that a certain solicitor would be representing him in court when the matter next came on for hearing.

A week prior to the hearing the son visited the said lawyer and, amongst other things said to him by the lawyer, he was told that he was not really entitled to legal aid as he had earned too much money during the previous 12 months. The son was then instructed to bring \$120 with him to the court on the day of the hearing and on receipt of that money the lawyer would then represent him.

The constituent, along with her husband and a friend of her son, accompanied the son to the court, where her son advised the solicitor that he had had a bit of trouble raising the \$120 and did not have it with him. The son came out and saw his mother, who had with her \$100, which she gave to him. The mother then followed the son into the interview room and saw him give the money to the solicitor. When they had finished the discussion the son then joined his parents prior to going into the court and advised them

that the solicitor still required the remaining \$20. That money was raised from other members of the family.

At the conclusion of the hearing the parents, with their son, spoke to the solicitor. As the solicitor was leaving he beckoned the son over to him. The mother started to follow and was told by the solicitor to go away, as he wanted to see her son. The mother saw her son take \$20 from his wallet and give it to the solicitor. To this date they have not received a receipt for that \$120.

The son subsequently visited the Legal Services Commission office, where he had originally sought and been granted legal aid, and the file was examined by an employee. It was noted that \$160 had been paid by the Legal Services Commission to the solicitor. When the father was told of these matters he contacted the solicitor by telephone and discussed the matter with him at some length. The solicitor denied receiving any money from the son. The woman discussed the matter with the solicitor and then her son discussed it. The father got back on the telephone again and advised the solicitor that he wanted an immediate appointment with him. The solicitor said, 'If you do come here on your own or with your son, I will refuse to see you and have you removed from the office.'

Following that incident they received another telephone call from the solicitor, who advised them that there had been some mistake with another person and that, in fact, he had received the \$120. When asked to issue a receipt for that amount, he refused on the ground that it would cost approximately \$40 to forward a receipt to the constituent's son. The constituent contacted me because she found this behaviour rather strange. I would be grateful if the Attorney-General could investigate this matter to see whether the solicitor has behaved improperly in seeking fees from a client for whom the Legal Services Commission has paid the solicitor.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for providing me with the specific details of this constituent's complaint, and I will ensure that they are handed to the Attorney-General. I would also advise the honourable member to send that information, and refer his constituent, to the Legal Practitioners Complaints Committee, which is established under the Legal Practitioners Act, an Act of this Parliament whereby complaints against solicitors are investigated very thoroughly and appropriate action is taken where there has been misconduct on the part of a legal practitioner.

MURRAY RIVER CHANNEL

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered a joint venture with the private sector to maintain a navigable channel in the Murray River in the interests of the tourism industry? The *Murray Pioneer* (25 July 1986) stated:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, spoke of the history of the Murray River and lauded the launching of the new \$4.5 million vessel during commissioning at dockside in Goolwa.

However, it has been pointed out to me by a number of people that the *Murray Princess* will be restricted to the near vicinity of Renmark other than at times of high flow, when it would be able to travel between, say, Renmark and Morgan. In the interests of the South Australian tourism industry, it is highly desirable that as much of the river as possible is navigable by large vessels at all times. Murray River Developments Ltd now has millions of dollars invested in cruise ships which bring thousands of visitors to South Australia each year.

It has been pointed out to me that if the Government offered an incentive for a contractor to purchase and operate an efficient dredge for the purpose of maintaining a navigable channel, and at the same time be a source of high quality building sand for sale to the construction industry, there could well be financial benefits for all concerned. For the Engineering and Water Supply Department to continue to dredge and place the sand on the river bank, to be immediately flushed back into the river with every high flow, is inefficient and costly to the Government. If the river can be dredged and the sand sold, then it would be possible to permanently dispose of the sand which otherwise would present an ongoing problem, while simultaneously recouping a substantial portion of the cost for maintaining a navigable channel.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am only too happy to take up that suggestion to see what can be made of it. I am aware of the problems that Captain Veenstra has had from time to time, and the honourable member would know that some Government money has gone into desnagging activities over the last few years. I am aware of the enormous benefit to the tourist industry from the boats that Captain Veenstra has built; I am aware of why they have been built as they have, but with that prescription comes a problem. Quite frankly, they are almost too big for a river of the size of the Murray. However, given that they are there and that they are operating to the benefit of our tourist industry, and given that there is some burden on the public purse to have to continue with desnagging and such activities, I am prepared to take up the matter and to see what we can do in relation to that suggestion.

SALISBURY COUNCIL

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport give an assurance that he will respect the priorities of the Salisbury City Council in the allocation of whatever major road construction funding may become available for use within the Salisbury area? In a recent special briefing of members of Parliament who represent part of the Salisbury City Council area, the council made a very strong case for the allocation of any funding which may be available to go towards the construction of a road overpass or underpass for the road which runs across the Salisbury railway line and for the associated extension of the Salisbury highway through to Gawler Street. The council indicated quite clearly to those present at the meeting that it gave this project a much higher priority than, for example, the proposed Golden Grove connector road. The council believes that priority should go to the improvement of a very busy road, rail and bus interchange which the council believes has been a cause of accidents, delays and motorist frustration since 1962.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Responding first to the last statement, the Golden Grove connector road is covered by an indenture of this Parliament and one really cannot compare its priority with that of any other road construction program.

An honourable member: What about the road to Roxby?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The road to Olympic Dam is also controlled by an Act of this Parliament, an indenture, and these two roads have to be seen outside the normal Highways Department road program. This is a serious matter; I am well aware of that, as I ought to be. My colleagues the member for Ramsay and the member for Briggs, the boundaries of whose districts join at about that spot, have made very consistent and persistent representations to me. I had the opportunity to speak to council and local groups

recently when I pointed out that this project is one of high priority. In fact, the planning process has not been delayed in any way. The Highways Department very soon will have completed the initial studies on the number of alignment options that could be available. One is a straight connection with the Salisbury Highway in Gawler Street, and there are two options with curved alignments to avoid the commercial enterprises of the Parabanks Shopping Centre and the Heidenreich Flour Mill. There is also a question whether there should be an underpass or an overpass.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member is way out of court. The planning process is not completed and will be available to me hopefully within the next month or two. The problem that the honourable member has highlighted was aggravated by the provision at that spot, at the request of the Salisbury council, of the Salisbury bus and rail interchange. That is not a criticism. Had I been a member of the Salisbury council, I would have wanted it as well, and probably the honourable member, during his time in the Elizabeth City Council, was lobbying very strongly to have the interchange there. It has good commercial benefit to the region, but it has aggravated the situation.

Some short-term measures have been taken by the Highways Department and the STA to improve the flow of traffic through those lights and over that intersection. The current planning is that the work will start in 1989-90, and in the meantime a number of environmental problems must be dealt with as well as a program of land acquisition. In any event, a project of this size (a minimum of \$15 million, and probably more) is a major road construction program, and does take a fair while to come on stream, but the priority has not been reduced. I accept the importance of doing something in this area. I am well aware of the traffic congestion that exists currently, and the short-term measures are only temporary. The long-term measure is that work on the new extension with the funding that is in place now and our expectation of future funding should commence in 1989-90.

PROPERTY VALUATIONS

Mr S.G. EVANS: Will the Premier negotiate with the Minister of Water Resources and the Local Government Association to achieve a more effective method of informing property owners of new Government valuations on their properties? The first metropolitan local government areas to receive notices for water rates were Enfield and Mitcham. It was brought to my attention by some residents that only by luck had they picked up the method by which new valuations are stated in the bottom lefthand corner of the notice. People who do not have water or sewer would have it stated only on their council rate notice. The valuation is not shown as a new valuation, but just as a valuation. The vast majority of those whom I contacted did not realise that there was a new valuation on their property. One property had gone up by 105 per cent and a pensioner, whose rates were \$400, will receive only \$150 concession. That has resulted in letterboxing by me to people in my electorate, and I was amazed to find that the community generally does not know the new method of valuation notification. The previous Liberal Government changed the method so that the Valuer-General does not now inform people of a change in valuation.

Can the Premier say whether we could have in the council rate notice and water rate notice a clear indication that it is a new valuation each year (because the valuation changes),

or, if not, could it be in a different colour showing the two valuations (the previous year's and the present year's) so that people can lodge objections if they believe that there is an injustice? The people I have contacted realise that they can appeal at any time, but at the moment the system is unfair. I ask the Premier to provide notification by that method or by an advertisement informing people in July each year that new valuations are coming out.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter concerns two of my colleagues—the Minister of Lands, whose jurisdiction includes the Valuer-General and his operations, and the Minister of Water Resources, the Deputy Premier, whose department sends out the notices referred to and presumably, if it could be worked into the system, would be able to tabulate or include those changed valuations. As members would know, the sophistication and speed of valuation under computerisation have improved greatly, and as a result, the Valuer-General is now moving to annual valuations, meaning that the old five-year cycle is going, resulting in more contemporary adjustments of values year by year. I guess that in itself is probably a good reason why we should provide as much information as possible. I will refer the matter to my colleagues and ask them to look at what is possible and what costs might be involved in so doing.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WORLD THREE DAY EVENT

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I claim to have had my position misrepresented by the member for Briggs. I have been involved with the three day eventing scene in South Australia for some 27 years, from the very commencement of the Gawler Three Day Event. Subsequently, the Gawler Three Day Event made some of its services available to a new organisation, the organising committee of the World Three Day Event, the sixth world championships. I was invited to become a member of the organising committee, and accepted that role. Being something of a magpie, I have a very large file of the documents associated with my involvement in that organisation. Those documents have remained in my possession and have not been shared with others of my parliamentary colleagues on any occasion.

At a meeting of the organising committee on Wednesday afternoon of last week, I sighted (but do not have, nor have ever had in my possession) certain subsequent documents relevant to the financial affairs of the World Three Day Event. In fact, the documents which were being referred to by my colleagues on the front bench at the time the member for Briggs introduced my name into this debate were not available from me because I have never had those documents. Whatever association the member for Briggs may have had in the past relative to the manner in which people act, I ask him not to ascribe to me the motives which he sought to ascribe to me and which are untrue in every circumstance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is particularly out of order for members to continue interjecting when the House has been called to order for just that reason.

Mr RANN (Briggs): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr RANN: The member for Light, in raising a point of order and in making a personal explanation, said that I had said or had insinuated, through interjection, that he had leaked documents to the Leader of the Opposition and to other members of his front bench. I made no such inference. My interjection simply questioned the continual silence of the member for Light on this issue, silence which thankfully has now been broken, as well as his accountability for financial mismanagement as an active member of the board of the World Three Day Event.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. I assume that the honourable member for Light has risen to his feet on a point of order in order to draw my attention to the fact that the last remark by the member for Briggs was out of order. The Chair was just about to make a comment to that effect.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I believe not only that it was out of order and not correct, but also that it should be withdrawn with no exception and with an apology. At the same time I suggest to the honourable member that, if he really believes what he has just said, he should make the statement outside the House when he would have the opportunity to test the validity of his statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not wish this to be an afternoon made up of a repetition of points of order and personal explanations between two members of the House. However, the member for Light has, within the limits allowed him, drawn the attention of the Chair to the words used in the concluding remarks made by the member for Briggs. Those remarks were not of themselves unparliamentary, and the Chair cannot and will not order their withdrawal. However, the Chair will request the member for Briggs to withdraw his concluding remarks.

Mr RANN: I withdraw my remarks, except to say that I actively reported my interjections, which was what the question was about.

The SPEAKER: Order! That does not relate to the point of order that was just taken in relation to the member for Briggs.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council advised its appointment of sessional committees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr PLUNKETT

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I move:

That two weeks leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Peake (Mr Plunkett) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

1. We, the members of the 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.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

I have great pleasure in moving the motion for the first time since I became a member of the House of Assembly. Indeed, it may be my last chance, because it is well known that I shall not be a candidate at the next election.

First, I express appreciation to my constituents in Gilles, who have expressed their confidence in me over seven consecutive elections, especially the election in December 1985 when I polled a record majority. I have tried to reciprocate the trust placed in me by my constituents and, more importantly, by the faithful members of the Labor Party in my district who have given their time and effort, especially at election time, both on my behalf and on behalf of the Australian Labor Party, which I represent. I do not want to make this a valedictory speech, because I will have further opportunities to express appreciation to all those who have helped me in my parliamentary career. So, I shall not pursue that line any further.

In his speech last Thursday, His Excellency referred to the passing of two former members of this House. The first of these was Bert Hawke, who was member for Burra Burra from 1925 to 1927. That is a long time ago: in fact, I was born in 1927.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes, other great events happened in that year. In fact, Windbag won the Melbourne Cup, but whether it is appropriate to mention that in this context is a matter on which I will not comment.

I had the pleasure of meeting Bert Hawke during the latter part of his life. In his parliamentary career, he finished up as Premier of Western Australia for a period.

The other deceased member referred to in the Governor's speech was my old mate and colleague Charlie Harrison. He came into this House in 1970, as did many other members, including me. We all became known as the class of '70 and were a distinguished lot. In fact, it was the largest number of new members ever elected to the South Australian Parliament, so it was a big class. Charlie Harrison was a member of that class. He retired in 1979 and soon thereafter had the unfortunate experience of losing his wife Elsie. My wife came to know Elsie fairly well, and they were friends as well as colleagues. Indeed, Charlie and I knew each other before we became members of Parliament because we were associated at the old Trades Hall in Grote Street—he as Secretary of the Vehicle Builders Union and I as Secretary of the Australian Boot Trade Union. So, we knew each other for a long time. I express my condolences to the relatives and friends of both Bert Hawke and Charlie Harrison.

The Governor also made reference in his speech to the difficult economic times and the major test that the nation is facing in relation to its ability to adapt to the situation. I do not think I need to tell the House that that is certainly true. As we are all aware, the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments are, because of the international monetary situation, the balance of trade and other economic factors, having extreme difficulty in maintaining the economic buoyancy of this country. We also know that as a result of the recent Premiers Conference the State Government will have to face the effects of the economic downturn which will without doubt flow on to local government and community organisations generally.

There are in the community those who subscribe to a theory that in 1975 the Whitlam Government was the victim of an international conspiracy to undermine it, and that that emanated particularly from the United States of America. As I have said, that is a theory. I do not particularly want to prove the theory to anyone, but I wonder whether history may be repeating itself. One must think about the situation that has occurred over the past couple of weeks where the United States of America is currently considering—and indeed I believe legislation is being prepared for passage through Congress and the Senate—subsidising the sale of wheat to Russia and China—countries that are supposed to be its political and philosophical enemies. Who wants enemies if you have friends of that nature? We have an all Party delegation currently in the United States trying to redress that situation as far as Australia is concerned. I do not know, but my political instincts tell me that it will not meet with success, because there is little morality or justice as far as international trade is concerned, particularly when it involves the United States.

It is a rather difficult situation for Australia when so-called allies are able to make life difficult for us. Comparatively, Australia is a small nation of about 15 million people. Our reliance on our economy has been gradually dissipated. Our manufacturing industry has suffered in the past 10 to 20 years as a result of competition from overseas imports. We find that mining and indeed the rural sector are now facing difficult times. As I have said, it is very easy for media commentators, politicians or anyone else to blame Governments for the state of the economy.

We live in a world where we are tied to the economic difficulties that occur in other parts of the world. Indeed, there are ultra-conservative right wing elements which control the international money market, and they would be only too delighted to get rid of a democratic socialist Government such as the Hawke Government in Australia. As I have mentioned, the theory is that in 1975 Whitlam was undermined by an international conspiracy. Indeed, one could contemplate that perhaps a similar situation might be occurring at the present time.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Morphet might think that that is a bit of a fairy tale, but in politics many things happen which might be regarded as fairy tales. However, sometimes they are factual.

Mr Hamilton: Truth can be stranger than fiction.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: As my colleague, the member for Albert Park, says, 'Truth is sometimes stranger than fiction.' I will return now to more local matters. First, I refer to our occupation as members of Parliament. My colleague the member for Semaphore is taking notice, and I think that we should all take notice, because we are not held in the highest regard by certain sections of the media. That reflects back into the community, and that is quite unfair.

I will make a few points about the profession—if I can call it that—of a member of Parliament. I entered the House in 1970 and since then there has been a considerable turnover of members on both sides of the House. Some members have passed away, some have taken voluntary retirement and many others have been defeated at elections. I think the last election showed, particularly on the other side, how hazardous this job can be. At the last election two former Ministers were defeated and, as a consequence, they are no longer in the House.

I have not done an exercise—perhaps I should have—in relation to the turnover of members since 1970. I venture to say that the figure would be about double the number

of members in this session of Parliament—over 90 members. Many members survive only one or two elections and, as a consequence, do not qualify for superannuation. Therefore, it is a game for survivors. Indeed, I do not think that that fact is generally appreciated by the media or by the public at large. It is certainly an occupation that does not give one a guarantee of continued employment. There are also the odd and rather tedious hours that members of Parliament spend in the service of their electorates and in attending to parliamentary duties.

Of course, there may be other occupations where similar sacrifices are required, but being a member of Parliament is certainly not a 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. job. As a consequence, severe strain is placed not only on members but also on their spouses and families. That fact is never taken into consideration. That is one of the hazards of the occupation, and we accept it. Nevertheless, that fact is not considered when members of Parliament are criticised. We do work long and tedious hours and this has an effect on our spouses and families.

I know from my own experience, particularly if one is conscientious, and even more so for Ministers, that members can spend almost every weekend and evening attending functions. One is obliged to attend those functions in the performance of one's parliamentary or ministerial duties. I know from my own experience the effect of that pressure. I realise the physical and indeed mental pressure that members—including myself—face. Eventually members find that it has a deleterious effect on their health.

It can manifest itself in many ways. In my case it manifested itself as a heart problem necessitating open heart surgery. It might have been a blessing in disguise. Fortunately, in my case, through the marvels of medical science I was able to survive—I am a bit of a survivor, anyway. However, for this and other factors I decided not to continue in a ministerial role. Members can easily appreciate that it was not an easy decision to make. However, it was motivated by a number of factors—family reasons, health reasons and the fact that it will be my last parliamentary term.

I would be less than honest if I did not mention that there were other factors that made me decide not to continue as a Minister. I do not want to tip the can on anybody, but I found it very difficult at times to come to terms with some of the pettiness, small-mindedness and, indeed, lack of sincerity in many cases of a lot of people with whom I was obliged to associate. Those are hard words, but they are true. It is a difficult profession and, indeed, if you do the right thing and expect it in return it does not always occur. It is another hazard of the occupation.

However, on the reverse side of the coin, there were plenty of people who were honest, genuine and sincere and who assisted wherever possible to make life more pleasant. Those whose attitude and behaviour I did not appreciate, made life difficult. I am not necessarily talking about members opposite. There were, unfortunately, many on the same side of politics as myself. Be that as it may, I have been an active member of the Labor Party for about 45 years. I have a more relaxed and enjoyable lifestyle now as a backbencher than I had as a Minister. I do not do a lot of homework now, and I allow myself the privilege of watching television about every second night, which is rather remarkable by comparison with previous times. I have been an active member of the Labor Party for a long time and at the local sub-branch level have held an official position for 36 years. I would be looking for long service leave shortly, or even the 17.5 per cent leave loading, if that were possible, something that members of Parliament do not receive.

I have endeavoured to serve both the Party and my electorate to the best of my ability. The electors at least gave me the great honour of choosing me to represent them for probably 20 years and, indeed, at the last election I gained a record majority. So, here I am back on the back-bench. As one media commentator remarked, probably with mischievous intent, the members for Playford, Hartley and myself should not have been seated here next to the Independents. It was something of a slur on the old blokes within the Party, up here in cobweb corner as they call it. I am happy in cobweb corner—I am enjoying it immensely. I have good company and have a lawyer on each side, so nothing can go wrong. I have the member for Playford on the one hand and the member for Hartley on the other. If they want any advice I am happy to help them, and I hope it is reciprocal. It is a good spot: I am happy back here and will enjoy the rest of my time leading up to the next election.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Independents are all right, and it is all right with me: being Independent is their decision as far as politics are concerned, and I respect them for it.

I turn now to a matter in which I had a special interest as Minister of Water Resources. I will not make this a travelogue as I have had a few trips overseas and do not know which one to deal with. The media may pick it up and think I am a professional tourist. However, as Minister for Water Resources, in company with Keith Lewis, the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the E&WS Department and other departmental officials, I had a trip overseas to Europe to look at water quality, probably one of the most important issues facing the future of this State. If we do not address this issue we will find ourselves in an irretrievable position. We went to Europe because I wanted to see at first hand and discuss with the European countries what they were doing about water pollution. This would be best expressed from the report I presented to the Premier and the Parliament following my return in 1984 in which I stated:

Water quality problems associated with surface water and groundwater in England and Europe have now reached alarming proportions, and all Governments are giving high priority to costly programmes aimed at redressing the situation. While South Australia's water quality problems do not compare with those of industrialised Europe, I am particularly concerned at the continuing deterioration in three of the State's major water resources, *viz.*, the Murray River, the Mount Lofty Ranges catchments and the groundwaters of the South-East. There is, therefore, no room for complacency, and I am of the firm opinion that a high priority should be given to significantly upgrading our efforts in respect of assessment, conservation, protection, planning and management of these and other State water resources.

My visits to the transboundary river authorities of the Rhine and the Danube have highlighted the need to improve water quality in the Murray River which is South Australia's lifeline. It will be important that the Government spares no effort in persuading the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian governments to join South Australia in taking early action on works and measures essential to achieving salinity improvement in this river. My concerns for the continuing deterioration of the quality of water derived from the important Mount Lofty Ranges catchments were also reinforced by the widespread pollution of rivers, water storages and lakes in Europe. Increasing pollution from urban, industrial and agricultural development in our watersheds is requiring increased chemical dosage rates and higher costs for water treatment to combat odours, tastes and other undesirable water quality characteristics. If this serious trend is to be halted, the Government will need to give more attention to water pollution control policies and surveillance as well as ensure that development plans are compatible with water quality objectives.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not know whether the honourable member received a letter from the Coles sub-

branch. Coincidentally, it is here in front of me. It expresses the concern it has about Mount Lofty water catchment areas which I am sure the member for Heysen would agree we must investigate regarding water pollution in Adelaide. I know of development taking place in the Adelaide Hills, and I appreciate that people who want to reside in that pleasant environment should be able to do so. I also believe that every protection should be given to the quality of water supplied to consumers on the Adelaide Plains, because if we do not address the matter higher chemical dosages in water will place us in a difficult—even an irreversible—situation.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: What is the answer to the problem?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Perhaps it is too late. One of the things that concerns me is that, with the continued development that has been allowed over a period of 30 to 40 years and which has been accelerated over the past 10 to 20 years, it might be too late. The member for Chaffey, as a former Minister of Water Resources, would know that the quality of water has deteriorated over a period. Of course, it varies, depending on rainfall and on other factors but, generally speaking, we have had to dose the metropolitan reservoirs more and more because of pollution occurring in the Adelaide Hills.

I do not know the answers but, although my report indicates that the problems being experienced in Europe are far greater at the present time, there is no need for complacency. We need to redress the situation now by thorough investigation and planning. As I have said, we should have done this 20 or 30 years ago to make sure that we did not have to face the situation existing in certain parts of Europe at present. We are not looking for an immediate answer. I think there are a number of ways to attack the problem, and we ought to be doing so for the benefit of the State in general, or else it will be too late to do anything.

Although I do not gamble—I am an investor—I believe it is better to run the house than to be one of the gamblers, but that is up to the individual. I would like to refer to the discussion that has been going on within the community as to whether we should have poker machines in the Adelaide Casino. All of us have had correspondence from people waging a fairly vigorous campaign for the introduction of poker machines in licensed clubs as well as the casino. The existence of the Casino Select Committee in 1982, consisting of seven members, could have been the kiss of death politically, because Michael Wilson, the former member for Torrens, was the Chairman, and the other members were the former member for Glenelg (John Mathwin), the former member for Victoria (Allan Rodda—now retired) and Dick Glazbrook, the then member for Brighton. There are only three of that original committee left—myself, the member for Playford and the member for Semaphore. I recall particularly the evidence that we took in Sydney, with regard to poker machines, and the evidence by an officer of the New South Wales Police Force, who is referred to in the report of that committee in relation to some of the rorts that were going on in that State involving poker machines.

A representative of the Licensed Clubs Association gave evidence, and that was the only organisation that came before the select committee to give evidence. That organisation's argument basically was not about the casino but about introduction of poker machines. Perhaps I should quote from a report of that select committee and refresh our memories. At page 194, the report states:

The Licensed Clubs Association made the only submission seeking the introduction of poker machines. The committee finds that many of the bland arguments put forward are strongly denied by Detective Sergeant Hanrahan of the N.S.W. Police ... whom

the committee accepts as a witness of truth. The committee further accepts his evidence that the rigging of poker machines in New South Wales clubs has resulted in an estimated \$20 million being skimmed from the machines. The committee also finds that the Licensed Clubs Association itself has an obvious vested interest in promoting the cause of poker machines, and consequently its submissions must be viewed in the light of the evidence tendered to the committee by the Deputy Commissioner of Police in South Australia.

On this evidence alone, the committee rejects the submission of the Licensed Clubs Association and, in addition, it is the committee's belief that neither the Parliament nor the people of South Australia would accept the introduction of poker machines. There has been a fairly consistent media campaign, and I am in the rather unique position of being Secretary of a licensed club and receiving correspondence from the Licensed Clubs Association, telling me that I should write to myself, as the member for Gilles. I do not think that is necessary: I talk to myself on occasions but I do not write letters to myself. The Hotels Association, which also has a vested interest in not introducing poker machines, has also circulated correspondence to all members justifying the association's position and claiming that it would interfere with the hotel and hospitality industry.

At this stage I am not a supporter of the introduction of poker machines in South Australia and I will tell members why. Apart from the arguments of the Licensed Clubs Association and the Hotels Association, my interest lies with the 8 000 incorporated bodies—charitable, social, sporting and otherwise—which would be dramatically affected by the introduction of poker machines. We have to decide whether we want poker machines in major clubs. Football clubs, which are facing financial difficulties, believe, whether justified or otherwise, that poker machines would be a godsend in solving their problems. I do not think they would be because there are always such things taking place as player payments, bearing in mind that we have semi-professional footballers in South Australia.

However, my interest is in all the small sporting organisations, of which there are thousands, and many of which would not be able to have poker machines because of inadequate premises. I am not supporting poker machines in the casino either, and that is a personal or conscience view that I have reached over a considerable period from reading both our select committee report in South Australia and the report of the Wilcox inquiry in Victoria.

Some years ago New South Wales and the ACT were forced into the present situation because they are surrounded by the gambling activities in New South Wales. The only other two places in Australia that have poker machines are both in the Northern Territory: the Mindil Beach Casino in Darwin and the casino in Alice Springs. We are not one-off with the rest of the community, and I do not believe there is a great public demand for poker machines.

I think that has been manufactured by the media and the licensed clubs. I certainly have not had a lot of letters requesting me to support the introduction of poker machines in South Australia. The only people who have done it are the Licensed Clubs Association.

I turn now to another matter in which I have had and still have an interest, and that is in relation to the Days Road Social Club. The activities of this club at Angle Park came to my attention when I was Minister of Recreation and Sport. As Minister, I had discussions with the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club, members of the Enfield council and representatives of the Days Road Social Club, both individually and collectively, in an effort to resolve a situation which had developed over a number of years.

For the benefit of members, I shall give a brief history of the matter. For more than 30 years, land at Angle Park known as the Harold Tyler Reserve was used as a training track for trotting. A body known as the Days Road Social Club was registered under the Association of Incorporations Act in March 1971. Its objects briefly are:

To provide facilities for its members interested in trotting and trotting racing and such other social and sporting activities as the committee may from time to time determine.

To make such arrangements as may be desirable whether by purchase leasing or licence for the use of the club of land and premises as may be necessary or suitable for the purposes of the objects of the club.

The club had other objects in its incorporation, but I will not go into detail because time is ticking away.

The property in question is owned by the Corporation of the City of Enfield. A lease arrangement of land comprising some 12 hectares was entered into between the corporation and the club in April 1971 for a period of 21 years with a right of renewal for a further 21 years. A second lease of adjoining land, some three hectares in the north-east section of this land, was also entered into in 1973, and that area is now mainly used for car parking purposes when there is dog racing at Angle Park on Mondays and Thursdays. In December 1971, a deed of licence between the council, the social club and the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club was arranged to allow the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club to conduct its greyhound meetings at Angle Park. Since that time, as we are all aware, Angle Park has become a very large complex, and greyhound racing in South Australia is regarded as a major sport. Large sums of money have been expended on the development and improvement of buildings and the grandstand, and the facilities are quite comparable with any I have seen interstate for greyhound racing. All of that has been generated by the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club and the Government through the Racecourse Development Board, providing the substantial amounts to improve those facilities.

The member for Fisher would appreciate that Harold Tyler, a relative of his, was a former Town Clerk of the Enfield council. As Minister, I had discussions with the chairmen and representatives of the groups because I believed that changing circumstances necessitated an alteration to the arrangements. I had discussions with the then Chairman of the Racecourse Development Board, Brian Taylor. I should point out that back in 1974-75, the Crown Solicitor's opinion was sought regarding the legality of the arrangements and the opinion at that stage was it was legal. Nevertheless, the situation has reached the point where the Days Road Social Club, with fewer than 10 members, is controlling a multi-million dollar complex. That is quite ludicrous.

After discussion with the Chairman of the Racecourse Development Board, I commissioned a former Deputy Auditor-General, Mr Gordon Harrison, to undertake a report on the situation. Mr Harrison reported in January 1986, and his report makes interesting reading. In reporting to Mr Taylor, the Chairman of the Racecourse Development Board, the report states:

I am of the opinion that it is incongruous for an organisation like the Days Road Social Club Incorporated to continue to exercise the degree of control it has under present arrangements over activities at the Harold Tyler Reserve.

Broadly my findings recommend that:

The present lease and deed of licence be set aside (if necessary, by legislation).

Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club negotiate for a new lease of at least 25 years of an area covering greyhound activities only at the reserve.

Government financial assistance be provided.

The Enfield council be requested to enter into a new agreement with the Days Road Social Club in order to safeguard trotting rights at the reserve.

I might say that they do not have many trotting nights. The report continues:

I consider that unanimity can be reached on new arrangements by negotiation between the three parties. However, should discussion be prolonged unduly intervention by the Government may be necessary.

That is exactly what I had in mind as Minister, so I appeal to the present Minister to continue efforts to resolve this situation.

For the information of the members, I might comment on the report. Paragraph 3.5 on page 3, which is particularly intriguing, states:

In respect to membership, I was told there were currently 25 members of the D.R.S.C.; a request for a listing and category of membership was refused. However, the names of the Committee of Management were provided, being President (R. Robinson)—who is a member of the Enfield council—

Vice-President (L. Morcom) and five ordinary members (N. Sim, W. May, D. Callary, A. Smith and M. Brooks). It is interesting to note that the rules provide for seven ordinary members. The Manager of the Club is Mr F.R. Jones.

The report continues:

The committee has continued to exercise its rights by restricting membership. It was reported that membership was closed some years ago. The rules provide that membership could be up to 600 for ordinary members. However with only a quorum of 10 required for the annual general meeting, it would appear that membership was always meant to be limited. In those early days there was factional in-fighting in the trotting industry and reservations were held of infiltration and loss of control over activities of the club. That situation no longer prevails in the trotting industry.

I take issue on that point. I believe that there is still faction in-fighting in the trotting industry. Nevertheless, that was a point made by Mr Harrison in his report about the Days Road Social Club.

No entrance fees were required to join the club and no annual subscriptions have been requested for the past 10 years. At this stage there is no proposal to wind up the club. The whole situation is ridiculous and the Minister of Recreation and Sport should follow this matter up. I am sure that he would be aware of the report from the former Deputy Auditor-General and realise that we should do something to ensure that a multi-million dollar complex is not owned and controlled by a group which time has passed by.

I do not criticise the members of that group. No doubt they acted with good intent and were looking after the interests of the trotting fraternity. However, times have changed and there should be a rethink of the whole situation. The deed of licence and the lease arrangements should be set aside. The Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club, which is legitimately providing finance for the complex, should have security of tenure and not have to bow and scrape to a social club that is practically non-existent. I hope that the Minister will act to ensure that the situation is redressed.

Everyone knows of my interest in the sport of kings—horse-racing. During the recent parliamentary break I went on a study tour of the United Kingdom and Ireland in order to study the racing industry, especially those aspects that concerned thoroughbred and bloodstock breeding. I do not want to bore the House with a travelogue of my trip, but I will refer to the conclusions of my report on the racing industry in the United Kingdom and Ireland. I visited the national stud, both in Ireland and in the United Kingdom, and I was greatly impressed by what I saw. Indeed, we have the chance to establish a similar set-up in Australia, preferably in South Australia. The concluding section of my report states:

The tour of England and Ireland although brief provided the opportunity to assess various aspects of the racing industry. I have previously mentioned in the introduction of this report of a submission to the Premier in 1985 from the bloodstock breeders

expressing concern at the future and long term viability of the breeding industry in South Australia. Concern was expressed at that time (by the Bloodstock Breeders Association, South Australian Division) of tax depreciation allowance and incentives available to New Zealand breeders by the New Zealand Government, placing their Australian counterparts at some disadvantage.

The Hawke Government redressed the situation in last year's Budget by taking action to ensure that the Australian horsebreeding industry could compete with its international rivals. Over 60 per cent of the horses that are sold at yearling sales in South Australia are purchased by owners from other States and overseas and this is providing important revenue for this State. The value of yearlings produced in 1985 was about \$12 million which is not an insignificant sum. My report continues:

In recent years other States have formulated owners and breeders schemes based on bonuses paid to winning horses in scheduled city and country races. The schemes are designed to foster the purchase of yearlings in those States which will eventually affect the breeding and racing industry in this State.

It is important to note from the conclusion of the report that many international breeding and racing companies are basing themselves in the Eastern States, where the stake money is larger than that provided in this State. Further, access to the markets is easier than that provided in this State. A few weeks ago I read a press statement that \$56 million was being invested by a large US company in a New South Wales stud for the breeding of racehorses, and such developments will continue to intensify the competition that must be faced by this State. Indeed, the effect of such developments is already known, as several well known studs have dispersed to capitalise on the high out of State demand for quality breeding stocks and some studs are already feeling the pinch. My report continues:

One option open to the industry is the formation of a national stud based in South Australia, adopting the proven policies and operating procedures of the national studs in the United Kingdom and Ireland. A commercially viable stud would initially need government financial support to purchase and develop a suitable property and to acquire quality stallions whose services would be available and affordable to the average commercial breeder. There are a number of advantages in the proposal for a national stud, including the genetic improvement of the State's bloodstock, both stallions and mares. A national stud could offer facilities for applied research in the equine area.

Many private and national studs in the United Kingdom have efficient and effective research units attached to them. Some of them are comprehensive and already developing such facilities overseas. That would give us the opportunity of doing the same thing and, if we can see our way clear, I am sure that the people interested in the horseracing industry would welcome such an opportunity.

Another opportunity for the development of a national stud would provide that the property could be used for on-farm training in horse management for persons associated with the industry. From experience overseas, I believe that the Government and industry should consider the formation of a working party comprising representatives of the horseracing and breeding industry to investigate thoroughly the proposal for establishing a national stud in this State. We must be quick off the mark, because other States have already shown that they are interested in establishing a national stud. For instance, my former colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport in Victoria is either currently overseas or intends to go overseas, as I did, to look at the national stud in the United Kingdom and in Ireland, and we do not want to be left behind. South Australia is the ideal location for such a national stud. In the past, the breeding industry has been an important industry for this State and, if we are not quick off the mark, other States will establish a national stud and, to use a phrase from the industry itself, we shall be left at the barrier.

I now wish to refer to another matter that relates to horseracing. Recently, I received a letter from the representative on the South Australian Jockey Club (Mr Isbell) concerning a submission to the Subordinate Legislation Committee on the proposed by-law of the Brighton council to prevent horses from using the Brighton beach near Gladstone Road. I understand that the council proposes to pass a by-law prohibiting horses using the Somerton beach. The submission deals with certain matters that I wish to bring to the attention of members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee by pointing out how important it is in the training of racehorses to have available a facility that enables horses to gallop on the beach and to use sea water which is so important in their conditioning.

Members will know that most of the successful stables are able to utilise sea water and walk or gallop their horses in that water or along the beach. What worries horse trainers and the racing industry generally is that this could be the thin end of the wedge and that other councils right along the coast will also consider passing by-laws to prohibit not only racehorses, but also trotting horses and others from using beaches. I have an idea that at present they must be off the beach by 8 a.m. or 8.30 a.m.

I make a plea to members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee to consider very seriously the submission by the South Australian Trainers Association because an unfavourable decision could have an impact on a very important industry in this State—that is, the sport of horseracing. With those remarks I repeat: I appreciate the opportunity of moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Finally, I again express my appreciation to the people of my district who placed their confidence in me. There will be other opportunities to expand on that in the future.

The Hon. T.M. McRAE (Playford): I support the motion. I believe that the various initiatives proposed by the Government should be of lasting benefit to the State. Before dealing with specific issues, I take the opportunity to make at least some of the observations that would normally have been made last February. The December 1985 result for the ALP in this state was historically a remarkable one. I believe there was a desire on the part of the electorate to make one of the major political Parties a decisive winner and provide it with a workable majority. To make that choice I believe the electorate paid regard to the achievements of the previous three years and to the overall attitudes and short-term policies of the Parties. I also have no doubt that the personalities of the candidates played a major role, and I congratulate the new members. In particular, I congratulate the member for Briggs on a fine election result in an area a large part of which I previously represented.

The result in Playford was indeed excellent, notwithstanding a substantial change in boundaries. I would like to thank the Playford sub-branch and all the volunteers who worked very hard in the election campaign. I would like to congratulate the new members of the Ministry, you, Mr Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees.

I acknowledge the speech His Excellency the Governor made on Thursday 31 July. I wish to acknowledge the excellent work carried out in the office of the Governor by His Excellency, and also record my appreciation of the fine support offered by Lady Dunstan.

The speech began by noting the need to adapt to difficult economic times. In short and sharp succession, our nation has had to face entrenched and high unemployment, high inflation and high interest rates. The Hawke Federal Government was proceeding, until fairly recently, to lessen unemployment and, at the same time, increase available

employment and, further, on the whole, had managed to stabilise, if not decrease, the inflation rate. At the time of the 1985 State election, these things had been achieved and were continuing to be achieved, although problems were apparent in relation to terms of trade, and the nation's currency was in difficult times.

One of the prices paid in an endeavour to stabilise the currency was a continuation of high interest rates in personal and commercial loans and also for housing. At the time of the 1985 State election, interest rates were a key issue throughout the community. Housing loans which traditionally had a ceiling based in equity rather than commercial causes were, in general terms, placed in the so-called free market. The end result was a fiasco in that all the banks offered the same loans at the same higher interest rates and at exactly the same conditions. This circumstance, more than any other, highlights how ridiculous it is to talk about free trade in a modern banking system. One might very well ask whether there would be any difference in replacing the current system with a nationally controlled program. I appreciate that the State banking corporations would have to be protected and that new arrangements would have to be made in relation to friendly societies and building societies. Granted all that, I wonder whether a central banking system might not be just as efficient and possibly less expensive.

Certainly, many of my constituents and, in particular, those on moderate and even low incomes, felt bitter about the rapid increase in interest rates and felt that, in some way, they were subsidising so-called entrepreneurs. This may very well have been the case. I acknowledge the action taken by the State Government to relieve the pressure by holding the line for a few months in relation to its own instrumentalities. These actions were, however, very much against the wishes of the building societies and banks, and the spokesmen for the building societies in particular, in my opinion, acted in bad taste, in dubious political tune and, in fact, even dangerously on behalf of their own institutions. I recall vividly the statements released in the *Sunday Mail* only a very short time before the election.

I realise that any action in relation to interest rates and, for that matter, banking generally, must be long term. I do, however, strongly support a return to the long held concept in Australian policies, economics and banking that housing loans should be protected from fluctuations on the market. This concept was of great value and support to families with moderate and low incomes. In particular, in difficult times, those are the groups who deserve continued protection.

It was also at the time of the State election that the Australian economy, having responded so well since 1983, began to reel from a series of factors which were interlocked or which became interlocked. At that time, the sharp reverses in balance of payments became very evident. The lower exchange rate of the dollar should have seen a marked and increasing reduction in overseas purchases and borrowings and, at the same time, an increase in domestic trade. That did not happen and, quite surprisingly, still has not happened. The result was that the dollar was placed under still greater pressure. Again, at the same time, while the volume of mining and rural production had sharply increased, a glut of commodities on the world market combined with great reductions in oil prices, sharply reduced our nation's capacity to earn income. Blatant subsidy practices and other distortions continue to jeopardise our greatest markets.

This is particularly so when mining and rural production have been such major contributors to the nation's economy.

Mining, prior to the recent recession, had grown from a marginal to a major contributor, providing 37 per cent of total exports. The volume of rural production has increased over 50 per cent in 20 years. The combined effect of diminishing exports, reduced export prices, continued balance of payment deficiencies, and continuing high interest rates has been to again reduce the value of the dollar. In political terms, all of this has been extremely bad for the Hawke Government. Certainly, things have not been helped by manipulators operating in the foreign exchange markets or by the disgracefully selfish acts of some Australian investors in continuing substantial borrowings overseas purely for the purposes of company take-overs.

All these events, combined with the imposition of fringe benefit and other taxes, has led to increasing unpopularity of the Federal Government. Personally, I believe that the Federal Government has on the whole responded to these challenges very well and, while some of the moves may have been unpopular, the only alternative would be to increase the burden on those who can least afford it. At the very least, the alternative is not attractive.

A brief reading of the recent financial and taxation statement by the Federal Liberal Party Leader, John Howard, indicates how clearly this burden would be passed down. Given the complexity of the above matters, I understand the confusion and uncertainty in the community, but any income earner at the low and moderate levels would most assuredly be worse off under Mr Howard. The State Labor Government has cooperated in these difficult times and has certainly faced some very major decisions, but I for one have confidence that, as in the past, in making choices, the State Government will clearly bear in mind the interests of the average wage earner.

South Australia, as a small economic unit of a medium sized economic nation, has been well served by the State Government. In particular, I applaud the efforts of the Government in relation to Technology Park and the continuation of diversity in production. Accepting for the moment that the general direction of both the Federal and State Governments is correct, I still most certainly believe that the worst excesses of the so-called free enterprise system that have been shown up in this current crisis must be controlled.

The whole process of currency exchange world-wide is surely in need of international governmental control. It is, in my opinion, disgraceful to have currency traded like red beans, wheat or oil. Surely some system can be devised to stabilise and regulate these unnecessary fluctuations. The few obvious winners in the current situation are the traders themselves, and we the people are most certainly the losers.

In addition, I hope that some attempt would be made to control reckless stock market activities, often based purely on ego, which at times cause enormous damage to the community. I think it is most important in difficult times to look for the better ones and to ensure the long-term increase in the purchasing power of average earners and standard pensions. Assuredly, it is most important to see that the benefits of growth and economic output are passed on to the average Australian and, equally, that the average Australian is not asked to bear more than a fair share of the burden in difficult economic times.

Again, my constituents can be comforted by the knowledge that the restraint on public expenditure will be evenly distributed by a social democratic Government. It is unfortunate that the State Government will find it difficult to maintain its housing and construction program at the same level. This is not a matter of choice and comes from restrictions on funds available from the Commonwealth. Public

housing and welfare housing have been outstanding features of the Bannan Government. Hundreds of my constituents have benefited from the increased level of constructions and, at the same time, the increasing construction standards by the South Australian Housing Trust. Housing is the biggest single issue by far in the Playford electorate, and it obviously remains true that Government housing programs provide a crucial part of the welfare program. It is important that the volume and the quality be maintained as far as possible, and I know that this will be the case. Housing problems strike at the very essence of family and individual stability and produce untold anguish.

His Excellency referred to a large number of programs put forward by the various Ministers. I cannot cover that field. I would like, however, in these general remarks to refer to the issue of poverty. This issue was discussed in a very good and balanced way by the member for Briggs in his maiden speech in February. I support his demands for a renewal of the attack on this scourge. I applaud the efforts of both State and Federal Governments in relation to pension income maintenance and employment schemes. However, we must, I believe, accept the responsibility without delay to grant a fairer share of national wealth to those on base grade wages and on pensions. It is a long time now in the history of the Australian political and industrial movement that any attempt has been made in the Arbitration Commission to generate such a debate and discussion. It is one of the issues that does not on the whole reflect very well on us. The need has been so self evident that it is a disgrace to the political Parties.

Linked to the standard of living there is another problem confronting me daily within my electorate. I refer to the vast array of problems stemming from low self-esteem, lack of education, cultural opportunity and, most brutal of all, lack of hope by people afflicted with poverty. I cannot think of any better way to combat these problems than by the use of the education system. There is a great need for not only equal opportunity but also education which will help change attitudes. I see day by day children, young people and particularly housewives in these areas affected by poverty who are devastated by depression and lack of hope. Contrary to popular belief people tend to live in isolation when they are poor, and this compounds the problem. A need exists for an attitude to life that is based on self-esteem, self-confidence and a general ability to cope with problems. I believe that without a great deal of extra training a very useful career would be waiting for teachers who were prepared to dedicate themselves to such a cause. This issue has been raised at other times marginally, and it has generally floated away. It is, I believe, time to get something constructive moving.

I turn now to some issues that relate to the electorate of Playford. I was very pleased indeed to be able to announce at the time of the State election that the Bannan Government had determined that the land known as the SAMCOR paddocks would remain in the form of open space land. This land has had a long history over the years, as indeed have a number of environmental issues in the electorate of Playford. In the 1970s, the big issue was the paddocks at Para Hills West, and in the 1980s it became the SAMCOR paddocks. This land is located at Gepps Cross, 11 kilometres from the city. Approximately 83 hectares of stock paddocks lie between Briens Road, South Terrace and Main North Road to the north of Grand Junction Road.

This area has been in contention for over 10 years. SAMCOR needed to sell it to the State Government to restructure its finances. This represented a \$3 million investment by the State Government some six years ago and obviously

a courageous decision was required as to its uses. I have always regarded this area as the last opportunity (apart from the excess Yatala Labour Prison land, which no doubt will have another hearing) to provide parkland facilities in what might be termed the inner section of the northern metropolitan area. Even as it is, the area is most important as an open space and buffer zone and is at times, and in particular in winter, of great beauty. The pressure has always been, however, to succumb to short-term wants and to lose the environmental value. The Tonkin Government wanted a Disneyland project and various Government departments have demanded commercial, industrial and housing developments. It was in those circumstances that I was so pleased to refer to the Deputy Premier's announcement. Even so, that new determination always left the area at risk, and therefore I was even more delighted by the recent announcement by the Minister of Recreation and Sport that a long-term recreational development in harmony with second generation parklands was now the Government program.

The provisions, among other things, are for a golf course, hockey/lacrosse and netball facilities, and potential for a swimming pool and other developments, are in line with the developments of the northern parklands of the city over the past 100 years, and have the dual advantage of maintaining a parkland, yet providing sporting and recreational facilities.

Another major local issue has been main roads, which have been a traditional problem in the electorate of Playford. While there have been some severe local problems, in general terms I have supported, and continue to support, the development of the Main North Road as the major freeway of the northern suburbs. Where there have been problems which have affected local traders and residents (and there have been many) these have in the main stemmed from bad planning decisions in the years gone by, in particular, the mix of residential commercial and industrial development along the margins of the road. This has provided enormous problems and we must make sure that this does not happen again.

The second major north-south road in Playford is Briens Bridge Road. I have continually put to the Government over the years the need for widening and upgrading of this major road. I am pleased to say that this has led to an undertaking that the bridge on which the road is placed will be doubled in capacity in the near future. I must, however, maintain my argument that the whole system will be in grave jeopardy in the near future unless Briens Road, strictly so called, is widened also.

The third main north-south road is Nelson Road. This road has a very sorry history and I am sad to say that only four or five years ago local government rejected a generous offer by the then Minister of Transport to redevelop this road throughout its length. In the result, the road can not be used in total, and traffic is scattered into the suburbs of Para Hills in a most undesirable way. While I appreciate the enormous variety of demands in the north and north-eastern suburbs, I continue to insist that overall traffic problems in my electorate will not be eased until Nelson Road is developed as originally planned.

Finally, I refer to Montague Road, which has become one of the main east-west highways of the northern suburbs. Its current status as a dual carriageway poses enormous problems and dangers, and it is not acceptable. I have put to the Government the need to double its capacity and I hope and have reasonable grounds to believe that this proposal will be accepted.

Another major local issue is the need for youth recreational facilities in my district. I believe that such facilities

can be provided as part of the SAMCOR paddocks development, and I will be continuing my request to the Government on behalf of my constituents.

I look forward to the implementation of the Government's legislative program, which I believe will be of greatest benefit to the State and will be of interest to all of us who participate in it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I am not leading for the Opposition but just happen to be up first, which means that I get half an hour and not an hour.

The SPEAKER: The Chair understands that the Leader of the Opposition has the right to 60 minutes.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Governor's speech was again an interesting document, rather freer of the humbug and cant which we get from the Government when it is blowing its bags to the full. It has not got much to blow about at the moment. The difference between this speech and those to which we have become accustomed by Labor Governments is that they cannot crow too much because they will not be able to keep their election promises. The fact is that we are in for a fairly torrid time.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Done it all? We will see in due course what the teachers and others have to say. One welcome result of the economic downturn is that the Government is not blowing its bags, as is its wont. Before we get on to the details of this speech, I want to say two or three things.

I did briefly pay a tribute in the Chamber last week to Charlie Harrison, whose recent passing is mentioned in the Governor's speech. I again say that it was with great regret that I learned of his demise. I recall an instance about 10 years ago when some of us had time to go on interstate bowls trips: it was a long time ago because my second son, who is now 22, was quite young. We lost my son on the train to Perth and found him at the other end, where he was with Charlie Harrison, who had taught him how to play poker. He was busily taking 5c pieces from Charlie at this game of poker, which Charlie had taught him to play. That is a good aspect of this place, in that when we do get outside the Chamber we can behave in a reasonably civilised fashion. As I said last week, Charlie was quite free of spite in his dealings with any of us in this place, and I was certainly sorry to hear of his death.

The Governor has again delivered his speech with his usual dignity. I hope that the Government will show good sense and see fit to reappoint him, as his term expires soon. It has been customary around Australia to reappoint Governors in some States. I do not think anyone could quibble about the effort and the dignity displayed by the Governor and, indeed, Lady Dunstan likewise. I do not think anyone could argue that His Excellency has not done the job to the satisfaction of the vast majority of South Australians. However, I would take issue with some of the statements the Government required the Governor to make. All the Governor does is recite a speech, which has been written by the Government.

Mrs Appleby: We heard this speech last time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You did not hear this one last time. I am commenting on a different speech. The honourable member has a very short memory.

Mrs Appleby: I have not.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not say anything about the Governor and I did not say anything about Charlie Harrison last time. I certainly did not say last time that the speech was free of the usual cant and hypocrisy. I would

invite the honourable member to read my speech. I know she hangs on my every word, and to refresh her memory I suggest she take up the bound volume and read what I said last time. The Governor's speech states:

There are, indeed, indications that in some respects our regional economy has fared better than those of other States.

I have searched the statistics to try to find what would sustain that assertion, but I just cannot find any evidence to support it: in fact, I find evidence that would indicate that the reverse is the case. We will certainly watch with great interest the comparative position of South Australia on the national scene as the months roll by and as the full effect of Labor's economic policies federally become evident to the nation. It has taken quite some time for the effect of the Labor Party's economic policies to strike the public. The Labor Party has had a wonderful media machine up and running. We have had Bob Hawke with his new hairdo and snappy suits and with his media machine in operation, and they have done pretty well, but the chickens are now coming home to roost. We had a couple of interesting by-elections in New South Wales at the weekend which indicated that the public is suddenly waking up to what the Labor Party has visited on this country. I will certainly be watching the indicators in the next few months—and indeed the next couple of years—to see whether the Government's assertion that we are doing better in South Australia than the rest of Australia is in fact true.

Let me just point to a couple of fairly important indicators for South Australia. No-one in this place will deny that the motor vehicle industry has been very significant in the South Australian economy since the Second World War, after which there was a deliberate attempt by succeeding Administrations to foster that industry. It has been widely recognised that it is a very important segment of the South Australian economy. The figures in that industry do not indicate that South Australia is faring better than the rest of the nation. Over the year to May, which are the latest figures available, registrations are down 1 530 units on May of last year, a decline of 29 per cent, which is above the national drop in registration of 27 per cent. Therefore, that does not give any support to the Government's assertion that we are doing better than the rest of Australia.

No-one denies that housing is one of the most significant indicators of economic activity. The housing figures indicate that there has been a very significant downturn in South Australia. The figures for 1985-86 show annual approvals of 10 940 dwellings, which is 27.3 per cent down on 1984-85.

In paragraph 6 of the speech the Government brags about the enormous contribution made to housing in South Australia. This involved an artificial boost and an enormous influx of Government funds, which in the long-term will probably be more damaging, because the boom-bust mentality has been something that has plagued planning and economic growth in this country. If one is planning a stable growth pattern for an economy in a State or nation, the last thing that is needed is a boom-bust situation, wherein the boom is built up and when there is a downturn the bust is so much bigger and the effects on employment and the like are exaggerated.

That is what is likely to happen in South Australia, because the Government saw fit to pour so much of its resources into housing and, now that those resources are not available, the decline will simply be more marked and the so-called benefits very much illusory. If the Government members subscribe to the theory that the boom-bust approach to economic growth is satisfactory, they have not learnt that very fundamental lesson, because the fact is that indicators

are there in those two significant areas of the State economy, with the result that far from faring better than the rest of Australia we are doing a darn sight worse. I certainly do not give credence to that statement.

The Government is now sheltering behind the fact that its funds from Canberra are going to be diminished. When they won in 1982, they could not shelter behind that excuse—they found another excuse on that occasion. Prior to that election they said that they had first class financial information. They had the Auditor-General's Report. They had done their economic sums and were quite confident that they would not have to raise any taxes and certainly would not introduce any new taxes. However, on election night the Premier was even backing off from that and was looking for some Treasury documents to support a case for which he did not know the facts, whereas he had been proclaiming during the election campaign that he knew the facts. He cannot use that excuse again. When he went to the election last year, he made a whole grab bag full of promises, including some very significant promises to the education community, to appoint a whole swag of new ancillary staff, for instance.

Mr Tyler: The education promises have been honoured.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, Mr Jackson from SAIT, the Principal of the Primary Teachers Association and the President of the parents organisation have not caught up with the fact that the Labor Party has honoured its election promises, as the member for Fisher would tell the House. In fact, I think the education fraternity is about to embark on a campaign to see that the Labor Party does keep its election promises. However, I will not be deflected from the point that it is again about to break its election promises.

Mr Tyler: How do you know that?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We will not have to wait long to find out, will we? The Minister of Education as good as said so publicly in the past day or so. As I mentioned, we did have boom conditions in the building industry to artificially inflate economic activity in South Australia during the past financial year, and the Government boasted long about that. However, the fact is that we are in for a recession of no small dimensions in the housing industry. I will be very interested to know how the Government will provide more funds (as indicated in the Governor's speech). The Government says that it will take all possible steps to ensure that the activities are maintained. We will watch that with a great deal of interest.

One statement in the Governor's speech which I find agreeable is that at last in this country rural producers are recognised for their contribution to the economy. Rural producers around the nation have been effectively and politically disfranchised over the years in the name of one vote one value, and for that reason they have tended to be neglected by Labor Governments—and that is demonstrated quite regularly by the fact that the Labor Party does very poorly indeed electorally in the rural community. But now at last the Labor Party has had to recognise that the economic health of this country depends very largely on two sectors, namely, the rural economy and our mineral producers. No doubt it is a grudging recognition from Labor Party members opposite—

An honourable member: Why?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because in electoral terms they have never been important to it. The Labor Party has never had any empathy with country areas or country people for the simple reason that they do not vote for the Labor Party and, electorally, it has managed to disfranchise them over the years. In this place the Labor

Party does not hold any of the rural seats that it might wish to hold, simply because it is not there to look after rural producers, and rural producers know it. The high level of rates and taxes which have affected the rural community, and the adherence to things like succession duties and capital gains tax, which severely affect rural producers, are dear to the heart of the Labor Party. There is now a growing realisation in this country that we are really well and truly on the back of the primary producer and the mining community. So I certainly hope that it comes into the consciousness of the Labor Party that we must at all costs encourage the rural community and the mining community, because they earn the bulk of our export income.

We have done very well in those areas over the years, despite the handicap and burden placed upon those communities by Labor Governments. It is now generally accepted by Labor politicians that it is up to the manufacturing community to do something about the plight of this nation's economy and its balance of payments deficit. I recommend that all members of Parliament read the booklet sent out by a study group set up by the manufacturing industry to examine the prospects for expanding the export of our manufactured goods. I recommend that members read it because it indicates that, if we reckon we will save this nation's bacon by a sudden export flood of manufactured goods, we are in cloud-cuckoo-land. It just will not happen.

I read with interest that Mr Crean of the ACTU says, 'It was not the trade unionists.' I would not say it is the trade unionists; I suggest that in many instances it is the trade union leaders. What they mean is: it is not the trade union leaders like Mr Crean and Co. who have ruined the economy of this country; it is the terrible, wicked manufacturing bosses who have not been exporting their goods. The plain fact is that there is no way in the world that we will compete in the short term with our manufactured products. It is just not on. If members try to delude themselves that that is the case, they had better read the report of the group set up to look at this matter. That report was made available to members a few days ago.

We are in for a fairly torrid time economically; there is no doubt about that, and that can be laid at the feet very largely in my view of the Labor Party and its fellow travellers who in my judgment are the leaders of the trade union movement and, in particular, the militant leaders. We all know who they are. The member for Fisher finds that amusing. I suggest to him that he go to his constituents, the majority of whom supported him, to see whether the majority of those constituents do not agree with the point that I am making. I think he will find that they do.

We talk about expanding export markets. I would like to refer to the study tour which I undertook, just prior to the commencement of this session, into Asia, Singapore, Penang, Bangkok and Hong Kong. I was reasonably assiduous in making inquiries of people in those places as to the export potential for our produce, manufactured goods and, indeed, anything that we can make. It is plain to me that again the biggest potential for exports into those places is some of our primary production.

A big boost was given to South Australian exports to those countries by the construction of the Adelaide International Airport. This project has been frequently criticised by the Minister of Transport and others, but it is a fact of life that the construction of that airport during the life of the Tonkin Liberal Government did more than any other single thing to enhance the export of fruit and vegetables from this State to that part of the world. Indeed, I believe that those facilities now need to be extended even further to cater for the export of more of that produce. This is one

area where we can enhance our export trade if we can go about it in the right way and learn more about marketing and selling. We can get a bigger share of the market by doing so.

We are being beaten hands down by the Americans, who are selling primary produce in these markets. Recently, I heard on an ABC newscast the politicking being done by an Australian Democrat member of the Legislative Council, Mr Gilfillan, who was in California trying to sell to the West Coast of America the idea of buying our oranges. However, the Americans are beating us hands down in the export of oranges to South-East Asia. Mr Gilfillan seriously suggested that we should be selling our citrus fruit in America. Indeed, I heard such reports day after day and then I read in a newspaper that a spokesman for the Riverland had said that Mr Gilfillan was talking nonsense. However, in the meantime Mr Gilfillan got a lot of air time and political kudos for being active. He was in America trying to sell our primary produce at a time when the Americans are beating us hands down in marketing citrus fruit and other primary produce in South-East Asia. I saw oranges marked 'Sunkist' in a Singapore supermarket and I thought that it had come from our Riverland. However, it was an American product. I and other people believe that we can do business in these overseas markets by having there people who are well versed and who can help the primary producer. The primary producer is the grower of the produce and he is not necessarily skilled in overseas marketing. However, with appropriate assistance we can do better than we are doing in those markets.

In Penang, I sought to find out what was happening in terms of the wild dreams of former Premier Dunstan, who set up Georgetown, in Penang as a sister city to Adelaide. We were going to sell in Malaysia all sorts of South Australian manufactured products such as stoves, washing machines and other white goods. However, all I found out was that we were selling Caroma toilet seats in that area. It seems that, because of our cost of production, we cannot service those markets. I discussed this matter with Datuk Chet, the administrator who is in charge of the sister city arrangement and he said that we could do more than we were doing at the moment in terms of expanding exports.

All in all, it seems that we must again rely heavily on our primary producers if we are to expand those markets, and I believe that we can. I remember when we sold much fruit from the Adelaide Hills and elsewhere to Europe, especially Britain, but, when Britain joined the European Economic Community, we lost those markets. Indeed, probably the only place where we will find markets for such produce to an increasing extent is South-East Asia. The EEC has an enormous lot to answer for in terms of the present world trade in primary produce. In this regard, I refer especially to the French. In Thailand, a developing country where a large section of the population is underprivileged and suffers from a low standard of living, at the instigation of the French the quota of primary produce that can be exported by Thailand has been cut.

There is a mountain of overproduction in the EEC and in America, whereas Australian farmers, who can compete without subsidies, are not allowed to do so. Nothing came home to me more forcibly during my travels than the selfishness of the French and others in the EEC because they are squeezing economically deprived countries such as Thailand, a country that is trying desperately and fairly successfully to expand its economy. Such countries have an enormous amount to answer for on the world scene. Certainly, I am not in love with the French after hearing what I heard in Thailand.

His Excellency's speech refers to a whole range of issues. Indeed, I could use up my previously allotted hour in talking about them but, unfortunately, I am not allowed to do so. The speech refers to workers compensation legislation. We know that the now discredited legislation was supposed to be the be all and end all when it was introduced by the Labor Government. However, now we are on the eve of history repeating itself. The Labor Government wants to reintroduce the legislation, but it will be discredited because it will not come to grips with the problem in terms of cost.

One paragraph of his Excellency's speech refers to the excavation of the coal deposits at Lochiel. I hope that the expected results turn out to be better than our experience at Bowmans, which was a big white hope. The Government said that, right or wrong, we would get our power by digging a hole at Bowmans and, after spending up to \$13 million, we are no nearer mining that coal to generate electricity than when the idea was dreamt up that Kingston would solve our problem. Now, holes are to be dug on the salt lakes at Lochiel, but the truth is that we are still in a fix as regards our power generation.

The idea of coal gasification has been regurgitated several times in the *Advertiser* but the timetable for that is about 16 years. I do not know how on earth people believe that low grade impure coal can be dug up, processed by beneficiation, gasified, taken by pipe to Adelaide, and burned so that the electricity can be generated economically. Yet that is what we are being asked to believe by one or two of our Government gurus. Such a project is being held up as a real hope for future power supplies in this State, although I cannot for the life of me see how it can operate, because plain commonsense indicates that, going through the processes with the costs involved in respect of the low calorific value gas, such a plan is impossible. I do not know how it would compare with the economics of other fuel sources, but here we have it regurgitated in the speech. Much has been said about the interstate connection as the great forward step, but the end result will be that in due course we will buy our power from Victoria in increasing quantities and it will become part of our base load.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Briggs.

Mr RANN (Briggs): I would like to congratulate His Excellency the Governor on an excellent speech, which clearly sets out a program of reform and sound economic management in this State.

I recently returned from a visit to the United States and Great Britain, where I looked at ways in which governments, local authorities, private enterprise and academic institutions can best foster high technology industries that provide jobs with a future. But, before looking at how high technology fits into the jobs equation, I must report that in both the US and Britain high technology leaders told me they were impressed with what we are doing here in South Australia.

Technology Park Adelaide is now recognised as the fastest growing and most prestigious high technology project in the southern hemisphere. Indeed, work being undertaken at Technology Park in microchip design, electronics and some forms of robotics is world leading. I can hear members opposite lamenting the loss of Dean Brown—they would prefer him to be their leader. Only last week it was announced that one Technology Park tenant—Vision Systems—had won a contract for electronic surveillance work connected with the space shuttle program. British Aerospace, whose Technology Park headquarters is almost completed, will also work on space satellite components.

High technology practitioners overseas pay tribute to the flexible range of incentives being offered prospective tenants at our Technology Park. Indeed, our park demonstrates a level of cooperation between State, Federal and local Governments, academic institutions and private enterprise that is unprecedented in the United States or Europe.

Slowly but surely Technology Park's innovation centre, Adelaide University's luminus and the South Australian Institute of Technology's excellent consulting arm, 'Techsearch', are beginning to overcome the lack of communication between the commercial and scientific communities that has meant that so little of our world ranking research was being explored commercially. Technology Park's success is also due to its strict insistence that only research based industries are allowed to establish there. So many other science or technology parks have come to grief by allowing anyone through the door in a scramble to fill up vacant allotments. Technology Park Adelaide maintains its prestige as a 'business address' and its international marketing edge by insisting on 'top end' technology. The park does not allow itself to be used for warehousing or straight assembly work. There is an insistence on a substantial research and development component. This way our Technology Park is prevented from becoming just another industrial estate with a fancy name.

In the marketing of the park I must pay a tribute to the work of the Premier, the Minister of State Development and Technology, and the board and officers of Technology Park Adelaide Corporation. I was certainly pleased to convey to the corporation the news that a prestigious inner London high technology venture—the South Bank Technopark—is keen to establish links with Technology Park Adelaide, with possible joint ventures in mind. Recently, the Director of the London Technopark visited the United States to establish direct links with similar centres for technology transfer arrangements, marketing and joint ventures. The Technopark, a private enterprise development linked to the South Bank Polytechnic, has proved so successful that three spinoff 'parks' are planned close to other London academic institutions.

In the Texas city of Fort Worth, sister city to Salisbury, I examined plans for a major robotics think tank to be called 'The Applied Robotics Research Institute'. This is a \$10 million joint project of the University of Texas at Arlington and the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. It will soon be established on an 18 acre site and will be the anchor of an industrial park to be developed around the institute. More than 100 high technology firms will participate in research into robotics applications at this institute. Companies have made cash grants to establish the think tank and each will be able to benefit from research and development breakthroughs. When the centre is established it is expected to attract robotics manufacturers and supporting industries from throughout the United States.

I certainly urge the Federal Government, in cooperation with industry, to consider establishing a robotics research centre in Australia. Around the world robotics is being used increasingly in automated industries. In our own State, robotics is being used in the motor vehicle and other industries. It is quite clear that we cannot stop this trend towards increasing automation. The challenge is to ensure that Australia is at the forefront in developing robot technologies for export. This way we can ensure that robotic developments create Australian jobs rather than destroy them. Of course, Technology Park Adelaide is already the base for some advanced robotics research, with the robot shearing apparatus attracting international interest. Technology Park,

then, could be considered as a site for a major national robotics research centre.

But there are broader issues to address. I am sure that no-one in this Parliament would deny that there is a pressing need for mainstream Australian industry and small business to rise to the challenge posed by the widespread introduction of new technologies into advanced industrial economies throughout the world. I am equally sure that there is a growing realisation that every working man and woman in this State will be faced with enormous and unsettling changes at work during the next decade. This will be inevitable as the micro-electronics revolution pervades all aspects of working life and all sectors of our economy. No technology in history has had such a broad range of applications in the workplace. It is also clear that rapid change will not be confined to the traditional manufacturing sector. Indeed, there is already considerable evidence that micro-electronics and knowledge based innovations have even greater potential in the rapidly expanding service sector that is manufacturing.

But we still have to ask ourselves why Australian industry has failed so far to fully embrace the technological revolution. After all, we have experienced, during the past three years, unprecedented employment growth and a substantial recovery in corporate profitability. Yet Australia's industrial investment is still well behind what is needed to start catching up to Australia's main industrial rivals. Even though our imports have been rising faster than our exports, industrial support for research and development, and for training, remains far too low to develop and sustain the new industries of the future on a broad scale. Australians have been slow to grasp that economic success must involve a shift away from a dependence on finite resources, raw materials and muscle power towards human skills and knowledge. Just as the industrial revolution dramatically expanded our physical capacities, the so-called information revolution will magnify our mental capacities.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr RANN: It is good to know that the member for Mitcham did not acquire any finesse at Ascot, but at least he will not have to go back to Wimbledon to get a serve. Unfortunately, some of the hysteria, as well as the genuine concerns about new technologies that emerged during the late 1970s and early 1980s still persist. That is a pity because pessimism about new technologies will entrench resistance to the kind of changes needed to increase national wealth fast enough to further bring down unemployment and increase living standards. From my observations overseas it now seems clear that hype about a 'post industrial society' and the so-called 'collapse of work' was enormously exaggerated. Indeed, experts in the British Labour Party and the TUC now argue that there is no automatic connection between the use of new technology on a large scale and unemployment. For example, Sweden has proportionately six times more industrial robots than Britain, but less than a third of Britain's unemployment. Japan is a further example of how high levels of investment and the use of new technology do not necessarily lead to higher unemployment. But it would be wrong to be complacent.

Bringing robots onto car assembly lines will clearly reduce jobs on the production line within the car industry. While new technology does not have to lead to more unemployment, it often does. For many workers the first experience with new technology can be the last, with redundancies following in the wake of its introduction. And, predominantly, it will be working class jobs—particularly in high volume process work—that will be hit. In contrast, employment in white collar work will continue to increase, whilst

the impact of micro-electronics makes it possible to create more productive professional and semiprofessional jobs at lower unit costs. The simple truth is that the least educated are at risk whilst the highly educated are barely threatened at all. That is why we need a massive national campaign—involving the schools, tertiary institutions, the media, sporting and entertainment personalities, clubs, parents, unions and business—to encourage young people to stay on at school, gain qualifications and go on for tertiary study or industry training.

Labor's election policy in this State last December—that winning policy that the member for Mitcham remembers so well—accurately prescribed 'technological literacy' as the key to young people's job prospects and innovations such as the School of the Future at Technology Park must be supported. This State, of course, is leading the nation in the provision of computers in schools, and much credit should be given to the former and present Ministers of Education, for whom I have enormous admiration. A need also exists for tertiary institutions to upgrade their outreach programs to encourage school leavers to pursue higher education.

In pursuing a fulsome embrace of high technology, I reiterate that it would be foolish to minimise the problems of change on a large scale. Our task is to manage change—as far as that is possible—so that the adverse impact is minimised. We all obviously would like to encourage a flourishing and competitive economy, in which the wealth created by the technological revolution in those sectors trading internationally can be used to build up those sectors which serve the community, but in achieving that goal Governments will have to ensure that new jobs grow fast enough to compensate for declining jobs, that workers are trained for new skills and new jobs, and that individual workers share in the benefits from new technology.

Overseas experience underlines the fact that the more a country is able to use the new technologies the faster total productivity will increase. By 'productivity' I am referring to increasing output and employment together, not the Liberal Party definition, which equates productivity with cutting jobs. The faster total productivity increases, the more rapid will be the underlying growth rate.

The potential for growth in high technology industries should not be underestimated. Between 1972 and 1982, for example, world demand for goods produced by high tech industries grew twice as fast as demand for all manufactured goods. That is why Japan has grown faster than Europe and the United States. Indeed, computer related occupations will comprise four of the top five fastest growing employment fields in the United States between now and 1995. Experience in the United States also shows that the introduction of computer-related technology has led to a massive growth in business services employment.

We are not just talking about new so-called 'gee whiz' industries. New technology can and must be used to revitalise our traditional industries, such as manufacturing, motor vehicles and steel. It must always be remembered that an increase in new technologies is not necessarily at the expense of traditional industries. The long-term failure of Australian industry to invest, particularly in research and development and new technology, has been at the heart of our poor performance in manufacturing. We must restore industrial health by modernising traditional industries, as well as stimulating new growth industries. The introduction of new technology on a large scale in Australian industry would undoubtedly improve industrial productivity and increase economic growth. It will also help check imports and boost exports.

I was interested to learn, upon returning from overseas, that Victoria is following South Australia's lead in backing high technology industries. Early last month the Victorian Premier, John Cain, announced a \$60 million plan to turn Victoria away from reliance on old-fashioned manufacturing industries and towards becoming a high technology exporting centre. This scheme is aimed at pushing private companies to develop exportable high technology products. The Victorian Government will invest in about 20 high technology ventures in the fields of biotechnology, medical technologies, advanced materials, information technologies and agriculture. The Government investment will be matched by direct private investment of more than \$150 million. This initiative in Victoria is an attempt to kick start a rapid growth in technology-based industries by encouraging large companies and entrepreneurs to develop products and processes created within the State's research institutes.

Of course, there are other strategies. In the United States, for instance, Senator Gary Hart has consistently argued that public and private pension funds, which in the United States control nearly \$1 000 billion in assets, should become a powerful instrument of economic and industrial revitalisation. This is not happening, because investing in small firms or non-traditional ventures is discouraged for most pension funds. Most State laws in the United States require pension fund investments to be made conservatively. However, the millions of American workers who are taking indirect control of significant chunks of corporate America through pension funds are not using their vast, collective influence that they could wield to open new opportunities and creative alternatives to stimulate job growth. Senator Hart, candidate for the next United States presidential election, argues that, by channelling just a small additional percentage of pension fund investments into newer, smaller ventures, such as higher risk high technology enterprises, decision makers could contribute significantly to creating jobs and opportunities. Perhaps we should look at such a role for Australian pension funds.

I now turn to a very important matter for this State. South Australia is poised to take advantage of one of the greatest technology transfer operations in this nation's history if Port Adelaide is chosen as the construction site for the \$2.6 billion submarine project. The impact on South Australia's manufacturing, engineering and electronics sectors will be enormous as our industries take the giant leap forward to become involved in the world's latest technology. There will also be enormous spin-off benefits as we develop a technologically literate management and a work force with new international class skills in high technology. That will stand us in great stead to win further defence offset projects. I make no secret of my excitement and commitment to this project, because the impact on electronic manufacturers based in the northern suburbs and on jobs in my area, as well as its impact on South Australian industry, will be enormous.

I must say I was disgusted by the attempt last November by some South Australian Liberals, including Mr Alexander Downer, to white-ant our campaign to win this important project. The sort of interjections from the member for Mitcham, who is trying to talk down this project, is certainly an example of that white-anting negative attitude. South Australia has the best greenfields site and associated port facilities. We have the most advanced defence, engineering and technological infrastructure. We have the enormous experience and expertise of the Defence Research Centre at Salisbury, but perhaps most significantly we have the best industrial relations record that will ensure that South Australia delivers the goods—and that is the key. Overseas

tenderers are terrified of industrial strife. The figures are stark.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr RANN: If the member for Mitcham listens, he may learn something. In June of this year South Australian Senator Graham Maguire received a reply from the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations to his question about comparative industrial relations records. For the 12 months to December 1984 Australia lost 0.246 days per employee because of industrial disputes. New South Wales had the worst record of all States with 0.355 days lost per employee. South Australia had by far the best record with only 0.056 days lost—6½ times better than New South Wales, our principal competitor for the submarine project. Our record in this State was also better than those of Canada, the United States, France, Italy and the United Kingdom.

Mr S.J. Baker: What about Germany?

Mr RANN: The member for Mitcham wants to know about Germany. I am sure that the German submarine tenderer HDW did not overlook the fact that South Australia's record in 1984 was many times better than that of West Germany. It is about time that the honourable member started doing his homework, if he is to hang on to his shadow Ministry. He is already looking a little dodgy. As members would know, West Germany is a country that prides itself on its industrial harmony. New South Wales figures, however, were much worse than West Germany's. Therefore, 1984's results were not unique. It was not a one-off result. Year after year for decades we have had the best record of industrial peace of any State in Australia.

Year after year we have seen successive Federal Governments, particularly during the Liberal years, throw defence contracts to the Eastern States. For 30 years there has been no genuine attempt to grasp the opportunities offered by defence contracts to develop industries by embracing new technologies, new management techniques and thereby become internationally competitive. The record speaks volumes. Every major naval contract awarded to New South Wales in the past 15 years has been an abysmal failure. It has been a sorry story of cost blow-outs borne by an overly tolerant Australian taxpayer, appalling industrial relations, poor quality control, costly delays and, just as important, the sully of our international reputation.

Every Federal politician and every Canberra bureaucrat should read the findings of the recent Senate inquiry into defence procurement in Australia. There was the costly farce involving the construction at the Carrington Dockyard in Newcastle of the amphibious assault ship HMAS *Tobruk*. There was the construction at the Sydney Cockatoo Dockyard of the ironically named HMAS *Success*. (No wonder it is nicknamed HMAS *Excess*.) That project cost \$100 million more and took three years longer to build than anticipated. For 15 years the New South Wales dockyard has produced a record of promises shattered in terms of costs, industrial strife, quality and meeting commitments on time. Every time there is a new contract in the offing each New South Wales dockyard promises that this time all will be well, and each time they blow it. I am afraid you cannot change entrenched Dickensian attitudes overnight.

But now, once again, New South Wales thinks it is in with a chance. They have even had the nerve to run full page advertisements claiming that New South Wales is the 'logical choice' for the submarine contract because of the so-called success of previous large scale engineering projects in that State. I believe that Australia cannot afford to squander the opportunities offered by the Oberon replacement program by allowing the submarine project to sink into the

mire of New South Wales shipbuilding. I challenge the Government in that State, its shabby Opposition, and its even shabbier Leader of the Opposition, industry or unions to defend that State's record with naval contracts. In fact, the only thing New South Wales and South Australia have in common in this case is that both State Oppositions are trying to make sure that their State does not win the contract. We must put the national interest first.

In contrast to the New South Wales case, South Australia offers a commitment by Government, business and unions to this project, plus a record of excellence in the execution of major projects. The Moomba project is a magnificent example. During the past five years engineering companies in Port Adelaide have successfully tendered internationally, beating companies in countries such as Singapore and Japan; and building to time, cost and quality with only one single day lost through industrial disputes. If the submarine contract is to be decided on strict commercial criteria, South Australia must have a clear, unbeatable advantage.

Back in May our Premier rightly warned against 'political patronage and pork barrelling' in awarding the submarine project. There is no doubt that New South Wales will seek to use its political muscle in an attempt to outweigh its industrial deficiencies. Fortunately, Australia has a Minister of Defence in Kim Beazley who would not tolerate the contract being decided by anything other than commercial grounds. He is well aware that the long-term industrial and commercial benefits of the program must be put before any short-term political gains. He must be supported in this approach because, if commercial grounds are to be the sole determinant, the awarding of this giant contract to New South Wales would not survive the basic credibility test. We have enormous opportunities ahead to ensure that South Australia is as well known as the 'High Tech State' as it is as the 'Festival State'. We must not allow the technological revolution to pass us by. If we do, we risk letting the future pass us by. I look forward with great interest to hearing the speech of the Opposition Leader, who is apparently having it written for him right now.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will have an opportunity to make his contribution in due course.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I support the motion. I join with other members in offering my condolences to the families of those former members who have died since Parliament was last in session. There are a number of things to which I wish to draw attention, and they are contained not only within, but also in addition to, those mentioned in the Governor's speech to the Parliament.

In the first instance let me, however, refer to some matters that are contained in the speech made by the Governor. I preface my remarks by saying that this is the first opportunity since the election for me to participate in a debate of this kind—thanks very much to the unreasonable indifference and arrogance of not only the Leader of the House, the Deputy Premier, but also the Labor Party in deciding that we could not participate in the Address in Reply debate in February when Parliament was opened after the December election.

The insult which was preferred by this House as a consequence of the Governor's opinions and attitudes is profound and one from which I wish to dissociate myself entirely. I believe that we have a responsibility, if nothing else, to respond to the address made by the Governor on behalf of the Government on the occasion on which Parliament is opened. If we do not have that much, then we have

not got anything. We look at that speech which, as we all know, is a statement of policy for the legislative program that the Government has in mind for the coming session.

One sees in point 7, for instance, that the Governor referred to the widespread soaking rains in the first week of July and said that they indeed meant a promising and optimistic outlook for agriculture in general in this State. That is in terms of productivity, but it is not too ruddy optimistic in terms of the economics involved. It really means that they will go broke less quickly—they will go broke more slowly. As the terms of trade adversely affect farmers at present through factors quite beyond their control, they cannot make profits, despite the fact that there are trade wars going on in the world that are beyond the control of those farmers and the organisations that are responsible for marketing their products, anyway.

The posturing that has been done in the United States, of course, paints the United States Government as the villain of the piece in the way in which the commodity markets, particularly for grain products, are being adversely affected. However, the real villain is the EEC, which has refused to accept the rationale that it should not subsidise the production of agricultural exports; in fact, it does not accept the rationale that it is unwise to subsidise its own agricultural production. The subsidisation of the production of any goods in any economy must involve only one reason, if any reason at all, and that is defence. In this case the EEC cannot justify subsidising agricultural production on such grounds.

One does not need to be self sufficient or even attempt to be self sufficient when one cannot produce goods at prices that are competitive with those for which they can be bought. One ought to be happy to trade with people, selling the things that one is able to produce most efficiently and effectively and, with the proceeds from those exports, buy the things which one cannot produce as cheaply, effectively and efficiently as can other countries in the world.

By that means alone, we will reduce the political tensions which develop as a consequence of trade wars. It is those political tensions that were the basis of the Second World War—probably the basis, more than anything else, of the First World War. It was not simply a matter of greedy people wanting to be even wealthier at the expense of the downtrodden mass of poor people, as some historians have portrayed it. Certainly that was not the case in the Second World War. Japan would never have gone to war had it been given access to raw materials and the opportunity to trade fairly with any other countries on earth sufficient to enable it to continue to survive. It was our racist indifference to their human need which brought about the inevitable, as I see it, deterioration of relations between our allies and that country which resulted in the war—or at least Japan's entry to it. Whether or not it is so in the case of Hitler is arguable, and I will not enter into that.

I want to make the point that it is not reasonable for either the Prime Minister or the Minister for Primary Industry in Canberra to attempt to blame the United States for all the problems that we have on the farms at the present time. We are having a good season, but it will not mean that farmers will be very much better off, if better off at all, at the end of it because of the higher costs of production which they must carry, and over which they have no control, as well as the lower prices that they receive.

I have explained to this House before that our export industries, particularly farming, are price takers on the world market. They cannot go to the Arbitration Commission and ask for an increase in the price per tonne of wheat, the price per kilo of wool or the price for anything that they produce,

yet they must pay the additional costs that are passed on to them through the goods and services that they must buy from the rest of the economy—costs which are determined by the price of labour that is fixed by the Arbitration Commission.

The process by which the Arbitration Commission makes those decisions is in no way related to the real capacity of the economy to pay at all. It is simply related in law to the necessity to settle a dispute between a trade union (or trade unions) and the employer or employer groups. It does not take into account the ability of the rest of the economy to pay; nor does it take into account the effect on consumers—the rest of society—outside the deal that is being made. I thought it important to make that point again.

I now wish to make a comment about point 10, which states:

Our State's industrial future and security for domestic consumers depend upon reliable and reasonably priced energy supplies.

For a Government of this political colour, the Labor Party in South Australia, to say that is gross hypocrisy. It has demanded higher and higher taxes and unreasonably high interest rates from the Electricity Trust, which the trust is then compelled to pass on to consumers. We have seen that.

It is also stated that there are to be further trial excavations of coal at Lochiel, and that in addition work will continue on the establishment of a link between the electricity grids of South Australia and the eastern States of New South Wales and Victoria, and that the second stage of the coal gasification study will also proceed.

Regarding the future development of the Lochiel deposit, and indeed for that matter the Sedan and hundred of Anna deposits of these lignites across the other side of the ranges, it needs to be borne in mind that they are deposits that have the highest levels of sulphur compounds of any coal ever used by man for the purpose of generating electricity or ever contemplated for use in that way.

The danger to the immediate surroundings, that is, a large part of settled South Australia, posed by the development of those deposits for electricity generation, is enormous. We should not proceed to develop and exploit those deposits of lignite unless we are absolutely sure that the sulphur oxides which will be produced as a consequence of their combustion (or destructive distillation) can be completely scrubbed from the gaseous emissions that enter the atmosphere. If those sulphur oxides do vent to the atmosphere with the other gaseous emissions, most of which will be water and carbon dioxide, they will simply dissolve in atmospheric moisture and in certain weather conditions produce acid rain.

It is not inconceivable that that acid rain would have a very devastating effect from a thunderhead, for instance, which had taken some hours (or days) to develop. If there were static or very slow atmospheric wind velocities—of less than four knots—for some time, and the thunderhead developed, seeded, probably by some of the dust particles as well as other material that could come from the chimney stacks on the coal fired power stations, it would produce acidic rain indeed. It would not only kill vegetables and lawns in front and back gardens and strip galvanising off roofs and duco from cars but would also wipe out fruit crops and pasture. Indeed, if that acid rain were to fall in any concentrations while grapes or cereal crops were flowering it would wipe out those crops. There is a great risk of such meteorological events occurring at that crucial time of the year, in October. We need to be pretty careful about

developing those deposits unless we first develop our capacity to precipitate, scrub or clean up the gaseous emissions.

I was amazed to hear the Governor, in paragraph 19 of his speech, talking about excellence, equality and efficiency in the education of our children. Since the Government was again elected to office last December it has repudiated the very policy that it promulgated on education. That is appalling. In fact, the Premier gave unqualified assurances and undertakings to the electorate at large, saying, 'Believe me, this is what we will do.' I recall seeing an advertisement saying that children born today would leave school next century. The silly goose, aided and abetted by an indifferent Minister, has decided to slash education funding. Indeed, the Government is softening up the electorate right now to accept the forthcoming cuts as being necessary. At the same time, the Premier says that it is legitimate and forgivable for the Government to do this now, nine months after the election, because at that time it did not know that the country was in such dire economic straits. The Government maintains that it is now necessary to restrain spending. That is piffle. Mr Speaker, you and I know that, and so do other intelligent members of this place.

The economic conditions presently prevailing in this country were with us and were wholly predictable last December. Not one aspect of the macro-economic factors which make it now necessary to even contemplate the cuts was not then known. The fact is that the accord was in place. That ratchet applying to the costs of wages and jobs is screwing them up literally, increasing their cost. If jobs cost more there will be fewer of them.

I would like to say other things about that, but I will leave that matter for now, because there are other things of more importance that I need to bring to the attention of the House. Not the least important of those matters is that, as the time approaches for the reappointment of the Governor, the Government ought to be doing something better than sitting silently aside as people in the community express their wish and concern about the wisdom and desirability of appointing the present Governor, Sir Donald Dunstan, for a second term. It is scurrilous that the Government does not give the people of South Australia an assurance in that direction. Journalists are derelict in their duty that they have not even drawn attention to the matter, and that is why I raise it.

Mr Becker: When does his term expire?

Mr LEWIS: It expires early next year. Quite obviously, the Premier and officers of his department would be looking around for a replacement right now—indeed, I know that they are. The names that have been contemplated would curl the honourable member's hair.

Mr Becker: Not another Dunstan!

Mr LEWIS: Another Don Dunstan! If he is alive, I guess, members opposite would not mind having Murphy. Incidentally, it is scurrilous that that man does not go away and take with him the divisions he has brought into the Australian community by his unprincipled behaviour during the time he has been involved in politics, been a Minister of the Crown and subsequently, by virtue of his capacity to manipulate people within his own Party organisation and twist their arm, had himself appointed to the bench of the High Court. I have no respect whatever for that man, and the sooner he leaves this scene the better. It is disgusting that the Prime Minister stood up and publicly defended the man when he was known to have a cloud over his head and over his professional competence and public standing. It is like his hide to simply waltz back into the court and take his place there while he is still under a cloud.

Of course, we can rely on the Labor Party to cry crocodile tears about it and the Democrats to weep with them for fear that they might be seen as less than compassionate. I believe that the course of compassion would be best served if the man simply went away and resigned. That would be the honourable thing to do. I cannot see how, having been involved with so many crooks during the course of his lifetime, he can consider himself to be fit to serve in that high office. Besides that article in today's News I saw other comments that were signs of the times.

An honourable member: This is a well prepared speech.

Mr LEWIS: Yes it is, because it needs to be stated in the context of the time in which it occurs, something that never occurs to the honourable member. He stands up and reads a diatribe of trash about a pet theory, which may have no basis in fact whatever.

I now want to sympathise with the member for Hanson, who is in the Chamber at present: I know that he has been harassed at home by people who have threatened him, perhaps as a consequence of his commitment to a view about whether or not poker machines should be made lawful in this State. I do not share his view but, to recall Voltaire, I would defend to the death his right to state it. I want to make the point as a fellow traveller in that experience, having suffered that kind of abuse or, more particularly, my wife having suffered it for over 20 months after I first moved to Tailem Bend following my election to this place as the member for Mallee. There are horrific consequences for anyone who is subjected to such abuse.

I have never before mentioned this because I did not wish to reinforce the behaviour that was occurring. I believe that the people guilty of such behaviour are the kind of people who will respond to an acknowledgment of its effect by continuing. If one ignores them and makes no comment about it, they do not get reinforcement to continue. That abuse has long since stopped, but it has had a continuing effect on both of us. It was an experience which has been tragic for me.

At page 11 of the *News* there is comment on another area in which the Government has spent money, I believe quite irresponsibly, and that is in financing organisations that do things which are in direct contravention to the administrative policy in place and being followed by the Government elsewhere in its administration. I am referring to the headline 'Champs slammed on 'roo shoes' on page 11 of the *News*. It makes sense to harvest kangaroos from parts of our State where their numbers have increased beyond what they would otherwise have been in their natural state, by virtue of the fact that we have extended established waters into a large part of the pastoral areas of the State. Those harvested kangaroos are a profitable crop just the same as, say, sheep, whether for chamois leather—and that is the least significant part of it, but it is still a valuable by-product—or for the meat, or the wool which is taken by fellmongers after the sheep are slaughtered. Indeed, we graze the sheep and, as is known to most members in this place, they are shorn for their wool on an annual basis.

Kangaroo leather is known for its toughness, flexibility and durability in a wide range of atmospheric moisture conditions, as well as for comfort to the wearer, in that it breathes easily as well as retaining its form. It does not stretch and go out of shape, whether wet or dry, as easily as does leather derived from the ovine and bovine species from which we most commonly get our leather. It is excellent quality.

For the organisation Greenpeace and affiliated organisations here in Australia to be agitating for the complete cessation of that harvesting of kangaroos on the basis that

it is going to make kangaroos extinct is absolute nonsense. There is no scientific evidence whatever for that view. The spokesman on behalf of Greenpeace, some twit called Ms Thorne, says:

We've got to stop it, and we will.

She is talking about the 2.5 million kangaroos which will be officially killed this year in Australia's outback. She is the Greenpeace campaign coordinator for Europe for stopping the killing of the kangaroo, and she goes on to say:

It's not culling, but killing. Five species have already become extinct.

They were extinct long before we started harvesting kangaroos for leather, pet food or meat for human consumption. I might say that it is damned good meat for human consumption. It is very low in cholesterol, and I enjoy eating it.

Mr Becker: I thought it was really wormy.

Mr LEWIS: That depends on where you get it. Ms Thorne goes on:

A further 11 are under serious threat. The attitude of the Australian authorities is hypocritical—like hell it is—

It is a protected species, but they issue permits to shoot it.

Ducks are a protected species and people have permits to shoot them in open season. At least we restrict the number of kangaroos that are taken, so that we know we are not depleting the population below what will give us the ability to maximise a sustainable yield from the species in its natural habitat. It makes common sense to me. It makes no sense to me, however, when I recognise that this Government is contributing money, each year it has been in office, to organisations which are flatly opposed to the further harvesting of kangaroos, and at the same time allowing the harvest to go on. It is a double standard and is typical of the sort of double standards that we find coming from this Government. On the one hand, donations are made to organisations, such as CANE, which go to places near Roxby Downs and deliberately disrupt the capacity of the joint venturing partners there to get on with their job of developing that massive resource for the benefit of all South Australians.

At the same time as we are donating money to those organisations—organisations based here and interstate to go and disrupt that work—we are spending more money to send police up there to control them. Those organisations could not go there if they did not get the money from taxpayers through the mechanism of this Government in the first place. They could not afford it. But, no, we give them the money to get up there and make a damned nuisance of themselves and put their lives at risk, then send the police up there to try to ensure that they do not make too much of a nuisance of themselves.

We must have rocks in our head—or at least the ALP Government here in South Australia must have rocks in its head. The member for Briggs, of course, is a clear illustration of the point that I am making. I just heard his speech wherein he related what he saw as a great opportunity for South Australia to win a submarine manufacturing or construction project from the Federal Government. Yet, at the same time, only last week I think it was, the member for Adelaide stood up here and said what a great thing it is to have a year of peace and that we should ban armaments manufacture. This Government is spending so much money on promoting an awareness of peace and the necessity to ban armaments everywhere and put war to bed. There is a contradiction in terms.

It is a ridiculous situation in which to find oneself. The only way one will have peace is to be adequately armed to

repel an aggressor and to serve notice on any potential aggressors that they are going to have to deal with us and that there is something to deal with if they attempt to invade our shores. That is the only way we will secure peace. We need to be eternally vigilant and ready. By being ready I do not mean that we should go out and attack anybody: I simply mean being able to defend ourselves.

However, each month of this last year we have been assisting some cranks and nut groups who belong to the Kamikaze left and who are hell bent on closing down not only armaments manufacture but also the radio surveillance umbrella which we share with our allies, the United States of America, some of which installations are on our soil and the benefits of which are enjoyed world wide. I heard some twits recently argue that we should close them down in spite, to try to bring America to its senses. Frankly, we would be cutting off our nose to spite our face if we did so. The Americans can fairly shortly now do without them, and we would be the poorer. We will not have the umbrella which they provide for us. We will not be able to discover if there is some nefarious plot to set the stage for an invasion at any point in the future, without them.

We cannot expect to be able to develop the high tech defence and surveillance mechanisms that an economy as big as the United States economy can develop. In fairly short order, I am saying that in less than five years, America could quite simply close down those bases and tell us to go fry our face and anything else that we have got that we think we ought to cook. This Government says, on the one hand, it wants to build submarines, that we want the contract here. Yet, on the other hand, it gives thousands of dollars to organisations to disrupt that kind of process. It makes no sense to me whatsoever.

I now want to turn to a matter that I had hoped I would have the opportunity of presenting to the Parliament when I was denied it on the last occasion in February in the Address in Reply debate.

Last year, as part of International Youth Year I undertook to do a survey, which has taken me and members of my staff over 600 man hours and cost several thousand dollars, on the attitudes of youth to a number of contentious issues relevant and topical to them. I want to briefly summarise the nature of the questionnaire which I personally circulated to all school leavers in the electorate of Mallee (and now Murray-Mallee) during the course of collecting that raw data. Over 20 per cent of people to whom I sent the survey responded, and that is a very high figure. As somebody who has been involved in market research previously, I was amazed by it. I was equally amazed at the attitudes uncovered by the responses to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was in several sections. The first was about the respondents themselves, the nature of their family, when they expected to get married, and so on; about their education, whether they thought the school system was adequate at the time at which they left school, the age and stage of their development, what they did well in and whether they thought it fitted them well for the work force. It dealt with then their attitudes to other people in their family and their assessment of other people's attitudes to them, namely, their parents, brothers and sisters; and referred to their work and adult life, what they saw as frustrating on the one hand or gratifying on the other hand, and what they thought was causing unemployment. Section 5 was about the things that they did.

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

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Before the adjournment we heard

the member for Murray-Mallee—and I am pleased to see him currently in the Chamber—make one of the most unprincipled and scurrilous attacks on His Honour Mr Justice Lionel Murphy, who is a member of the High Court of Australia. I see that the honourable member is now leaving the Chamber. He obviously cannot face the music. I think that every member of this House ought to be ashamed and disgusted with the member for Murray-Mallee's performance, which I believe was not fitting for a member of Parliament. Certainly he abused the responsibilities and privileges that as members of Parliament we have.

In the next 30 minutes, I would like to discuss some of the short-term and long-term problems that affect my electorate and some of the surrounding areas. To support my arguments I will rely heavily on a recently released report from the Department of Environment and Planning on the population projections for Adelaide to the year 2001. This report predicts that the population of the outer metropolitan council areas will reach 626 100 by the year 2001, an increase on recent figures of over 200 000. This increase will coincide with a population decline in the central metropolitan area.

As most members know, the Happy Valley council covers the majority of my electorate. The population in this area is predicted to increase by 85.3 per cent between 1981 and 2001. This will mean that the population will reach approximately 38 000 people. In scale with this prediction, numbers of dwellings have increased rapidly over the past five years and, although this will, I imagine, slow down towards the end of the century, there will still be significant growth in the housing and construction industry. Part of my electorate falls within the Noarlunga council. This area is expected to have an even greater rate of growth during this time. Many of the needs that these increases will generate are common to all in the southern region. This is something with which I am sure that the Deputy Premier, the member for Mawson, the member for Bright, and even to some extent the member for Hayward will agree.

The Minister for Environment and Planning has rightly pointed out that these population trends have important implications for the communities involved and so should be of concern to both local and State Government bodies. Planning is an important aspect of meeting the needs that such increases will bring. Without an optimistic and constructive view of what South Australia will be like in 20 years time, society's ability to meet its aspirations could be seriously impaired. Further, the extent to which the State meets these aspirations will depend to a large degree on the quality of planning presently underway.

Tonight, I would like to address my remarks to the future social and economic development of my electorate, which will be greatly affected by these population changes. I am particularly concerned about the cost of providing infrastructure to meet the needs of our ever increasing population. The findings of the report that I referred to earlier certainly require further assessment, particularly regarding detailing of engineering costs, environment and social impact. Much of this work is already under way and the Minister for Environment and Planning should be congratulated on this initiative. With the demographic trend and housing demand projected, I believe it is essential that future planning should consider technological change, human services, quality of life, environment and conservation, as well as the ever-vexing question for my electorate of transport and accessibility.

Naturally, there will be considerable monetary cost involved to meet the people's needs. However, I feel that, with careful and cooperative planning, we can do much to alleviate or delay the overall cost of providing an adequate

infrastructure. Existing and future quality of life will not necessarily be protected by providing more of the same services which presently are suitable to meet the community's needs. It is in fact possible that such a policy would contribute to additional problems such as high per capita costs and isolation to which I have referred many times in this place before and which are already evident in my electorate. It is important, therefore, that we approach this task with vision, cooperation and flexibility.

It is always easy to criticise decisions of the past, but it is true historically that the physical aspects have dominated decisions about urban form and development. For example, governments have tended to plan around sewers and roads and not around people. Considerable doubt exists regarding the wisdom of allowing people who are often most in need in the community to also become the pioneers of new regional developments. Recent discussions at all levels of government reinforce this view and place emphasis on the containment of outward growth and also on the pursuit of a people oriented strategy aimed at maximum accessibility to services. This embraces subjects such as affordable housing, services and facilities, employment, and a safe, attractive environment.

In the meantime, Governments need to think seriously about the facilities which can and should be provided in the immediate future. For instance, a great deal of work is currently under way to improve water services in my electorate to ensure adequate and high quality supply to the growing population. This includes a filtration plant at the Happy Valley Reservoir and a four year scheme at a cost of \$2.9 million to boost water supplies in the areas of Aberfoyle Park, Flagstaff Hill, Happy Valley and Morphett Vale East. One of the other major infrastructure costs is in the area of transport. Recently there have been a number of improvements to the Main South Road in the Darlington area.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: If the honourable member waits a minute, I will get to that. The realignment of Reservoir Drive is well under way, and I am hopeful that the Minister of Transport will agree to my requests to upgrade Flagstaff Road when this project is completed so that this important road corridor can carry the expected increase in traffic.

The design and documentation for the construction of the third arterial road from Sturt Road to Reynella, and for the upgrading of Panalatinga Road between South and Pimpala Roads is already under way. The construction of these projects is expected to begin, at the latest, in the early 1990s. The Highways Department has certainly been busy in recent years in the southern area.

Investigations into improving traffic flow through Coromandel Valley are also under way. Naturally, residents are also concerned about the impact of these improvements on their environment. Certainly, I am opposed to the Coromandel by-pass concept and have made my views known to the Minister, as have residents who abut Murrays Hill Road. The Happy Valley council also shares the residents' and my concern that this is not the appropriate option to assist the traffic flow through Coromandel Valley, and it is my view that the Highways Department should adopt one of the other two options available.

During the course of the last 12 months the State Transport Authority has made some improvements to public transport services within my electorate, and I know that these services are appreciated by my constituents. However, glaring examples of inadequate transport services remain. Sheidow Park and Trott Park, for example, have an inadequate bus service. The Minister of Transport will be well

aware of my representations to him regarding this issue. Public transport in Reynella East and the western area of Happy Valley is also unsatisfactory. I am very much concerned that the Reynella East campus does not have an adequate bus service. This school is one of the biggest in the State, having an attendance of approximately 2000 students and 200 teachers. The Minister of Transport, of course, is well versed regarding this problem, as I have raised it both privately and publicly with him. I hope that in the near future we are able to find a solution to this situation, which is creating havoc in traffic management at the school.

Although the corporation of the city of Adelaide will continue to be the major focus for commercial business, retail and entertainment functions (and it is something that my colleague the member for Adelaide would appreciate) regional centres can and should be expected to play an increasingly important role in servicing the surrounding areas. Such policies have the added benefit of reducing the need for people to commute to the city each day. Sections of my electorate currently have a higher percentage of two-car households than is the metropolitan average. This is certainly linked to the higher incidence of households in which there are two wage earners, but it is important to gauge precisely the extent to which this trend is a result of inadequate local facilities.

Mr Ingerson: If they have two cars what do they need public transport for?

Mr TYLER: That is the view of Opposition members. They do not want to supply any services to people in outer suburban areas. That is one reason why they have not been elected to government for some time. As I was saying, it is important to gauge precisely the extent to which this trend of owning two cars is a result of inadequate local services.

If the latter is the main reason, as I believe it is, it is important to remember that not every family that comes to lives in these communities has the financial resources to be able to afford the luxury of two cars. The relative benefits and costs of providing the infrastructure by way of transport, industry relocation, and the provision of local facilities must be assessed. It is the view of my Party that the responsibility of Government is to ensure that all people moving into new communities (indeed, all communities) have access to jobs and a range of community services.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr TYLER: That is the view of the honourable member's Party, and that is why it has not been in government for some time. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee interjects; he is from the country and would not know how people down south or in the north-east have to contend with such problems. Before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Murray-Mallee I was saying: that I cannot emphasise enough the importance of providing human services to people in new outer suburban developments. The human cost of social isolation cannot of course, be quantified. But the physical costs of the need to travel out of the immediate area for almost every service is excessive to both the public and private purse. The people most in need of those services often cannot afford the cost which is required in both time and money.

One of the most important issues of future planning lies in economic development. In my electorate, for reasons I have already covered, one of the most important issues is the provision of future employment opportunities even though there is currently no unemployment crisis in the area. Unfortunately, in some surrounding areas, this is not the case. But without careful planning there will certainly be a major unemployment problem in my electorate as more than a third of the population of Happy Valley is under the

age of 14 years. This fact has obvious implications for the provision of new services now, but for the moment I will discuss the implications this has for the future.

In the not too distant future these children will be adults seeking employment. For a variety of social and economic reasons it is vital that varied local employment opportunities be initiated soon. Naturally, State and federal Governments play an important role in assisting communities to adjust to changes in economic structure. Indeed, the Bannan Government has already achieved, and is continuing to achieve, a great deal in the area of training and retraining in order to encourage participation in an increasingly technological society.

Many of the projects and programs designed towards this aim proceed only with cooperation from various Government bodies and industry. For example, a program has been developed through the Department of Technical and Further Education which involves joint ventures between industries and TAFE colleges. This program is an example of this society's ability to adjust to change with minimal cost involved. This is achieved through cooperation and flexibility. The Bannan Government has undertaken a range of programs, projects and activities to assist industry and groups within the community to adjust to the new technological challenge. These initiatives obviously have relevance within local communities, but the community must help to identify groups that may have been overlooked so that programs can be adapted to meet their needs.

I am proud to say that the State Government has done much on a State-wide basis, particularly in the tourism and technology industries. However, it appears increasingly the case nationally and internationally that communities are moving towards semi-autonomous or creative employment groups centred around local government. The State Government is interested in promoting this trend in South Australia with the introduction of the Local Employment Development Program.

Local government and community bodies can contribute to improvement of local employment opportunities by identifying an employment base, training and other regional needs. There is great potential for future development of this type of scheme in my electorate, particularly in the areas of technology, tourism and the provision of human services. Councils in my area have already shown a keen interest in this line of thinking. To emphasise that fact, research into the development of local employment opportunities was recently undertaken by the Southern Region of Councils. The first stage has been a survey of the opinions and needs of commerce and industry located in the southern suburbs. The survey was funded by the Commonwealth Government in the form of CEP assistance, and I notice that the member for Davenport this afternoon disagrees with this program. The program was also funded with an RCDP grant. There was considerable State involvement in the allocation of funds. The councils themselves also funded the project.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: It is interesting that the member for Mitcham says it was a waste of funds to identify needs in the southern region for the encouragement of further jobs. I am sure that the people down south would be very interested to hear the member for Mitcham's interjection.

Mr Lewis: Self employment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee has already made his contribution.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra will shortly have the floor. In the meantime, the member for Fisher has the attention of the House.

Mr TYLER: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. From the survey the Southern Region of Councils hopes to develop a clear image of the types of companies which might be attracted to locate in the southern suburbs. I have no doubt that it includes the small business person that the member for Murray-Mallee interjected with earlier. I am hopeful that these new companies might be persuaded to relocate to areas such as Aberfoyle Park, Noarlunga and southern Marion council areas. This project is a major forerunner to what I hope will be an increase in local employment opportunities, which I hope will have the full support of the House except the member for Mitcham, who obviously does not agree.

An important part of the way we face the future relates to the ability of all sections of the community to work together to achieve a desirable result. The initiative I have just outlined is an important aspect of this ideal. Another is the provision of services in the community. The sensible approach of shared facilities, particularly the prospect of reducing infrastructure costs and of maximising available resources, is overwhelmingly obvious.

There are some outstanding examples of this in my electorate. In the field of education, there is a shared public and private primary school campus. There are also examples of campuses shared between various levels of education. My electorate office is in the middle of the Hub complex which, of course, includes a shopping centre, a number of professional services, sporting, recreational and library facilities shared between the Aberfoyle Park High School, Aberfoyle Hub Primary School, YMCA and the community. The Happy Valley council chambers are appropriately located here also. This is a marvellous concept, which will blossom even further as our community develops, giving access to the whole community.

In other areas, a Neighbourhood House is being built in cooperation with the local community, State and Local Government. It also includes a significant input from private enterprise in the area. A combined community and health centre is shortly to be constructed. The possibilities for this kind of enterprise are endless in developing areas such as my electorate. The flexibility of shared facilities is important from the point of view of financial cost. It is also important in bringing together people from all walks of life and of all ages.

I firmly believe that the Department of Environment and Planning's report about the population has implications not just because of the population increases but also for the changes that will occur in the proportions of particular age groups within the community. This has some relevance in considering the position of community services. I have already discussed the relative proportions of people aged between 0 to 14 years and those aged from 15 to 65 years and the implication this has for local employment and transport both now and in the future. This also has a bearing on the provision of other services such as education, child care, recreation and health facilities.

Another group to be affected in this way comprises people aged over 65 years. There is not a large proportion of aged people in my electorate at the moment, but this important group is steadily increasing. In the next five years the number of people aged over 65 years living in Fisher will increase by 45.2 per cent. This group has special but not necessarily unique needs. Ageing-in-place is becoming increasingly important and it is imperative that we make provision for

the needs of this group of people now. There is also a high growth rate in the number of retirement villages in the area.

Mrs Appleby: Commercial retirement villages.

Mr TYLER: Yes, as the member for Hayward has pointed out, they are commercial retirement villages—free enterprise at work. State and local governments are already working towards providing services for aged people, to encourage this group to participate in community activities and to use their wisdom and experience for the benefit of the local community. For instance, the Happy Valley senior citizens club has been very active in the Happy Valley area for some time. The years of active participation will be rewarded later this year when its own clubrooms are opened for business. That is another CEP funded project that the member for Davenport does not want to see being used for community facilities.

In developing policies aimed at a particular group, planning is important. As in other areas, the first stage is an information gathering exercise followed by a cooperative effort between all sectors of the community to reconcile State and Federal sponsored schemes with council and local group priorities. This effort can be extremely effective in producing the required services and also in reducing operating costs, once again making our resources stretch further.

In facing up to financial restraints it is too simple to say that spending must be cut. Indeed, a more appropriate word would be 'savings'. A more important skill in economic management is in spending limited resources to ensure that all sections of the community, indeed every person in the community, has equal access to the resources that are available. The Bannon Government has shown, and will continue to show, its ability to do this. I will be doing my part to ensure that the needs of the people of Fisher are well known.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Before addressing the House in reply to the Governor's speech, I wish to record my condolences to the families of the late Albert Redvers George Hawke and Charles Albert Harrison, two former colleagues and members of this Parliament. I did not know the former personally, but Charlie Harrison was, as has already been described by other members, a very personable and amiable and useful member of this Parliament.

I want to refer to a couple of matters that I was unable to raise during the first session of this Parliament earlier this year at which time the Address in Reply debate was confined to about half a dozen speakers. Firstly, I express disappointment at losing a fearless statesman and legislator in Dean Brown; an experienced, hard working electorate member and great mate of mine in John Mathwin; a dedicated and diligent young fighter in Scott Ashenden; and a professional media lobbyist and Party strategist in Mike Wilson, all of whom were defeated in their respective electorates by a handful of votes at the last State election. Secondly, as we are seldom granted the opportunity to record the services of members who have retired in their own right, I further place on record my recognition of Ren DeGaris, Allan Rodda, Arthur Whyte, Jack Wright and George Whitten, irrespective of their political persuasion and acknowledging that they gave a fair amount of their lives and a tremendous amount of effort to this Parliament and the institution of State politics while they were representing their respective districts in the two Houses.

There is not the time nowadays to address each of the items raised in the Governor's speech, but I refer to His Excellency's emphasis on the importance of the national economy, as follows:

My Government recognises the difficult decisions facing the Commonwealth in managing the national economy.

It is true that, irrespective of which State one lives in, the States are distributors of national assistance from general taxation revenue to the community and that we are all therefore dependent on the health of the national economy. It is in that vein that I wish to address the House this evening. I do so for obvious reasons, in particular in relation to agriculture or the rural community as a whole and, further, in trying to impress on members of this Chamber, irrespective of their political persuasion, the importance of the rural sector to the economy not only of Australia but also more specifically of our own State.

The future of agriculture will depend on a number of factors, not the least of which is the need for innovation and excellence—crucial requirements for future success in that field and indeed in any other Australian business. Agriculture and business share many common problems. Central domestic issues affecting agriculture are interest rates, the rate of inflation, the wage fixing system and, generally, the uncompetitive nature of the Australian economy. Certainly, businessmen around Australia share that view. The position of agriculture at present is extremely critical. The problems facing rural industries result primarily from a combination of corrupt and depressed world markets and high Australian costs in comparison with those of our trading partners. This has led to farm costs increasing more rapidly than have commodity prices and as a result net incomes have decreased alarmingly.

Perhaps the most alarming aspect is an 18 per cent unemployment rate in rural areas compared with an 8 per cent rate nationally. This indicates clearly that farmers' capital stock is running down. Important maintenance and improvement programs are being deferred, and jobs are simply not available as a result. Many farmers have put up the shutters in response to low prices, high costs, low confidence and low morale. In my view, they will not go out of business, but their potential contribution to the economy is being muzzled and discouraged.

Agricultural issues fall broadly into two categories. Firstly, there are those related to export prices, market penetration and marketing generally; that is the price side of the equation. Secondly, there are those which are related to the costs of production and transport handling—the cost side of the equation. To be quite frank, there is little anyone can do in the short term to bring about a sustained rise in the prices we receive from most of our agricultural commodities.

The European community and the United States will continue to subsidise production and export of their rural products. Those tactics destabilise world markets and reduce prices. As well, world production of staple agricultural products will continue to rise, fuelled by subsidies and by development in third world countries and, more latterly, in the United States by its move to further subsidise wheat sales to our traditional and vital customers in China and Russia. The combination of export subsidies and over supply creates a generally depressing price outlook for most commodities.

Clearly, the reduction of costs is the best immediate option to restore greater viability in Australia's farm sector. We require a more competitive Australian economy to allow us to compete more effectively in those world markets. We are not alone in seeking a more competitive domestic economic structure. The issues which affect us affect every businessman in Australia and, indirectly, the living standards of all Australians.

In the Australian economy itself the crunch time has arrived. We have the situation now where, as a nation, we

are spending over a billion dollars per month more than we earn from exports, and that has led to an unacceptable level of national debt. The figure was over \$80 billion at the end of June 1986, and the interest payments alone are already the third highest item of expenditure in the Federal budget—more than education and, in fact, more than defence. Australia's level of inflation and interest rates are two to three times higher than those of the nations with which we are attempting to compete, yet we are burdened by another 2.3 per cent national wage increase, a threatened 3 per cent productivity increase and additional taxes on the business sector.

That, quite simply, is a recipe for disaster. The ingredients already are destroying by the day farm businesses and other small businesses. Whilst this situation applies nationally, as we all understand it does, it does back here at home, where it is all important to the welfare of our own State constituents. The national accounts for the March quarter showed that the total GDP fell for the second successive three month period, and an even worse situation emerged at the mid-yearly mark. The economy has contracted sharply throughout this calendar year under the weight of those high interest rates.

Investment has failed to pick up as a result, and it will not pick up until businessmen have greater confidence in Australia's economic and industrial directions. One may ask how anyone can have confidence to invest when interest rates are up to 20 per cent and above, inflation is at 9.2 per cent, and the new capital gains and fringe benefit taxes create confusion and act as a deterrent to risk taking and to initiative. Wage costs are increasing twice as fast as the OECD average.

Hourly earnings in the OECD are expected to rise 4.25 per cent in 1986 and 3.75 per cent in 1987. The OECD forecast for Australia is 8.5 per cent and 8 per cent respectively. It is easy and of some comfort to organisations acting on behalf of the business sector to say to Governments around Australia 'We told you so.' However, the NFF was the first to appreciate the dimensions of Australia's economic problems, because the people whom they represent are the leading edge of the economy. Farmers export 70 per cent of their production. They are the first to feel the chill winds of Australia's uncompetitive position and, as the State most dependent on rural export income, we in South Australia are indeed, therefore the hardest hit. They have been forced to adapt and rationalise. The general prospect now faces the whole community.

The facts are these. Firstly, Australia must be a trading nation, because our domestic market is not large enough to service a broad range of manufacturing industry. Secondly, with a population of 16 million, Australia does not have the tax base to subsidise production or exports or to maintain high levels of production as are occurring at the moment in the United States, for example.

We must therefore be competitive by world standards in the products that we produce and export. We are not competitive at the moment; that is clear from our monthly trade figures. The only possible conclusion is that fundamental changes are required in Australia's economic and industrial directions. For those changes to occur, there must be major shifts in community attitudes and expectations. Quite simply, Australians have become accustomed to a standard of living to which we are no longer entitled by our productivity.

It is quite ridiculous for Mr Keating to say that our domestic economy is fine and that all our problems are caused by reduced world prices for the commodities that

we export. It is quite clear that investment has not picked up, despite our currency devaluation in 1985. The issues of interest rates, inflation and wage costs all are functions of our domestic policy and are a root cause of Australia's reduced ability to compete on world markets.

One might then ask what needs to be done. Commodity specific policies will count for little if the overall economic environment is not favourable. Agriculture's performance is largely dictated by the broader macro-economic factors. This issue was cited by the member for Murray-Mallee this evening. Solutions require a change to the inward looking, rigid attitudes developed over 40 years of living off an expanding export sector. However, agriculture also has its role to play.

Farmers must become better marketers to produce for the marketplace produce instead of producing just greater bulk volume, and maximising production is a tendency in the rural sectors of our community when times are tough. The first thing that a farmer does is plant more acres or put more stock on the grazing situation, whether it be agricultural or pastoral and for the dairyman to bring in a few more cows to milk and into his herd so as to enhance his bulk production.

Some farmers, irrespective of their efforts, will leave the industry and their exodus has to be facilitated. But, for its part, Government must address the cost side of the equation. The Government must stop propping up the dollar with tight monetary policy and high interest rates. Australia simply cannot afford the current level of interest rates that we are all incurring. If the dollar was allowed to float cleanly, major banks advise here in South Australia that interest rates could fall by up to 6 per cent. It is agreed that, the dollar probably would devalue further in the first instance. To prevent the additional costs of imports being transferred to a new bout of inflation via wage indexation, there should be another 12 months wage freeze. The productivity case should be dismissed and not just deferred as is threatened by our federal colleagues in government at the moment. It is no good to them and it is no good to us.

If this occurred there would undoubtedly be greater confidence in the Australian dollar and any devaluation would therefore be shortlived. There must be greater flexibility in the wage fixing system so that wage increases are more directly related to the capacity of industries and employers to pay. The principle of comparative wage justice is well and truly outdated and destructive to the economy of Australia and, indeed, to the economy of our own State of South Australia. Government expenditure must be reduced dramatically; that means expenditure by the States and local government as well as by the Federal Government.

There must be changes to the tax system to encourage incentive and not further attacks on the productive sectors of the economy. The Government must recognise that people need profit encouragement to actually go into the business of creating growth and jobs. Any other strategy such as artificially created jobs as in the Government funded employment schemes are doomed. They lead to higher taxation and perpetrate the dole syndrome. Some, if not most, fail to gainfully produce value for the public dollar spent, either at regional or community level. These schemes have been widely described as examples of gross waste. The Federal Government now appears to recognise the need to relax interest rates and to curtail Government spending. But, because of its special relationship with the trade union movement, it is much more reluctant to do anything about national wage increases, the productivity claim or wage indexation itself.

At the State level, irrespective of the political persuasion, the example of restraint needs also to be demonstrated in Government. It may sound a little biased back home in South Australia but, indeed, it is true. Under the Australian Labor Party it is more difficult to achieve because of the Trades Hall dominance over the State's budget, the appointment of public employees and administrative strategies. The Premier may dress and talk like a conservative but, as we all know, he is a socialist to the core, and, like his Government and federal colleagues, he is a victim of that trade union movement.

Unfortunately, we have a current Minister of Agriculture who is out of his depth. He is the weakest link in the watch chain of Government Ministers and he provides no confidence at all to our rural sector. In my view, he never was suited to the job; he is a lightweight. Neither he nor the rest of Australia's farmers receive much guidance from the man at the top, namely John Kerin.

In the short time that I have left, I want to refer to a few issues that surround the Minister for Primary Industry at the federal level and to refer particularly to the rural economic policy statement that he made earlier this year. It contains some useful initiatives, but it failed to come to grips with the key policy issues affecting agriculture's ability to compete on the world markets—interest rates, the level of inflation, cost of wages and Australia's general cost structure. The statement is already out of date, but in Mr Kerin's speech to the Parliament on 15 April, he said:

Success means minimal inflation, strong economic growth and international competitiveness. We had substantial success on all of these fronts.

That statement did not then and does not now stand up. It was a false claim which was grossly misleading and, in my view, it constituted sheer political propaganda. Mr Kerin then said:

I want to state clearly here and now that, given the demonstrable success of the Government's—

this is the Labor Government in Canberra—

wages policy, we are not about to change our basic direction.

Then came the oddly contrasting statement by the Treasurer that Australia is in danger of turning into a banana republic, Mr Willis's approaches to the Australian Council of Trade Unions for changes in the accord, and the need perceived by the Prime Minister to make a major statement on the economy. Remember that in the Australian Government Mr Kerin is the man on whom at the moment every farmer ultimately relies for sound political direction.

Then came the Prime Minister's economic statement. I do not have time in this address to go through the details of that statement, but he explained the need for Australia to be competitive internationally. He explained that we are not competitive now and that we all have to tighten our belts, but he is yet to specify severe cuts in Government spending or to identify real taxation reform for those in the national productive arena. Those sorts of positive signals would do a lot to restore the investor confidence and would prompt growth without fuelling inflation. Labor cost restraint would allow strong growth. A switch in demand towards domestic production, lower interest rates and less fear of investment would create stronger and more durable employment growth. At the same time it would correct the balance of payments problem that is so often referred to by our federal coalition colleagues, and rightly so.

The Prime Minister should explain that past productivity growth cannot be redistributed without undoing the economic and employment benefits that it has already created. Those benefits should be preserved and enhanced, not reduced. Further productivity growth should go towards

improving job prospects for those without jobs, rather than to increase real incomes for those already in work for as long as unemployment remains a major problem.

I now turn to the fringe benefits tax. That is really an issue in its own right. Clearly, there is not time to address that iniquitous tax that has been thrust upon us. We have heard very little complaint from the Premier or from his Ministers to their federal colleagues about introducing that new form of taxation. We know about the business lobby and about the infuriated community at large in relation to that tax.

One thing is clear from the rural economic policy statement and subsequent events and that is that the Government will not change its fundamental direction unless business as a whole becomes better organised. Mr Kerin said quite clearly that the Government would not act on the advice of any one sector. The National Farmers Federation has probably gone as far as it can in prompting changes to national economic policy in the short term, and it has encouraged concerted action by the entire business community. The arguments are logical, and they are being increasingly understood by the electorate at large. What is needed is the political will; the challenge is to generate it.

In a political sense, the influence of the trade union movement needs to be countered. It is up to the business community to provide such a balance. The present deteriorating position would not have occurred, nor would the national farm lobby have been necessary, if Governments at federal level, backed up by all of the respective State Governments, had been doing their job.

The farm lobby exercise has shown all Australians how resilient the rural sector is. In many cases individual donations to the fund have been made by borrowing on overdraft. The farmer knows only too well that in all campaigns one needs to be well organised and therefore well funded. That is precisely why the NFF started the Australian farmers fighting fund, with great success to date, because the issues hitting farmers hit all Australians. More and more people believe positive action is now required. For the record, the issues identified to be pursued with the fighting fund are: industrially dangerous levels of union power; the need for a more flexible wage fixing system; the level of interest rates and inflation; the need for a tax system to provide rewards for incentive and for risk taking and the need to eliminate taxes and other Government charges on goods the farm and business sector use in the course of their production.

Many businesses are reluctant to take action on such matters themselves, as they are vulnerable to victimisation by unions or other conservative groups with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. It is much harder to victimise farmers in the same way. It is almost impossible in this country to shut down agriculture, as we saw in the early 1970s in the infamous Dunford issue on Kangaroo Island and subsequently in the live sheep issue where the farmers said 'enough is enough' and then took over the loading of those live sheep, while striking union labour stood well back.

In conclusion, it is clear that it is time for some fundamental changes in Australia's economic and industrial directions. It is accepted that rationalisation will continue to occur in agriculture and that, as an industry, we have to continue to improve our productivity and our marketing skills. That is the farmers' job, and the farmers recognise the responsibilities of their own job. However, for their part Governments must accept that Australia's cost structure is not competitive by world standards and there needs to be greater concentration on fiscal and wages policies. Monetary policy must be relaxed and, accordingly, so must interest

rates fall. The Australian economy must become more competitive: this means that everyone has to tighten their belt. There have to be adjustments in the community's expectations and, while the Prime Minister must provide leadership at the national level, we at the State level need to insist on similar strategies from our Government also. Our Government could well begin by cutting down its own departmental costs, many of which are incurred under the guise of the age old and protected term 'the Public Service'.

It is easy for a member of Parliament to criticise what is occurring around him. It is not very often that we have the opportunity or inclination to identify some alternatives. In the three or four minutes I have left I will address some positive alternatives to the problems of those people who are victims of United States marketing strategies in the wheat industry. We have a very valuable wheat belt in this State not just in the Mallee region and in the upper South-East but more specifically on Eyre Peninsula as well as in the mid-northern region. These are areas of suitable soil types and fair rainfall where we produce a lot of grain.

Our State has become dependent upon the domestic and export income derived from that produce. However, we are now in trouble. I do not believe that it is appropriate for the department to put all its eggs in the one basket. I do not think that it is appropriate for farmers to do that, either. Rather than the usual case of farmers planting more acres to produce more wheat to get themselves out of trouble, there ought to be more diversification. I will cite two or three areas in which farmers should positively move and in which the Agriculture Department should take up the challenge. His Excellency's speech last Thursday, to research—

Mr Ferguson: You'd ask them to cut their budget.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: This can be done without increasing their budget; they can cut down on the administrative democracy within the black stump and apply people in the field where it is most appropriate and productive. There is no question that we need further research. We need specialist and tested varieties in grain legumes, for example. There is a market in South-East Asia, China and India, and people are screaming out for specific varieties of peas, beans, chick peas and lentils which are alternative crops—and not just in small quantities.

The market is there, but our people are not ready to meet it because we are not planting the right varieties in enough cases. We have but one research officer in the pea area and one research officer in the bean area, which is really a token of attention to that all important diversification program. A little encouragement and guidance should be forthcoming from the Department of Agriculture to orientate people farming in the wetter areas of the agricultural zone towards hay growing, instead of reaping the barley crop and over-supplying in that area. Why not cut it for hay? The market for hay in China and Japan is enormous, where they are substantially increasing livestock numbers but do not have the broad acres to graze and therefore rely on concentrated lot feeding. The area of biotechnology must also be examined. For goodness sake, improving livestock genes and having our department assist are of paramount importance.

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

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): In supporting the motion before the House, I wish to add my congratulations to His Excellency the Governor on his comprehensive speech outlining the future directions that the Government will take in both economic and social areas. As one of the members who did not participate in the Address in Reply in the first session of this Parliament, I think that it is appropriate that

I briefly discuss the outcome of the last State election and the way in which that outcome relates to my electorate. I obtained a two-Party preferred vote at the recent State election of 66.1 per cent, with a swing of 5.8 per cent to Labor on first Party preferences and 5.1 per cent on the two Party vote.

Mawson is now the tenth safest Labor seat, excluding the Independent Labor seats, that is held by the Australian Labor Party in this Parliament. I am very proud indeed to be the Labor member for the seat of Mawson. In looking at the results of the last State election, I would like particularly to thank ALP members and supporters in my electorate who worked so tirelessly for a Labor victory. Most importantly, I also wish to publicly thank the approximately 11 500 people who voted for me as the ALP member in Mawson.

I would like to look at my electorate in terms of the redefined boundaries, which now include the suburbs of Morphett Vale, Hackham, Hackham East and a large part of the suburbs of Hackham West and Reynella. My electorate also includes the newly developing areas of Morphett Vale East, which is now called Woodcroft, and I want to have a specific look at the electorate in terms of some of the breakdown of the profile. My electorate is located within the council area of Noarlunga, and I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table showing the projected population growth in that council area from 1986 to 2001.

Leave granted.

PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH

	Noarlunga	Happy Valley	Willunga
1986	74 099	29 474	8 820
1991	89 679	34 886	14 199
1996	106 125	36 741	19 000
2001	119 275	37 968	24 796

Ms LENEHAN: From this table it can be seen that the projected increase in population in the southern council area of Noarlunga indicates an enormous increase in population. In fact, by the year 2001, it is projected that the population will be approximately 119 275. In looking at the profile of my electorate I have, since being elected to this Parliament, sought the help of the research section of the Parliamentary Library in building up a profile specifically of the new parts, namely Hackham, Hackham East and Hackham West. Also, I have looked at things that my colleague the member for Fisher has done in a previous speech in this House this evening, that is, an age profile, I have also been able to obtain some statistics from postcodes in the Hackham and Hackham West area which look at the number of recipients of pensions and benefits. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table which shows the number of pensioners and beneficiaries in the Hackham and Hackham West area under postcode 5163.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Is the matter statistical?

Ms LENEHAN: Yes.

Leave granted.

PENSIONERS AND BENEFICIARIES
Postcode 5163—Hackham, Hackham West

30 June Figures	1984	1985
Age Pension	411	457
Invalid Pension	163	179
Wife/Spouse Carer's Pension	96	97
Rehabilitation Allowance	4	1
Widows (class A) Pension	129	118
Widows (class B) Pension	41	48
Supporting Parents Benefit	211	244
Unemployment Benefit	416	361
Sickness Benefit	32	48
Special Benefit	9	13
Family Allowance—Families	2 097	2 136
—Children	4 055	4 155
Handicapped Child's Allowance	58	65

Ms LENEHAN: It can be seen from this profile which I have been able to establish with the help of the Parliamentary Library staff that I now represent an electorate that has a range of very specific problems—problems which deal with the day-to-day issues of housing, education, the provision of children's services, transport and a whole range of other matters relating to a fast growing outer metropolitan electorate. I am sure that my colleagues from the northern suburbs would probably have similar electorate profiles.

However, while speaking about my electorate, I would like very briefly to pick up one of the issues which the member for Fisher has raised and which relates to his electorate as well, namely, the problem of the provision of services and care for the aged in the southern community. As the member for Fisher has pointed out, we have a proliferation of privately run and funded retirement villages. However, we have not been successful in achieving a similar growth in the support and care for the aged, and I think specifically of the provision of nursing home beds.

It is of concern to me as a local member in the southern community that we have only 41 deficit funded nursing home beds for the whole southern area from the escarpment at O'Halloran Hill right through to Victor Harbor. Those nursing home beds are in fact provided at the Perry Park Nursing Home, and that is to service virtually a third of the population of Adelaide. As one of the local members who is very interested in this whole issue of the provision of services for the aged I have made continuous representations to both the State Minister of Health and more importantly the Federal Minister for Health to see whether something could be done about changing the CURB regions. For members not familiar with this term, CURB regions refers to regions drawn up many years ago to look at the population distribution and the provision of nursing home beds.

I put to the House that those CURB regions are very much out of date. In fact, if one looks at a distribution of nursing home beds, and specifically at deficit funded nursing home beds, that is, nursing home beds that can be afforded by the people I represent, people who, in the main receive pensions and benefits and who are not in receipt of large superannuation benefits but are on modest incomes, it becomes apparent that the majority of nursing home beds in this city are provided in a clustered area in the old established suburbs, represented by the members for Morphett, Mitcham, Unley, and to a lesser extent some of my colleagues in the remaining southern area, north of O'Halloran Hill. I will continue to fight for the provision of adequate facilities for the aged in my area.

It would be very remiss of me to not highlight the tremendous work done by community service providers in the southern area, specifically through the Noarlunga Community Services Forum, which has put forward many submissions

on a range of issues relating to the provision of services and facilities for the local southern community. I also take this opportunity to congratulate and thank the many Government employees working in Government instrumentalities in the southern area, and I am thinking specifically of instrumentalities such as the Housing Trust, the Department for Community Welfare and indeed other voluntary and non-government agencies which work together as a team. People who come to the southern area comment about the way in which we work as a group, as a team and about the community spirit that exists in the southern area. I am proud to be an integral part of that community and that community spirit.

I want to devote the substantial part of my Address in Reply speech tonight to the issue of child abuse. I want to draw to the attention of the House and the community the insidious and increasing problem of child abuse, and in particular child sexual abuse. While the topic of child sexual abuse has been publicly discussed a lot in the media recently, I wonder whether members of this Parliament, and indeed members of the wider community, realise how widespread and how socially, emotionally and psychologically damaging child sexual abuse is to the victim, to his or her family, and to the community as a whole.

Child sexual abuse can be defined as being any sexual contact imposed on a child by a person in a position of trust, authority or power. Research indicates that one in three girls and one in four boys will be sexually abused at some time during their childhood. Some 75 per cent of these children are likely to be abused at or before the age of 10 years. It becomes more apparent why that is so when one looks at what happens in relation to the legal response to child sexual abuse, and I shall do so a little later. Ninety-seven per cent of child sexual abusers are men, and about three-quarters of those are men in the child's family. That is absolutely horrifying. I do not know whether the male members of this Parliament feel as outraged as I do.

It is a tremendous indictment on our community that men—fathers, uncles and relations—are sexually abusing their own children or relatives. That is why I have chosen tonight to speak about child sexual abuse. Let us consider where such abusers come from. Child sexual abusers come from all classes and professions—from the very rich families and the very poor families. The thing that most child sexual abusers have in common is access to children in a relationship where they are expected to behave as caring, responsible adults. But what do they do? They behave in exactly the opposite manner. They betray the trust that not only the community has given them but also in many cases that the child has given them.

At a recent national conference on child abuse many problems relating to the reporting and judicial response to this problem at both the Family Court level and the criminal court level were outlined. I would like to refer to some of the problems, because I believe that this is an issue to which members must address themselves, whether they want to or not. I am sure that those members of Parliament who are concerned will support me. A number of speakers at the conference emphasised that the Family Court in many cases operates against the best interests of the child. For example, two speakers alleged that the Family Court denies the child the right to be heard on matters that are very personal to the child. The authors stated that the right, although enshrined in both common law and legislation, in fact did not actually exist. The child is not party to the court proceedings.

The child's wishes and feelings regarding guardianship or custody are usually not directly canvassed by the court, and

the child's advocate does not necessarily advance what the child wants but what, in his or her view, is in the best interests of the child. That is important. It may not always necessarily be the case. In fact, it is the best interests of the parents and lawyers that are promoted by the existing statutory methods adopted by the Family Court, two of the speakers claimed.

In looking particularly at child sexual abuse, the area addressed by the conference, Ms Julie Stewart from the Women's Legal Response Centre in Sydney maintained that the Family Court should not even consider cases of incest because that is a criminal offence and should be dealt with by the criminal law. However, she went on to claim:

... incest is not treated as a serious crime. Police effectively condone incestuous child sexual assault by not providing appropriate support for child witnesses, and by their reluctance to charge offenders. Police perform the function of judge and jury and prejudice the outcomes; they make no apology for this exercise in discretion, or their failure to improve methods of investigation and collection of evidence, nor their willingness to 'put those little children through the court process'.

It has been my experience, working with the local police in my area, that that is not the situation in South Australia.

However, I am addressing myself tonight not just to the situation in South Australia but to the situation of child sexual abuse throughout the country. Ultimately, the Family Court is approached for a remedy for incestuous child abuse. I would just like to refer to the South Australian situation where in the Family Court, up to February 1986, no man had been refused access to his children because he had sexually abused them. Some fathers had, however, been convicted in the criminal court of incest but were still allowed access to their children.

That seems to me to be absolutely abhorrent—that somebody who is convicted in the criminal court of child sexual abuse is then allowed access to the same children he has sexually abused. I am going to get on to the point of rehabilitation for offenders, because it is my understanding that there is very little or no rehabilitation in this State for child sexual abuse offenders.

It is my understanding that the Family Court is supposed to act in the child's best interests. However, it is clear from some of the things which judges say that they just refuse to acknowledge that sexual abuse takes place, and continued contact with the abuser is granted. Of course, this has an extremely detrimental effect on children—the fact that they continue to allow the abuser to have access. I am going to highlight some of the other problems that occur legally.

I shall take the House through what happens when a person reports child sexual abuse. The things that may be of importance to highlight are the symptoms which young children—and I am talking here of children under 10 but specifically of children under six—actually indicate, because it is very difficult for parents often to ascertain whether their child has been or is being sexually abused.

One of the lists of symptoms which have been compiled states the following: things like bed wetting, nightmares, insomnia, nail biting, obsessions, phobias, unusual knowledge about sex; things like very frequent masturbation and complaints of sore genitals. Any one of those things on their own in many cases will not indicate that a child is being sexually abused.

However, some of the parents who have come to me in a very distressed state about child sexual abuse have blamed themselves and have said, 'I should have known; I should have been able to detect that my child was being sexually abused.' My response to these people is that they should not feel guilty because it is a very difficult thing to be able to identify, particularly in one's own child. I think one of the things we have to do as a community is try to remove

the guilt from the parent who obviously feels that in some way they should have picked this up earlier than they did.

Having looked at the symptoms, what happens then? If the child reports it and the parent or the adult in authority takes up that report on behalf of the child, then there is a range of support services available in South Australia. For example, the Department of Community Welfare has legal responsibility in connection with child sexual abuse in this State and if a professional person discovers that a child is being sexually abused they have to report the abuse to the DCW.

This is something which has to be done. The DCW has laid down procedures for dealing with child sexual abuse. I will not go through those procedures, but suffice it to say that, once the procedures have been carried out and once the police have been involved, the Adelaide Children's Hospital also provides services, as do the police through the Rape Inquiry Unit. The child is then, of course, subjected to a range of interrogations, if you like, or court proceedings, where they have to give evidence. Let us have a look at what happens in the criminal court.

This is where the abuser can be tried for the criminal offence of assault or gross indecency. Experiences in this court are particularly difficult for children. If they are under 10 years of age (the point I raised earlier) the law requires corroborative evidence: eye witnesses, photographs or strong medical evidence. I do not have to explain to the House, but most child sexual abusers do not abuse children in front of an audience and are very cunning in terms of providing any sort of corroborative evidence, so what happens is that the child's evidence is totally discounted and the case, in 99 per cent of cases, does not even get to the criminal court. So, no conviction can occur.

I had a woman in my electorate office yesterday whose husband scoffed, joked and laughed about the fact that the wife could do nothing about proceeding with any kind of criminal charge because, as he said, the courts would not take any notice of the evidence of a four year old. That is what we are up against as a Parliament. That is what we are up against as a community. Before I go on to what can be done, I want to talk a little about the effects that can occur in many cases on the mother.

The mother of a sexually abused child is left to cope with the child's disturbed, aggressive or regressive behaviour and to clean up the mess that the abuser has left behind. Counsellors observe an emotional, upset and angry mother arguing with the father, who denies the allegations. The mother is quite understandably upset, but the father's persuasive denials in many cases seem to be believed. I ask the question: is it that they seem to be believed because we as a community find this behaviour so abhorrent and repugnant that we cannot face up to the fact that it is in our community and that we should therefore do something about it? I am going to be one member of this Parliament who does do something about it and I would like to put to the House some of the things that can be done about child sexual abuse in our community.

First, we can look at educating the community about the problem, about the severity of the effects of the problem on the community as a whole, on the child in particular and on the child's immediate family. Secondly, we can implement educational programs aimed at teaching children what is called protective behaviour where they are able to use their own initiatives in helping to prevent the sort of sexual assault that is perpetrated on them.

At the national conference on child sexual abuse several strategies were outlined that are being carried out in other States. Two of those related to educational programs. I

would like to share one of those programs with the Parliament.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: It is not necessarily strangers. By way of interjection, the 'stranger danger' program was mentioned. I quoted figures earlier. With 97 per cent of child sexual abusers three-quarters are men in the child's family. We are not talking about somebody in a raincoat who sexually abuses a child on its way to school. That happens, but it is not the majority of cases. One of the things we have to do is teach our children how to develop protective behaviour themselves.

One of those programs is called a child assault prevention program and it is aimed at preschool and primary school children and emphasises that children have the right to be safe, strong and free. I am sure there would not be a member of this Parliament or this community who would question a child's right to be safe, strong and free and that they need to learn skills to achieve this. I will not go into details of that program but would like to share with members another program on adopting protective behaviour where teachers, school counsellors, community health workers, police, doctors, clergy and representatives of parents groups have been trained in the techniques of the program which they implement in a variety of ways. This protective behaviour program I understand is being implemented and introduced into South Australian schools and communities. I congratulate the people involved in doing that.

One of the things I would like to say (as well as the educational side, which must be two pronged—aimed at the child and aimed at the wider community) is that we have to do something as a Parliament and a Government to look at streamlining the procedures through which young children have to go. The initial interview is crucial because it is at this time that the events are fresh in the child's memory. Since the nature of the offence is such that there are rarely any eyewitnesses to the event in question, the strength of the prosecution for the child's sexual assault lies chiefly in the evidence of the child victim.

I suggest (and this is suggested in the paper) that a video record of the interview also would be in line with the submission to the New South Wales Child Sexual Assault

Task Force. I think that we will have to move towards video-taping the child's initial evidence in order that the child does not have to relive that trauma time and time again.

In relation to offenders' rehabilitation, it seems that we have to look, as I have said in this Parliament before, at this subject in relation to the problem of rape. It is of no benefit to convict people and send them to gaol, or in some way punish them, without conducting a comprehensive and thorough rehabilitation program for offenders, otherwise, as shown by significant documented evidence, they reoffend. In the time that I have left I will refer to what is happening specifically in South Australia. First, the Minister of Health has established the Child Sexual Abuse Task Force and I understand that that task force will soon make its report to the Minister, which report will be made public. I place on record my deep admiration for the Minister of Health for the way that he has supported every move towards doing something about child sexual abuse. I congratulate him also on the establishment of this task force.

A second body that has been established in the community is an organisation called PACSA—People Against Child Sexual Abuse—which consists mostly of parents of sexually abused children. They offer support for other parents and aim to educate the community about child sexual abuse and to lobby for changes to the law. I am proud to say that I am a member of that group and I have attended a number of meetings.

On a local level, the Noarlunga Community Services Forum recently made a submission to the Child Sexual Abuse Task Force. I was a member of that forum and I was in fact one of the people who presented this submission to the task force. In response to the ever increasing number of child sexual abuse reports in the Noarlunga region, in the submission we call on the Government to establish a community based Sexual Assault Referral Clinic in the Noarlunga area. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table which actually shows the Child Protection Panel statistics for the period from 1 July 1984 to 30 June 1985 and for the same period in the following year.

Leave granted.

Table 1—Child Protection Panel Statistics for Period 1.7.84 to 30.6.85 and for the Period 1.7.85 to 30.6.86

Office	Age (yrs)		Physical		Sexual		Emotional		At Risk		Neglect		Total	
	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86
Noarlunga	0- 5	—	36	—	17	—	5	—	10	—	9	—	—	—
	6-10	—	20	—	21	—	6	—	3	—	5	—	—	—
	11-15	—	16	—	30	—	2	—	3	—	1	—	—	—
	16+	—	3	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			(50)	(75)	(44)	(73)	(6)	(13)	(20)	(16)	—	(15)	(118)	(192)
Marion	0- 5	—	18	—	19	—	4	—	14	—	4	—	—	—
	6-10	—	13	—	9	—	2	—	2	—	3	—	—	—
	11-15	—	13	—	7	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	16+	—	4	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			(37)	(48)	(19)	(36)	(2)	(8)	(11)	(16)	(2)	(7)	(71)	(115)
Mitcham	0- 5	—	8	—	3	—	—	—	4	—	3	—	—	—
	6-10	—	5	—	3	—	1	—	3	—	1	—	—	—
	11-15	—	5	—	1	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	—	—
	16+	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			(11)	(18)	(2)	(8)	—	(2)	(4)	(10)	(1)	(4)	(18)	(42)
Glenelg	0- 5	—	2	—	3	—	1	—	3	—	2	—	—	—
	6-10	—	4	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
	11-15	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	16+	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			(8)	(8)	(4)	(6)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(18)	(21)

Table 1—Child Protection Panel Statistics for Period 1.7.84 to 30.6.85 and for the Period 1.7.85 to 30.6.86

Office	Age (yrs)		Physical		Sexual		Emotional		At Risk		Neglect		Total	
	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86	84.85	85.86
Goodwood	0- 5	—	5	—	2	—	1	—	5	—	1	—	—	—
	6-10	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
	11-15	—	3	—	5	—	1	—	1	—	2	—	—	—
	16+	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			(5)	(10)	(4)	(9)	—	(2)	(2)	(6)	(1)	(4)	(12)	(31)

Ms LENEHAN: In conclusion, I congratulate members of my local community on the way that they have responded to this issue, which I believe is an important one which this Parliament will address in the very near future because, if we intend to do something about bringing to justice people who are sexually abusing children, we will have to make changes to the legal system, to educate the community and to give support to these children and their families. Child sexual abuse has been described as an epidemic of monumental proportions: what a terrible indictment on a supposed civilised society.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Before referring tonight to the text of my speech, I take this opportunity to express my condolences to the families of Mr Albert Hawke and Mr Charles Harrison, both of whom the Governor noted in his address to the Parliament last Thursday had passed away during the past year.

In opening my remarks I refer specifically to the address made by the Governor when he opened the Parliament last Thursday. Those parts of the speech that were written by the Premier for the Governor left me with a feeling of great anxiety. It was a speech of considerable gloom and apprehension from a Government that does not know what the future holds for it. The speech was obviously written by a Premier and Treasurer who has great concerns and fears for the economic future of this State, as well he might have. It was a speech written by a man who, with all the goodwill in the world, will never be able to improve the economy of this State as long as he allows himself to remain subservient to Bob Hawke and the militant trade union bosses who frequent Trades Hall and demand ever-increasing rises in wages.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Honourable members opposite scoff, but they know what I have said is right and they know they support the trade union movement and those militant bosses who are forever asking for more and more wage rises. Honourable members opposite know that the country is in diabolical strife because we can no longer afford the cost of living the trade union movement has imposed upon us. This country is being financially ruined by Labor and by an element within the trade union movement which unfortunately happens to be at the top of the trade union movement.

Under Federal and State Labor the bankruptcies in this country, particularly in South Australia, have reached the highest point since the last depression. If that is not an indictment of the Labor administration at Federal and State levels, I do not know what other evidence this Parliament needs. Bankruptcies in South Australia are now occurring at the rate of three a day. Figures obtained from the Official Receiver's office show that 520 people were declared bankrupt in South Australia in the first six months of this year; that is 170 or 50 per cent more than the numbers in the first half of 1985. At this rate we will have more than 1 000 bankruptcies in South Australia in our Jubilee year alone.

I ask members to dwell on that figure, which would be the highest for more than 50 years. That is as many bankruptcies as occurred at the height of the Great Depression—

let that sink in. I believe this demonstrates the depth of the economic recession brought about by Labor's high tax and high interest rate policies. We have to live with that fact as long as a Labor Government stays in office. It has to be borne in mind that about one-third of bankruptcies occur in small business. Common reasons given for the difficulties of businesses in trouble are: devaluation of the dollar, high interest rates and rising Government charges and taxes. Imposed upon that is this ever-rising wage bill which all small businessmen have to contend with.

Employers of labour in this State have been hit in three ways: first, the excessive wage demands endorsed by Premier Bannon and Prime Minister Hawke have strangled the profitability of businesses in this State. By doing this they have reduced the ability to employ labour. Secondly, exorbitant Federal and State taxes are skimming off what little profit remains. Thirdly, the Government's policy of devaluing the dollar and forcing up interest rates has been an absolute disaster for the business community.

Let us look at the labour market, which has continued to collapse under a Labor Government. Over the past year the number of people out of work has increased by 1 900 or 3.7 per cent, which goes against the national trend where the number of unemployed is down 1.7 per cent. Those figures alone indicate that something is wrong in South Australia under Labor. Of particular concern is the increase in teenage unemployment. The May 1986 rate was 23.6 per cent for South Australia; 12 months ago it was 20.9 per cent. So, members can see that it is on the rise. Quite clearly, the Federal and State Government's job creation programs for young people are simply not working. Members would also be interested to learn that South Australia's rate of employment growth has also lagged behind the national average in the past 12 months and in May there was virtually no growth at all.

I am sure that Premier Bannon will not use those figures because he always likes to be associated with the good things that are happening in the community. He likes the glitter; he does not like the bad news. He asks other members of his Party to announce the bad news. Bad things are happening in this State. It is on the bones of its backside and Labor Governments, both federal and State, must take responsibility for that. Premier Bannon and Prime Minister Hawke have lost control of the economy, despite the fact that they spend most of their time trying to talk the economy up. Another alarming part of the Governor's speech appeared in paragraph 5, as follows:

The revenue base of the State, and consequently the ability of my Government to meet the demands the community places upon it, depends almost entirely on activity and growth within our economy.

That is a subtle way of saying that unless the Premier can raise revenue from new growth in the State's economy we cannot pay all the State's bills—that is what he is saying to us. The State is going broke under Labor. There is no growth in our economy. With a Federal Labor Government also sending the country broke, what hope has South Australia? We are in diabolical strife and the sooner this is realised the better. Yet all that Premier Bannon, Prime Minister Hawke, Kelty, Crean, and company from the ACTU and

John Lesses here in South Australia at Trades Hall can do is urge higher wages on the industrial front and, as far as the public is concerned, higher taxes and charges to help keep themselves solvent, and to hell with the public's ability to pay.

The public is frustrated and genuinely and honestly fed up with this constant pressure upon it to constantly pay more. In the meantime, the trade union movement, which is interested only in the deals that it conducts with big business and those that the unions represent, namely, the wage earners, have forgotten all about those people outside who happen to fall into the non wage-earning class. I refer to the non wage-earning people in the community: pensioners, superannuants, those who are disadvantaged, those who are on some form of pension, or who are not lucky enough to collect wages. Others benefit every time there is an increase in wages.

They are the people who are in trouble—the people that the Labor Party has decided to walk away from, to its peril. It has been to its peril in New South Wales where there has been a 22 per cent swing against it. That is why it is losing the vote in New South Wales—because Labor has walked away from those non wage earners in the community. I do not know why it has done this—maybe it is the academic people who are running the Labor Party now who are not willing to give in, or who side with the trade union militants who keep pushing for increased wages.

It is as clear as crystal why this country is in trouble and it is about time that Premier Bannon and his friend and colleague in Canberra came to grips with this matter and put the required curbs on the economy. There was a time when people such as Ben Chifley and earlier members of the Labor Party would stand up to those militant union secretaries and the like who were making unreasonable demands on the community. If something was not in the public interest they would say, 'No, it is not on.' But not now! The marriage that now exists between the hierarchy of the Labor Party and the hierarchy at Trades Hall is such that they are interested only in increasing wages for those who are lucky enough to hold a job.

Bob Hawke would have to be one of the greatest hypocrites to strut around the world stage, and our own Premier Bannon persists in running around behind him at every turn. I have never yet known a Premier to be so genuinely rapt in a Prime Minister on all economic policies, but he is too frightened to go to Canberra and stand up to him. Sure, he talks a lot in our local press for local consumption, but, when the time comes for him to go to Canberra and fight the fight for South Australia, the man goes to water. He has a track record of that, and he cannot walk away from it.

It was Bob Hawke, members may recall, who recently tried to play the tough statesman role by saying that Australia must learn to live with lower standards to counter the current economic crisis. Sure, it is a nice statesmanlike statement to make. He could not really say anything else. I suppose, with the Australian dollar crumbling down to below the 60c barrier, although tonight it is back up to 61c. His statement, however, did not say anything or make any apology for the fact that, back some 15 years ago or so, he presided over the ACTU and over the greatest wage rises that we had ever seen in this country. He presided over a period when wages went through the roof and when the cost of living absolutely soared through the ceiling. He presided over a period when the inflation rate went out of control in this country and when 2 per cent unemployment is now something for the history books. Mr Hawke presided over the ACTU when for a short time Gough Whitlam

happened to be at the helm and they worked together. Apart from that short period of three years, Bob Hawke personally presided over the demise of the lucky country, yet we are all supposed to think that he is the godfather of the country and what a wonderful job he has done.

It is through Bob Hawke that we have lost our competitive trading position overseas. It is through Bob Hawke that we have lost our manufacturing base. Indeed, it has been wrecked by his marriage with the militant leaders of the trade union movement. It is no wonder that our manufacturing base under this marriage with the ALP and the militant union leaders is in tatters.

While on the subject of this corporate state which the Labor Party has set up in this country and which now exists between the Labor Party and the big unions, it is interesting to remember that there is on the other side of the ledger a growing army of poor from whom the academic Labor Party has walked away. It created it and then walked away from it. I referred a few minutes ago to who makes up that poor but great army of non-wage earners in this country. It is relevant that we should look at some of that group that the Labor Party has walked away from. Let us look at some of the statistics on poverty. I am sure that the members in some of the Adelaide metropolitan seats who keep in close touch with their electorate would be aware of these. An article headed '“Fifth” of children in poverty', which appeared in the *Advertiser* in January of this year, states:

One in five Australian children lives in poverty, according to Federal Government figures.

The figures, issued at the weekend by the Department of Social Security, show there are now 787 890 Australian children under 16 whose families depend on Government pensions. The total has more than doubled in the past decade, from 307 778 in 1975.

The Minister for Social Security, Mr Howe, said the dramatic increase was a result of extensive unemployment and family breakdown. . . . 'What we have seen over the past 10 years is a redistribution of poverty from the aged to the very young, and unless the situation is addressed immediately, it will have serious ramifications for the future of Australia,' he said.

I must ask: Where are we going in this country? What will the State and Federal Governments do about it? This matter must be addressed. It is no good Governments that run the country only being interested in the sweetheart deals with the trade unions for high wages that are causing this immense poverty amongst the young. The elderly have had to contend with it for some time, and the young are now having to contend with it. As the country is brought to its knees the Government will have to address this problem. The country cannot wait for 18 months or so at the federal level and three years at the State level for this to be implemented when the Labor Governments get thrown out. It has to happen soon; it is a matter of the upmost urgency.

Another article in this vein to which I draw the attention of members of the House refers to the fact that South Australia has now reached the stage where it has the greatest number of homeless people. This is a significant indictment of a Government which, as a socialist Government, has claimed over the years to represent certain classes in the community. This highlights the fact that the academic Labor Party in South Australia under Premier Bannon and his colleagues and friends in Canberra have walked away from that section of the community that it has always professed to represent—it has deserted it. The article states:

South Australia may have the highest number of homeless people in Australia on a per capita basis, it was claimed today. The chairwoman of the South Australia Council of Social Services, Ms Judith Roberts, was commenting on a major Government report on the homeless issued in Canberra. The report, 'Study into homelessness and inadequate housing' says about 40 000 people in Australia sleep out of doors or in refuges. About another 60 000 live on the verge of homelessness and are extremely dependent on support services.

The report, issued by the Federal Minister for Housing and Construction, Mr West, reveals that in 1983, the latest year for which Australia-wide figures are available, South Australia had Australia's second highest number of outstanding applications to State housing authorities for rental accommodation. On 30 June 1983 there were 28 213 outstanding South Australian applications for housing.

That figure has now risen from 28 000 to 34 000, as indicated by the South Australian Minister of Housing and Construction. Applying a factor of each applicant representing two or three people, South Australia would be now looking at waiting lists of some 120 000 to 150 000 people. That is how the number has grown as the poor in the community have been left behind by the policies of academic Labor and are now suffering.

In the report, Ms Roberts also said that on a per capita basis South Australia might have the highest number of homeless people, and the figures that I have referred to indicate that. A very rough estimate suggests that 700 000 households in Australia may have insufficient income to live at the poverty line and pay their rent or mortgage costs. That point is linked to what I said earlier. With its connection to the unions and the link between the unions and the head of the ACTU, the Labor Party's attitude in the Industrial Commission is such that the non-wage earner continues to miss out. I am the first person to be amazed that the Labor Party has walked away from the non-wage earners in the community, but it has done so.

The non-wage earners in the community are looking to the Liberal Party, knowing that we will help them. Obviously, the academic Labor Party under Premier Bannon and his friend in Canberra, Bob Hawke, is not interested in them. They are not interested in those people who are not lucky enough to have a wage packet coming in: a chap with a wage packet knows that he will get his 2.3 per cent tacked on and that he will receive other benefits, but pensioners, superannuants and many others do not have these advantages.

The member for Mawson referred to sexual abuse occurring in families around Adelaide. I totally agree with what the honourable member said, but I often wonder whether the Government realises the extent of the pent up tensions that exist in households at the moment and whether it realises how many women are coming into DCW offices in the electorates and are saying, 'I beat my child today. I know I did wrong, but I beat my child because of the tension that I live under.'

Such women are probably single parents, trying to make ends meet, pay the rent, and make decisions normally made by both parents. They live under tremendous pressure. Such a person may strike out and hit her child: she knows she has done wrong, but she cannot help herself. Such people are now starting to go to DCW offices, whereas they were not doing that a few years ago, and I believe that this indicates the feeling of tension building up among those in the community who are not lucky enough to be wage earners.

Mr Hamilton: It's a terrible—

Mr OSWALD: I heard an honourable member say that it is terrible. An appalling state of affairs has built up, and quite clearly it has to be addressed. I am not trying to make any mileage out of this other than to say it is a fact of life in this community and the sooner we come to grips with the problem, and in the Arbitration Commission and other bodies attached to it stop worrying only about the wage earners and recognise that non wage earners in the community are in the most appalling strife and must have help, the better off these people will be. I appeal to the Government, both Federal and State, to do something about this

matter quickly. People do not need help next year or the following year—they need help this year.

Since Prime Minister Hawke gave the union leadership a free go and more recently since Labor Governments got control of most Parliaments in Australia, there has been a growing army of poor which, in terms of human tragedy, is reflected in the fact that one in five children, or .75 million, in such households have to endure the situation. I do not think that any member is happy about that situation in the country that was once called the lucky country. It is the most appalling situation.

It is quite obvious from the Governor's speech that both the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments are in deep financial trouble under the Labor Party and union leadership. The people of South Australia are tired of being part of the Premier's public relations machine, as he plays his little games of perception politics. The public are tired. They are tired of being led by the nose into believing that everything in the garden is rosy. They are tired of Ministers who spend so much of their time talking up the economy and never saying where things are really wrong. We are tired of being manipulated into accepting continuing rises in tax because the Labor Party and the union leaders have lost control of the economy and because of a series of other factors. Departments want more money and the Government has had to step in and raise it.

We are also tired of the way in which the Premier continually gives in to his Federal colleague and friend, the Prime Minister, as well as to militant union bosses, who gave him his seat in the House. Let us not forget the way in which the Labor Party works. It works on the basis that the trade unions give all members opposite their seats and, if they do not tow the line faithfully, they are ostracised (as has been observed from time to time) and sometimes they even lose preselection, thus they dare not step out of line.

Members opposite do not have the freedom that we on this side have to express particular views. We are tired also of the lack of incentive for people to do an honest day's work. That no longer exists in this country.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I would like my comment to sink in. Perhaps the honourable member while he was interjecting did not hear it. We are tired of the fact that in this country the incentive has gone for a man to go out and do an honest day's work. That incentive has gone under the leadership of Premier Bannon in this State and his friend and colleague in Canberra, the Prime Minister, who seems to have such power over our Premier that the Premier will not get up and speak his mind on our behalf. Casinos and Grand Prix may have certain appeal to some members of the community as a form of entertainment and employment, but they are not materially helping to strengthen the backbone of our society, the average man and woman who on the whole cannot afford to go to the casino or the Grand Prix (which the Premier seems to hold up as one of the great success stories of his three years in office).

I would like to conclude by asking the Premier to be honest enough to cut out this up-front personality cult syndrome which both he and the Labor Party use to obscure the fact that they cannot and will not make an economic decision without having to first obtain the approval of their trade union bosses. As a consequence, the Premier would be made more accountable for the pressures and the destruction that both he and Prime Minister Hawke are imposing on ordinary South Australian families.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I support the motion and congratulate the Governor on his excellent speech. I

would like to extend my condolences to the families of Mr Albert Hawke and Charles Albert Harrison, both of whom passed away during the parliamentary recess. I met Mr Hawke on only one occasion, but I had the opportunity during the recess to visit Parliament House in Perth, where I learnt of the great affection in which he was held there by members on both sides of the House who mentioned him to me, and by the staff of Parliament House.

Charles Harrison (or Charlie Harrison, as I knew him) I knew much better. He was a member of many of the committees to which I was attached at the Trades Hall, and involved in the various activities surrounding the Trades and Labor Council. He was Secretary of the biggest union in the State at that time and had the job of looking after the industrial needs of the members of the Vehicle Builders Union at a very turbulent time in South Australia's history. South Australia has an undeniable record in industrial relations, and, despite the rhetoric we have heard from the previous speaker, much of the credit for this record must go to the trade union leaders in this State.

Charlie Harrison exemplified the leadership that came through the Trades Hall during that era. He was under considerable pressure from time to time to take a very militant stance so far as his own members were concerned, and he resisted pressures from within and without his own organisation, both on the employers' side and on the rank-and-file side, to engage in a much more militant role for his union. I also knew him in his capacity as Secretary of the Labor Day celebrations committee, a committee very important to the trade union movement, because it arose out of the eight-hour day movement and preceded the Trades and Labor Council in South Australia. The Trades and Labor Council was born out of the eight-hour day movement, which eventually became the Labor Day celebrations committee and for 10 years or more—I think probably more like 12 years—Charlie Harrison was Secretary of that very important organisation. He was succeeded by Mr Roy Abbott, who is also a member of this House.

It is my intention to devote most of my speech this evening to my own electorate, but I cannot launch into that aspect just yet because of the speeches of the members for Morphett and Alexandra, who have preceded me, and whose remarks I found most extraordinary. We are moving into a problem situation so far as the economics of this country are concerned. World commodity prices have dropped away and the first part of the speech by the member for Alexandra—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I wish I had an hour to answer these interjections but, unfortunately, our time has been cut back. I did not interrupt Opposition speakers; I took the opportunity to sit down and listen to them quietly, and I hope that they pay me the same courtesy. We are approaching a difficult time so far as the economy of this country is concerned, and the drop off in the world commodity prices is causing the sorts of problems that we are now facing. I agree with the earlier propositions from the member for Alexandra, who in the first part of his speech put forward propositions and reasons why we were entering this difficult period. I thought that he put them concisely and well, but his resolution of the problem is something that I find very difficult to take.

The conservative element of this Parliament provides an answer to problems by way of conflict. I have made a note of all the propositions that have been put forward (and I refer to the problems that have been put by the Opposition) as a means of solving our economic problems, and I will accept challenges as they might come. Mention was made

of no wage increases, smaller government, deregulation of the wage area and elimination of the capital gains tax. The member for Alexandra wanted to see the elimination of the CEP funding, and then we had some criticism from the member for Morphett because of the poverty situation with which we are now faced. I find it quite incredible that the conservative element of this Parliament proposes that, on the one hand, there be no wage increases so far as labour is concerned and, on the other hand, there be absolutely no restraints so far as capital is concerned.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The interjections are coming from somebody who purports to represent small business and, if these propositions are accepted and carried out, the first casualty will be small business. The number of bankruptcies that will occur will be incredible, if these propositions are upheld.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I must be hitting home judging by the number of interjections that are coming forward. One reads from time to time in the newspapers so far as one side of industry is concerned—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know it is the situation that the honourable member defends the privileged classes in Australia. I understand why he is trying to shout me down. I find it absolutely abhorrent that our daily newspapers talk about takeovers in this country involving \$100 million, \$150 million, \$300 million and \$400 million. On the one hand we have the conservative element in this Parliament asking for restraint from workers and, on the other hand, we have an absolutely ridiculous situation where the moguls of Australia are sitting around tables and talking on telephones playing with money as if it were monopoly money.

Where is the call for restraint from the other side? If Australia is facing a difficult situation (and I concede that it is) and we ask the trade union movement to show some restraint in seeking wage increases, which I thought was what the last two Opposition speakers suggested, what are they asking capital to do? What are they asking directors of companies to do? On the one hand, they are calling for restraint from the working class but, on the other hand, they are telling the capitalists to go ahead and make as much profit as they can squeeze from the public. I want members opposite to tell me exactly what they want from the sponsors, the people who put them in this House. That is one of the ridiculous situations that has been put to us.

The other suggestion put forward related to smaller government. We are already faced with a proposition (and I do not think that this is a secret) where \$100 million will be taken out of the South Australian budget. In addition, we are facing a federal budget that will impose cuts across the board. Members opposite already have begun to criticise the Government in relation to what might happen to schools, health, housing and in other areas as a result of cuts in the budget. They ask the Government to continue to spend money as freely as possible but, on the other hand, we hear a speech like the one that we have just heard that suggested that the way out of our economic ills is smaller government. Following the sorts of budgets that we are now faced with, I ask the Opposition to explain where we will have smaller government. Will members opposite reduce even more the education budget, the Police Force budget, or will they increase the waiting lists of the hospitals by cutting the health budget? I would like to hear the details. The member for Alexandra, on the one hand—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: I'm back.

Mr FERGUSON: I do not think that it is proper for a member to interject when he is out of his seat. On the one hand, the member for Alexandra has asked for smaller government but, on the other hand, he has been asking for—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Bragg to order.

Mr FERGUSON: Speakers on the other side have asked for smaller government but, towards the end of his speech, the member for Alexandra asked that the agriculture budget be increased. He asked also for more research staff, complaining that there was only one member on the research staff in the Department of Agriculture.

Let us stop this nonsense. So far as the capital gains tax is concerned, the greatest recipient of benefits has been the rural sector, which has received the greatest concessions from the Federal Government. I do not argue with that, but when they have something, there is always a scream for more.

Another suggestion was that the CEP be abolished, so that the only opportunity that many people have to climb out of the unemployment circle, to get themselves out of poverty, to put themselves on the first rung of the ladder and to assist themselves, is removed. I thought that the Opposition believed in self help.

The answer of members opposite to the crisis is to increase unemployment. Their other magic formula is the deregulation of the wage system. Why do they want deregulation of wages? The only reason for asking for deregulation of wages is that they think they will save money. I can tell them now that they will not, because as soon as the wages system is deregulated those who are in the strongest bargaining positions will use those bargaining positions, the restraint that is now being applied will be lifted, and higher wages will be paid in those areas where unions are in a position of strength.

What is the other factor in relation to deregulation? Those who are in a weak position will be further exploited. A 16 year old girl working in a delicatessen will have her wages award abolished. How is she to get the protection she now gets if we deregulate wages? Members opposite want to abolish the protection that is now available to younger people. A farmer might be able to employ a 16 year old person and pay him a pittance for working on a farm, and that might be of great assistance to the farmer; on the other hand, there will be people who are able to use their strength, and employers will find themselves paying out more wages than they are paying now. The only difference is that people in a weaker position will be further exploited. I have never heard such a ridiculous proposition to answer the crisis that we are now facing.

We must find solutions, but I believe that we ought to be talking to one another and that there ought to be cooperation. There is a way that we can get together and do something about it, but I do not believe it ought to be on the basis of the rich exploiting the poor, and that is the sort of proposition—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I know that the member for Alexandra represents those people. They put him into this House, and he has to look after them, but he ought to look at the matter on the basis of equity and equal sacrifice for all, rich or poor.

I wish to turn now to some problems within my own electorate. I had intended to devote all my speech to these problems, but I had to look at some of the nonsense put up by members opposite. I refer particularly to the provision

of child-care, a problem about which every member of this House ought to be concerned.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

Mr FERGUSON: If anybody believes in the sharing of power and in equality he ought to be concerned about what is happening in relation to child-care. I am certainly concerned about the lack of child-care facilities in my electorate. I have been on a campaign for 3½ years, lobbying federal and State Governments on this proposition. So far, unfortunately, I have not been successful. I know that members opposite find the subject of child-care amusing and do not consider it to be a serious subject. They are cackling and laughing about efforts that people put in regarding child-care. I think that it is to their absolute disgrace that they treat the subject of child-care in such a manner and find such amusement in this subject. This is one of the most serious social problems facing us.

So far as privatisation is concerned, I have been approached by a group of people who are interested in establishing a private child-care company on Trimmer Parade adjacent to my electorate. I was only too happy to give my blessing to the project. The company purchased a house on Trimmer Parade and made application to the Woodville council to use it as a child-care centre. The company was prepared to invest \$100 000 in addition to purchasing the house to provide suitable accommodation for children up to four years of age.

Unfortunately, objections were raised by some residents in relation to applications made to the Woodville council and in due course the council upheld those objections and disallowed the use of this dwelling for child-care purposes. Therefore, we are back into a situation where there are no child-care facilities whatever in my electorate. There are 2 500 potential customers for a child-care centre in my electorate. I am envious of the amount of money spent in adjoining electorates in relation to child-care.

In relation to long day care there is still no relief in sight. I have been disappointed that up to this point no announcement has been made about the future construction of long day care centres in South Australia. I am not sure whether the delay in this announcement, which should have been made at the beginning of July, has been caused by federal or State budget considerations. I understand that it is possible that freezing the capital works program could have something to do with the delay or that, alternatively, the Federal Government may be looking at a future cutting of funds available for this area.

The Liberals have nothing to laugh about. That includes the member for Davenport, who was a member of that Party for many years. The amount of money that the Liberal Party put into child-care during the period it had an opportunity to do so was nothing short of disgraceful. If I had the time, I would go through the history of the amount of money injected by the McMahon Government and the previous Liberal Administration in comparison with the amount being put forward by the present Federal Government in this area. Unfortunately, time does not allow me to do so.

I hope that the Parliament, and the department, will take note of the absolute lack of child-care facilities in Henley Beach, Grange, Fulham Gardens, Kidman Park, Findon and part of Seaton area. During the parliamentary recess I made further representations to the Children's Services Office, Western Districts, and to the head of the department through Ms Anne Howe. I take this opportunity to give due praise to Anne Howe and her staff for their courteous hearing and

for the concern that they have shown for the situation in which I find myself as a local member trying to provide a much needed facility in my electorate. It is certainly no fault of the Western Children Service's Office, or its Administrator, Anne Howe, that the services of that department in the area of child-care for children aged up to four years have not been extended.

I will take this opportunity to praise the efforts of Natalie Fuller, the Community Services Officer for the Henley and Grange council. Natalie has been very vigorous in her organisation of community groups within the electorate to try and achieve the commencement of child-care within the Henley and Grange area. It was through the efforts of Natalie Fuller that the Child-Care Action Group was formed during the Parliamentary recess. There are three special committees of this organisation. One is to try and achieve after-school care within the electorate; another is to try and establish vacation care during the school vacation, and the third committee is to continue to work to try and achieve the establishment of long day care somewhere in the area or nearby. Needless to say, there is no after-school care available within my electorate. Funding has been provided for after-school care centres in each of the other western areas, but unfortunately no provision has been made for funding of any sort of after-school care within my electorate.

After-school care is a necessity for the area. There are many children, with two parents working, who need supervision in a group situation following the gap between school finishing and either mother or father being available at home. Surveys have been taken by the Henley Community Centre and the indications are that this service would be well patronised. Applications have been made for funding but the Child-Care Action Group, of which I am a member, has been informed that it is most unlikely that consideration can be given for funding until at least 1987. Nonetheless, the action group (which comprises representatives from local schools, the Community Youth Support Scheme, Child and Adolescents Family Health Service, Grange Community Centre, family day care, TAFE, Henley and Grange council and the local kindergartens) is determined to go ahead and establish after-school care regardless of whether or not funding is available.

The action group is of the opinion that, once the community can see that it is attempting to help itself, then help will come. It is anticipated that a local resident, Mrs Jan Northey, would be prepared to establish this service in the near future. An appeal letter has been circularised to service groups seeking the necessary equipment, including a telephone desk, filing cabinet, first-aid, sick bed, blanket and pillow, table and chair, story books and reference books, kitchen equipment, art and craft equipment, board games, Lego and construction toys, fencing of the yard, and possibly television and stationery.

It is anticipated that vacation care will also go ahead during the Christmas vacation and that the Henley Primary School will be used as a venue for vacation care. Members will be able to realise that, despite the lack of assistance, the community is taking up the challenge to move towards self-help in the after-school care and vacation-type situation. However, this does not solve the problem so far as long day care is concerned, and I make no apologies for continuing to lobby for the establishment of this very important facility. Some of the parents are seeking the benefits of this service in order that their children will have the benefit of a group program in their early years.

As we have turned to different types of housing, a lack of space is not an uncommon problem. Many families live in smaller houses or flats which do not have gardens or

accessible parks nearby. Not all families can afford the toys, books and games that others take for granted as a normal part of childhood. Many do not have the sandpits, paddling pools and swings which better-off children enjoy at home. Child-care provides not only educational benefits but also the opportunities for companionship, imaginative play, loud and messy games, many of which could not be enjoyed at home. There is a definite advantage for younger children to have a place where they can strew toys around, walk sand and mud into carpets, empty cupboards, spill things and generally take part in activities which cannot take place at home.

The changing structure of the family is one of the motivating features in the need to establish child-care centres. One in three mothers of children aged 0 to 5 are employed; 13 per cent of households are headed by a single parent, usually a woman; and between 1975 and 1980 there was a 60 per cent increase in the number of lone parents responsible for children below school age.

Mr INGERSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to refer to a couple of points made in the last two or three speeches by members opposite. The member for Fisher has a great name in the electorate and I hope that he will pay more regard to the appropriate use of the truth when he refers to my attitude towards the new bowling club that has been established at Aberfoyle Park. The honourable member said that I did not support it and did not want it there.

The honourable member then went on to say that we should make multiple use of resources, dual use of resources, and try to save money and resources. That is all I have ever said about CEP funding. I have said that the present conditions attached to CEP funding lead to an inefficient use of resources. The ALP should get the message that, to make proper use of resources, local government should be given the opportunity to call tenders and, for example, instead of building one bowling club at Munno Para and one at Aberfoyle Park, three could be built with the same amount of money, thereby using 50 per cent more material, 50 per cent more people in the activity of producing, delivering, laying and handling the material, and it would mean a 50 per cent increase in the use of resources in the community, with more facilities thus being made available. That is the point I make.

Some of the people who have worked as forepersons on CEP-funded projects have had people working under them who have been as useful as a wheel on a walking stick when it comes to productivity. It is unfair to those individuals who are forced to work under those conditions, with no effective use of the trade skills above them or encouragement of how to learn a trade. They are the cold, hard facts, and members opposite should realise that. Nearly every CEP-funded project that has been attempted in South Australia has run over budget, even though the original estimates have been higher than what they would have been on a normal contract basis for the same project. That is my objection to CEP funding. I am not saying that funding should be cut out but that better and more proper use should be made of resources, as the member for Fisher suggested

he would like to see happen. The member for Fisher should not allege that I did not want the bowling green there, because that is an untruth.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: Let the honourable member read his speech. In relation to another matter, the Federal Minister for Social Security (Mr Howe) was reported in the *Advertiser* of Friday 18 July as saying that the Federal Government would save nearly \$20 million a year from a social security amnesty. The amnesty finished at the end of May, and I think members should take note of why the Federal Government chose the three months to the end of May to have the amnesty on social security cheats. If one looks at the results of the amnesty, one can quite easily understand why that was the case. During the latter part of the Fraser Government's term of office there was an unfortunate incident with the Greek community over allegations of exploitation of the social security system. Of course, that caused some embarrassment to both Governments.

The present Government knew that a reciprocal agreement was to be reached with the Italian Government but, until that agreement was reached, the Italian and Australian Governments could not swap information about who was receiving pensions in Italy or Australia. They knew that once agreement was reached the fan would start spluttering some material around that would be uncomfortable for the Federal Labor Government, so it was decided that the best thing to do was to have an amnesty under which the few, in terms of the total number in the Italian community, could give themselves up and admit they had been receiving an Italian pension of up to \$5 000 a year and at the same time collecting an Australian pension. To obtain a clean sheet, the ideal plan was to have an amnesty. The agreement was reached—signed and sealed—in April and the community was informed through the normal channels, such as clubs and so on, that people who were cheating on the system could get in.

If members opposite think I am wrong, I challenge them, as I challenged Mr Howe through the news media, to disclose the number of people from the Italian community who were cheating and gave themselves up under the amnesty. However, Mr Howe refused to make that information available. On top of that, the amnesty did not work. Mr Howe said it worked because he thought that it would save about \$20 million a year, but at the same time as the amnesty was disclosed the ALP Governments, Federal and State, supported, in the main, the proposition of identity cards—which I support quite strongly. Senator Bolkus and a few of his lefties, plus the Liberal Party and the National Party, decided not to support that proposition. That immediately made those on the dole, the younger age group, realise that they would not be caught out exploiting the unemployment situation, so they did not give themselves up under the amnesty. I challenge Mr Howe again to declare how many people who gave themselves up under the amnesty were unemployed and, in particular, in the younger age groups. I believe there were very few.

In the main, those who gave themselves up (except for the bulk, who were Italians) were the aged and the invalid pensioners who thought that they might have been in a position of conflict and were cheating the system. We find that some of those who gave themselves up were not cheating but had misunderstood the system and were entitled to what they were receiving. A small percentage was in that category. I challenge Mr Howe to make available the figures on each of the classifications. One of the biggest gains were the dob-ins. The amazing thing was that the number of dob-ins was greater than had occurred before, because people

in the community (and I only hope that the press cite this) suddenly realised that, if they were working alongside someone who was collecting a full pension and getting a full wage by using a fictitious name, they only had to telephone the department and say that there was a person of a certain address, male or female, of a certain age, called Mr X who was collecting benefits. A whole host of people dobbed in others. I am not condemning that; what I am saying is that the response the Minister wanted was achieved in regard to the reciprocal agreement with Italy. The response that he did not expect was the number of people who were dobbed in.

The amnesty, in the sense of ascertaining the number of cheats, was a failure. I hope that Mr Howe gets that message. In South Australia, 1 200 people were identified, and the benefits of 1 500 people in Western Australia, 1 200 people in South Australia, and 1 700 people in Queensland were changed because they were cheating. When the assessments were made, it was found that a fair percentage of people were not cheating. I would say that in the South Australian figure something like three-fifths to four-fifths were from the Italian community. The figure in Victoria was also very high for the Italian community.

An honourable member: That is a reflection on them.

Mr S.G. EVANS: It is not. The Italian community in the main is very honest. It was a group of Italians who worked out how they could cheat the system, and the honest Italians would not accept that. If Mr Howe likes to disclose the figures, we will find that I am accurate.

The only reason that the amnesty was held and to be completed by the end of May was to get the Federal Government off the hook. There was going to be a conflict with the Italian community because the reciprocal agreement was going to find the few cheats among the multitude of Italians who were on pensions (although it ran into thousands in the end) who were using the system of non exchange of information between the two countries up to that time. The reciprocal agreement found them out and the Government got off the hook by means of the amnesty.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I would like to pay a tribute to the staff of the Department for Community Welfare and, in particular, to those who are concerned with foster care or alternative family care. We have already heard this evening of the large numbers of young people who are the victims of sexual abuse; that is one category of young person which the staff of the Department of Community Welfare tries to place in alternative family care arrangements.

There is a whole range of other young people, from infants and young children right through to adolescents, who need to be placed in alternative family care for some time during their upbringing. The Department for Community Welfare staff are at the moment engaged in an extensive community exercise to try to bring more families into the foster care or alternative family care arrangements. One of the reasons for this is the increasing incidence of child abuse. A total of 25 child abuse cases were referred to the Enfield Office in the year before last, and in the last year that has jumped 100 per cent, so that there are now over 50 cases on the books of that office. It is necessary to find alternative foster care home environments for those children to go into.

Through the various churches in the northern suburbs, as well as throughout metropolitan Adelaide, an enormous amount of good work has been done, in addition to the work done by the Community Welfare Department. The emergency foster care program which is run by one of the churches places over 150 children a month in temporary

and short-term foster care, as well as another 150 a month in respite care.

That is the size of the problem with which we are concerned, and hence the effort that is needed by Community Welfare Department staff to find as many families as possible to act as alternative families. The department's responsibility comes from its Act, in which an umbrella authority is provided to assist children whose parents, for a variety of reasons, are unable to care for them and to provide them with support and guidance in a proper family environment. The department, under the Act, is charged with finding a substitute to the parental care, support and guidance of which those children have for the time being been deprived.

Those children are variously described as being in need, in crisis or at risk, and that risk can be physical, emotional, moral or sexual. The emphasis in the Act and in the operations of the department is based on the belief that the wellbeing of children in our society is indeed paramount. Previously, this obligation has been met through a variety of residential care programs, but, as a result of society changing and, indeed, as a result of the nature of families changing, and the need for children to be given specific support rather than simply being placed in institutional residential care, the whole foster care movement has been given more prominence.

It is necessary to find people who have particular parenting skills, who are prepared to offer themselves, their families, their care and affection to young people in order to provide them for the time being with an alternative while the particular family crisis from which they have come is resolved. The justification that is given for singling out children for special legislative and executive attention is associated with the very vulnerable status the children have. For that reason, much attention is given to placing children in a caring environment. All children need stability and security in their lives, and that is really what foster care provides—time out from their own family because of problems that they are confronting or problems or difficulties that their families are experiencing.

The aim of foster care or substitute family care is to provide the child with a secure home and a family that they can call their own and with whom they can feel happy and secure. The Department for Community Welfare and its staff offer four main types of foster care for children whose parents are unable to care for them or for themselves or who for one reason or another have run into a crisis or difficulty that needs to be overcome. The first of those is emergency foster care, which is arranged in response to a family emergency such as illness or hospitalisation. The second is respite care, which really provides a limited time out for both parents and the children in order for parents to be given a chance to recharge their batteries. It is an attempt to try to re-establish the links within a family and enable the child to return to it after a short time out.

The third category is short-term foster care, which provides time for natural parents to resolve any personal or social problems that they have between themselves or in the way that they are caring for their children. Of course, after that there is the fourth category of longer-term foster care which provides for placements where it is very unlikely for children will be able to return to their natural family.

The important and critical point of all this is the philosophy behind the programs that are run by the department and the effort that is put into these programs by Community Welfare Department staff. I think I can summarise that by saying that it is based on three points: the first is obviously the stability and wellbeing for the child or adolescent; the second is an attempt to try to rebuild for the child the ties

with the biological family. This is very much the difference between the programs which are run now and those which were previously run through institutional child care arrangements. The third part of the department's philosophy is the attempt to maintain for the community the integrity of the family.

Foster care is important because it addresses in a collective manner the needs of a variety of people—the child, the family, the foster family and the general community in trying to provide a breathing space in order for that whole team of people to help the natural parents adjust to a crisis that they may be confronting in their family life. To love and care for children and watch their personal growth and development, to be part of a family building team, to create extended families for people who have not got them and accept the challenge of putting the innocence and enjoyment back into childhood and the excitement back into adolescence is to enumerate some of the rewards that are offered to foster parents by the Community Welfare Department staff who are involved in this program.

Alternative family care attempts to prove a warm and supportive emotional atmosphere for children whose home life has undergone some previous disruption and perhaps severe disorientation. It is important with all this to maintain a link within the community for these children, because it is important to have an anchor in what is often for them a changing tide of loyalties and emotions. It is particularly difficult for young people, adolescents and teenagers who are at the same time questioning their values and the values of the society around them and the way that adults are behaving to try to have some solid base, some solid moral and value system for themselves and some sense of solidarity—something that does not move. This is the philosophy of trying to provide an alternative family or an alternative foster care arrangement for children who run into crisis themselves or with their families.

In the northern suburbs the attempt to provide more choices for the staff in the placement of children is an attempt to keep the children within their community so that the links that they have established in their school, in the social programs in which they have become engaged and in the sporting activities and so on can be maintained, and that link or anchor that they have with the community can be maintained. The alternative parents can then work with the child, with the natural parents and with the social work team associated with the department to try to maintain the family from which the child came, because the family is seen, both through the Act and the operations of the department, to be such an important part of our society. I would like to again pay tribute to the enormous amount of work that has been done by the Enfield community welfare staff in particular in trying to bring more people into the foster care program in the northern suburbs.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Last Thursday allegations were made in this House by the member for Bright in relation to supposed overcharging by Adelaide Pest Control Pty Limited. The facts of the matter relating to these allegations are as follows. On 15 November Adelaide Pest Control received a telephone call from a Mrs W of Brighton North. Her complaint was that she had biting insects within her home and she asked for one of the company service advisers to call and inspect the property. A service adviser subsequently called on that day and he assessed the problem of the home as being bird lice and fleas.

The treatment in this case was the treatment of ceilings, cavity walls and all internal areas as required for bird lice and flea control. The quote was for \$85, and contained a

three months warranty. The warranty provides that, should reinfestation occur or further treatment be required to eradicate the lice or flea problem, Adelaide Pest Control would return at any time during the three month period and re-treat at no extra charge to the client. Usually, where fleas are a problem, there is a callback two or three times, but this depends on the number of household pets and general hygiene.

The woman concerned accepted the quotation, signed and authorised the company to proceed with the work, which was subsequently carried out on the following day. The invoice shows that the roof areas, ventilators and interior areas were treated for fleas and bird lice. The director of the company received a call from Mrs W a day or so later and she advised that she had been speaking to some friends who said that she should contact the Residential Tenancies Tribunal. She did so, and was advised that the responsibility for payment of the charge for pest control should be the landlord's. She was about to contact him and discuss the matter with him. The director of the company subsequently received a call from a Mr Young stating that he would accept the charge, but he wanted to meet the service adviser on site to discuss the service with him.

The service adviser met Mr Young (and this is the member for Bright's constituent, as he claimed) on 19 November at Brighton North and advised him that the roof areas should be proofed off to stop bird entry, because the same situation of bird lice could again occur in the future. Mr Young asked that the charge of \$85 be made to him and cancelled in the name of his tenant, Mrs W. The service adviser then gave a quotation to Mr Young for \$250, which was broken up as follows: \$85 for the treatment of bird lice and flea control, with three months warranty, and \$165 to proof off the roof areas and to remove nests. This was only a quotation and, at Mr Young's request, the \$85 was included in that quotation. The company assessed the hours to complete the birdproofing of the roof as three to four hours, allowed for materials such as flashing, gutter guard and bird wire and also took into consideration travelling time to and from the site.

The company director subsequently received a telephone call from Mr Young stating that he wanted all of the work done for \$85: birdproofing, flea control and bird lice eradication. It was explained to him that at no time did the company contract to do all of the work as outlined for \$85. The director read out details appearing on the card as signed and accepted by Mrs W. The company director said that he could not understand Mr Young's insistence that they should carry out all of the work for \$85. He said that he then explained to Mr Young that he had a quotation for \$250, which sum included \$85 for the work already completed, which was charged to him at his request, and a quotation of \$165 for the remainder of the work, namely, birdproofing.

Mr Young became agitated and the director completed the discussion by stating to Mr Young that he had no contract with the company, anyway. Subsequently, the director of the company received a letter by certified mail on 26 November which was addressed to the Manager, Adelaide Pest Control and which read:

With reference to your quotation for the treatment of birdproofing, as outlined in your quotation of 19 November 1985, I have obtained two other quotations and the price quoted by one firm is \$75. One thing puzzles me. Did you really think that I would have paid you \$250 for a job which one of your competitors will do for \$75? If you did, you were mistaken.

Here is the error, and this is the false allegation and false charge. The extra work done would have cost \$165, not \$250. The other quote was for \$75, and this was for entirely

different work. The difference there is \$90. In conclusion, the facts of the matter are—

Mr ROBERTSON: Since my contribution the other day is being attacked, I would like to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order at this time. Once the adjournment debate has been commenced it has to be completed. If the honourable member wishes to make a personal explanation, he will have to do so at the conclusion of Question Time tomorrow.

Mr BECKER: On 31 July 1986, the member for Bright asked: 'Will the Minister consider implementing an inquiry into over-charging in the pest control industry?' Members will note that his constituent suggests that his tenant had contacted Adelaide Pest Control with a view to removing birds nests and lice from the roof of the house and rendering the roof birdproof. There is no truth in this comment and reference to the quotation given to Mrs W does not suggest the removal of birds nests, or refer to birdproofing.

The member for Bright said, 'According to my constituent, the firm's employee inspected the inside of the roof and said there were only three nests to be removed and three holes to be proofed.' He then said that the price to complete the job was \$85. This occurred on Tuesday 19 November 1985. The reference to the quotation given to Mrs W will show that, in fact, the work agreed to on that quotation was completed on 16 November, and again no reference is made to removal of birds nests or proofing.

Finally, it is suggested that on Wednesday 20 November 1985 all that was received from Adelaide Pest Control was an invoice for \$250. Mr Young at no time received an invoice for \$250 from Adelaide Pest Control. There is nothing to say that it was an invoice or anything like that. An invoice contains a number, but the member for Bright probably would not understand that. A quotation was given to Mr Young for him to consider. The company does not object to anybody obtaining further quotes. Mr Young has every right to compare the company's charges, as has been quoted. He states that, luckily for him, he received the invoice two days before the work in question was to be carried out, enabling him to stop Adelaide Pest Control from removing the nests and to call for two other quotes.

There was no obligation by the company to carry out the work; it was simply a quotation, and the company wants to make that clear. We were told by the member for Bright that there was a quote for \$75. We have not been told what was the quote from the other company. Therefore, I assume that it must have been greater than \$75.

The other point the company wishes to make known is that the hourly rate it charges is about \$46. The figure in Melbourne is between \$90 and \$100 an hour and in New South Wales between \$75 and \$85 an hour. In this State people can get a reasonable deal from the pest control industry. The director of the company has also had discussions with the manager of the company that undertook to do the work for \$75, and he asked how the charge was assessed. He assessed the charge on the basis of what Mr Young instructed him to do and he assessed between one and two hours. The Director of Adelaide Pest Control explained that he had assessed the job at three to four hours and asked whether a fee of \$165 would be exorbitant. The person from the other company said that it certainly was not and that he was prepared to put that in writing. Here is a classic example of a company feeling it has been maligned.

Adelaide Pest Control has been associated with South Australia for over 38 years. A check with the Consumer Affairs Department would prove that it has substantial credibility and consideration for its clients. The company

spends hundreds of thousands of dollars a year on advertising its name. Since the remarks were made in Parliament, they have been reported in the *Advertiser* and on the radio, and the sales staff have run into problems on at least six occasions with clients who have commented on supposed overcharging. Adelaide Pest Control has spent \$700 000 on promoting sport in South Australia in the past five years and yet the honourable member claims that that company is not doing its job for South Australia.

About two weeks ago Adelaide Pest Control serviced the Premier's property to the entire satisfaction of the Premier's wife, so if the honourable member wants to check up on the credibility of this company he should check with the Premier. You want to be a little bit more careful when you stand in this place under parliamentary privilege, malign

private enterprise and name companies without checking first with the company involved.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been here long enough to know that he must use the third person when referring to other honourable members.

Mr BECKER: This company supports the North Adelaide Football Club, five soccer teams, several Italian clubs, as well as hockey and junior athletics: it is well involved and proud to be South Australian.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 10.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 6 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 August 1986

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

10. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. To which department or agency does Government motor vehicle UGM 951 belong and were the four occupants of the vehicle travelling along The Parade, Norwood at 12.15 p.m. on the Australia Day holiday on official business?

2. To which department or agency does Government motor vehicle UGM 303 belong and were the four occupants of the vehicle travelling along The Parade, Kensington on Sunday 5 January at 12.30 p.m. on official business?

3. To which department or agency does Government motor vehicle UGD 582 belong and are the two occupants of the vehicle travelling along the Esplanade, Brighton between 5.30 p.m. and 5.40 p.m. on most weekdays on official business and, if so, on what business?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. Government vehicle No. UGM 951 belongs to the Central Government Car Pool and at the time of the alleged incident was in the care of the Department for Community Welfare. The officer who was driving the vehicle on the Australia Day holiday was on official duty and used the vehicle to attend a meeting which was being held at Dulwich. On his way to the meeting he dropped his wife and children at a house which was in a suburb adjacent to Dulwich. The officer has been counselled regarding the use of Government vehicles for transporting persons not associated with official business.

2. Government vehicle No. UGM 303 belongs to the Department of Transport. The officer using the vehicle at the time of the alleged incident was taking visitors from Tanzania to inspect the O-Bahn and then to lunch.

3. Government vehicle No. UGD 582 has been allocated to the General Manager of the Central Linen Service for official use. The Manager has approval to use the vehicle for travel to and from work. The only time there were two occupants in the vehicle travelling along the Esplanade, Brighton at approximately 5.30 p.m. was between December 1985 and the end of February 1986. During this period the Manager's daughter was working in the office at the Central Linen Service, providing relief support while staff members were on leave.

35. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

36. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

37. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

38. **Mr LEWIS** asked the Minister of State Development: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

39. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

40. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

41. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

42. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

43. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

44. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

45. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

46. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

47. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism: In relation to Government-owned motor vehicles utilised by all departments and statutory authorities under the Minister's control for the year ended 30 June 1986:

(a) how many parking infringement notices were received

(b) what was the total value of fines imposed

(c) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by drivers of relevant motor vehicles, and

(d) what was the number and amount of expiation fees paid by the Government?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply to questions Nos 35 to 47 is as follows:

The time and effort to provide this information is not considered warranted. However, if the honourable member has any specific examples or instances he wishes to raise I will be pleased to pursue them.