

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 August 1986

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

PETITION: HOME INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 75 residents of South Australia praying that the House do all in its power to reduce home loan interest rates was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

A petition signed by 381 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices was presented by the Hon. M.K. Mayes.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 784 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 Mr Blevins, Ms Gayler, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Meier, Olsen, Payne, and Rann.

Petitions received.

PETITION: STA CONCESSIONS

A petition signed by 49 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to extend the two-hour concession time on STA transport to between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. was presented by Mr S.J. Baker.

Petition received.

PETITION: RSI

A petition signed by 488 residents of South Australia praying that the House introduce legislation to encourage participation by Government, workers and their registered associations in the prevention of repetition strain injury was presented by Mr Rann.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOOROWIE AND HARDWICKE BAY WATER SUPPLY

A petition signed by 562 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a reticulated water supply in the hundred of Moorowie and Hardwicke Bay was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

LIBRARIAN'S REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the annual report of the Parliamentary Librarian for 1985-86.

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 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 49, 50, 79 to 91, 93 and 102.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Lands—Pastoral Act 1936—Schedule of Pastoral Improvement—Return, 1985-86.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulation—Prescribed Health Centres.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulation—Annual Returns.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Meat Corporation—Triennial Review, June 1986.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GRAND PRIX TICKETS

The **Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Recreation and Sport)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.K. MAYES**: Last week the shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport, the member for Bragg, made a very serious allegation against me, as a Minister in this House. I wish to outline to the House my response to that allegation.

Early in April I made inquiries of the Grand Prix office regarding purchasing a number of gold passes for the Grand Prix. On 18 April 1986 I wrote a cheque No. 631282 for \$900 to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix, being the full price of five gold pass tickets worth \$180 each. My purchase resulted from an agreement reached with members of my family that I would purchase five tickets and be reimbursed for three of them by my brother-in-law and two of his friends. The other two would be used by myself and my wife.

Having dispatched the cheque I thought no more of the matter until the tickets were delivered to my office by an officer of the Grand Prix, who required a signature by a member of my office staff to verify that the tickets had been received. That office staff member queried the Grand Prix officer to ensure that all necessary payment had been made for the tickets, and was assured that this was the case. Without looking at the tickets in detail, I immediately dispatched three of the five to my brother-in-law, Mr Garry Burrows, with a request for payment to be made directly to me. I certainly did not notice the word 'guest' and the figure of '0.00' recorded on the tickets. I subsequently received \$180 from Mr Burrows, and a cheque for \$360 from Mrs B. Lloyd on behalf of herself and her son after her son-in-law and his wife, the two friends of Mr Burrows for whom I had originally purchased the tickets, decided against purchasing them.

The next I knew of the matter was a question put to me by the member for Bragg in this House last Thursday, 7 August, and further questions raised by his colleague, Mr Goldsworthy, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, later that day. The suggestion of the member that I had not paid for two tickets, yet had profited by selling them, was totally denied by me at that time. I immediately contacted the Grand Prix office and members of my family to ascertain the basis for the members' questions. The following emerged:

(1) All five tickets purchased by me showed 0.00 in the 'Price' column and were marked 'Guest'.

(2) The Grand Prix office received my cheque for \$900 in full payment for the five tickets.

(3) All other tickets purchased at around that time from the Grand Prix office but issued by BASS showed the same information.

(4) The reason for this was that at that stage moneys for tickets were collected by the Grand Prix office, not BASS, and the BASS computer system therefore recorded zero money received by BASS and labelled the tickets 'Guest'.

(5) This confusing feature of the ticket selling arrangements has now been rectified.

Further investigation by myself has revealed that the two tickets in question were made available to the Opposition directly or indirectly by Mrs B. Lloyd. I have sought but not obtained a full written apology from Mrs Lloyd.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not propose to let the matter rest there, however. It was clearly scurrilous and malicious of the member for Bragg to put that suggestion before this House also without taking any steps to check its accuracy. A simple telephone call to the Grand Prix office would have established that no complimentary tickets are given to any member of Parliament or Minister. This was the case for the Grand Prix last year. In fact, even the Premier paid for his ticket. Both the member for Bragg and the Leader of the Opposition should have been aware of this fact.

If asked, the Grand Prix office would also have been able to explain why tickets held by a member of Parliament showed zero price paid. The member sought not to make this call until after he had made the allegation in this House. I have since received a telex from the Grand Prix office confirming that I have not been issued with any complimentary tickets for the Grand Prix. I have also been advised by my colleague, Mr Mike Duigan, M.P., that when he contacted the Grand Prix office to book tickets he was told that by coincidence the member for Bragg had just been in to pick up tickets. Mr Duigan has checked his tickets and found that they show 'zero' in the paid column, although he paid full price. I would urge the member for Bragg, as I am sure he has already done, to check his tickets and tell this House what they show.

As for the accounting system of the Grand Prix office in its dealings with BASS, I have been advised that the office was aware of the potential confusion which could be caused by the wording on tickets and took steps to rectify it.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Samcor REPORT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is with mixed feelings that I have tabled the triennial review of the South Australian

Meat Corporation. On the one hand, the report of the review team highlights shortcomings in a range of administrative and managerial areas, and details the major reasons for losses experienced by Samcor for the past three years. On the other hand, the report provides very constructive suggestions which the review team believes can make Samcor financially viable in the longer term. Overall the report is thorough and detailed and will provide, I believe, a sound basis for future decision making at Samcor.

The problems experienced by Samcor go back many years and would be well known to most members of this House. Over the past 3½ years, this Government has pursued a policy for Samcor which is based on it being a commercial operation. Samcor's charter in fact directs it to compete on a commercial but not favoured basis with private enterprise. Despite many actions taken by the board and management to improve efficiency of operation, Samcor has made operating losses for the past three years totalling \$3.6 million.

The reasons for this trend stem not only from inefficiencies of operation, however. Climatic conditions and market fluctuations have significant effects on the day-to-day production level at the works. The recent spate of wet weather, for example, has significantly reduced throughput in the works. However, the report concludes that Samcor's continued survival is important to the South Australian meat industry, both producers and meat traders. It is also a large employer of some 650 people in the metropolitan area. For these reasons I believe that every effort must be made to meet the challenge of making Samcor viable in the long term.

The recommendations contained in the report are many and wide-ranging. Among the more significant are:

As sheep produce marginal financial results, it is recommended slaughtering be restricted to day shift without overtime and afternoon shifts.

The use of daily stand-downs would avoid the labour cost disadvantage of operating the slaughter chains at reduced capacity.

Samcor should address the implications of its ageing work force.

The collection and processing of fancy meats and offal should be a much bigger source of profit for Samcor, and current practices are in need of urgent review. Samcor could make more effective use of its load-out gang by also using one shift starting at 4 a.m.

An immediate target should be to reduce maintenance costs by 20 per cent in the high cost areas.

It is suggested that the staffing used for cleaning, courier services and the issue of uniforms be rationalised.

Samcor has extensive leased facilities and it is recommended that an in-depth review be carried out to ensure that economic rents are being charged.

There is an urgent need to streamline existing cumbersome office systems.

There are currently 17 foremen at Samcor ... the review team considers that nine foremen is adequate.

Foremen should have the authority to hire and fire employees.

... the development of a new and sound corporate plan will be an essential component in improving Samcor's competitive position.

I am confident that the problems and possible solutions highlighted in the report can be tackled in a way which will ensure that Samcor is commercially viable, but this will require full consultation with, and the support of, all the parties involved in making Samcor work.

To this end I will be encouraging the Samcor board to convene as soon as possible a forum for all appropriate

organisations to discuss in detail the recommendations and convey their views to me. This will assist me to bring before Cabinet comprehensive proposals for implication of changes in the methods of operation at Samcor.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: GRAND PRIX TICKETS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: The appropriate time for a personal explanation, for which I understand the member for Bragg is implying that he will seek leave, is at the conclusion of Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions, I advise that questions directed to the Premier will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

YOUTH MUSIC FESTIVAL

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Education indicate who the Government holds responsible for the financial failure of the Youth Music Festival—the Education Department, or the Jubilee 150 Board and the event sponsors? Whatever the answer, will the Minister immediately order a full and independent inquiry into his department's involvement? The Opposition has reliable information that this event, which began with a budget of \$100 000, has finished with a budget deficit approaching \$400 000.

The event was organised entirely by the Education Department as its major contribution to the Jubilee celebrations, and, as such, the Education Department must accept the full financial responsibility. However, in this morning's *Advertiser* the Premier is quoted as saying that the sponsors of the event would have to pay for cost overruns, and that the Jubilee Board had contingency funds covering all sorts of things, which suggests that the Government is once again trying to distance itself from a financial failure, as it did with the World Three Day Event.

This is despite the fact that, at the opening of the festival, the Premier was on the stage with the Director-General, and no Jubilee Board officials participated in that opening function of the Youth Music Festival, clearly indicating that it was an Education Department event. The nature of the media reports already requires that the Minister makes an immediate disclosure about the extent of the budget deficit incurred by this event and initiates a full and independent audit of his department's involvement.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Minister of Education, I would again remind the Leader of the Opposition that, although he is extended a certain amount more latitude than applies to some other members of this House, he is nevertheless not permitted to introduce comment or debate into his explanation of his question. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for raising this matter, although obviously he is not in possession of all the relevant facts. The Jubilee Education Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Jubilee 150 Board, consists of a number of senior officers of the Education Department, of the Department of Technical and Further Education but, certainly, a number of other community representatives as well.

That committee is responsible for some 1 300 official Jubilee events which are occurring in the education community of this State throughout this Jubilee year. This is one event—and I would suggest one of the very few events—where there has been a budget blow-out, and obviously there have been some problems with respect to its management. When I was advised that there were problems with this, just prior to the festival actually commencing, I asked the Education Department to take all steps necessary to minimise any losses that may occur and to give whatever additional support was necessary for that project to be a success.

I think that all members who have taken some objective interest in this quite major event would know that, indeed, it did bring great benefit to South Australia, particularly to children in this State. There were opportunities for many thousands of children to participate in the Jubilee year in a very real way and for many people, in fact, to enjoy many of the functions organised during this event.

As I have said publicly, I have called for a full report from the Education Department, which was one of the major sponsors of this event. We were pleased to be associated with it, staff were seconded to assist in its functioning, and other similar support was given. I would like also to acknowledge the very generous support given by Coca-Cola Bottlers and a number of other corporate sponsors who saw great merit and had faith in this ambitious project and have, in fact, been very generous in their support.

Also, the Jubilee 150 Board provided a substantial allocation of funds for the event. I will be examining very closely, and discussing with the Chairman of the Jubilee 150 Board and the Premier, hopefully later this week, the report that I obtained with respect to the deficit and management problems associated with the festival. I will then certainly consider whether a further independent inquiry should be held and whether we should formally ask for the involvement of, for example, the Auditor-General or other appropriate authorities to ensure that there is full accountability for the cost overruns of this project.

GARDEN ISLAND TOURIST COMPLEX

Mr De LAINE: Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of the proposed \$15 million tourist complex planned to be built on Garden Island, as announced in the *News* of 31 July 1986? If the Minister is aware, will he say whether the project has been approved by the Government and, if so, when completed how many people are expected to be employed at the complex?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Garden Island, of course, is in the Port Adelaide estuary and is separated from the mainland by the North Arm. Until the construction of the Torrens Island Power Station, it was separated from Torrens Island by Angas inlet. It was historically subjected to tidal inundation and, historically, was also a wetland mangrove area. In recent years a good deal of the island, specifically the western end I think, has been reclaimed and, of course, is subject to a good deal of human impact. Access to Torrens Island by other than water transport is across Garden Island; also, people use it for power boat activities (and I think it is used by a group called the North Arm Club, which is situated in Angas inlet).

Despite the considerable modification of the environment of the island as a result of this reclamation, it remains in a very fragile area. In fact, honourable members will probably know that it is adjacent to the Magazine Creek area, which was subject to some pollution from a misadventure last year. At this stage my department has nothing formally

before it. Therefore, it is very difficult for me to comment on the employment implications of such a project, or indeed on how we would properly handle such a project. I remind honourable members that a number of mechanisms are available to us in the Planning Act, including section 50 and the possible use of the environmental impact statement and assessment, if it can be demonstrated that approval for such a project would be such as to lead to some considerable environmental impact. I assure the honourable member that the matter will be dealt with properly under legislation when we have something specific before us.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BUDGET

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Why did the Minister of Education repeatedly tell the media yesterday that the Opposition's exposure of a massive budget blow-out in the reorganisation of the Education Department was the first that he had heard of the problem when the President of the South Australian Primary Principals Association, Mr Alec Talbot, has informed the Opposition that at a general meeting of the association in April the Minister admitted being aware of a blow-out and that figures of \$6 million, \$7 million or \$8 million were being used?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: This matter was certainly raised with me at the public meeting, and indeed many figures were floated around at that time. In fact, at the meeting I voiced my concern that there were allegations of this type in the community. No-one has ever said to me that there is a blow-out of \$8 million in the budget, as the Opposition education spokesman has said. I have denied that there is proof of that, as I said at the meeting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I invite the Opposition spokesman on education to go along to the Public Accounts Committee and show it his evidence for the allegation that there has been a budget blow-out of \$8 million.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I have not said that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. At the moment members are listening to a response to a question that was directed to the Minister of Education, and that is not intended to be accompanied by private conversations between the Deputy Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Coles.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The restructuring of the Education Department, which was a policy implemented by a Government of members opposite (and was in fact initiated by the member for Mount Gambier when he was Minister of Education, and was then adopted by the Bannon Government and my colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education when he was Minister) has been proceeding now for many years. From time to time people have attributed various positives or minuses to the reorganisation of the Education Department, and certainly the President of the Primary Principals Association has, from time to time, raised his concerns about that. Equally, there are many people who would say that many advantages have come to those in our State who benefit from the education system because of the reorganisation.

I have said a number of times that that is something of which we need to be constantly aware: that, when such a large reorganisation takes place, it is monitored, and that it is ensuring that there is a better delivery of services. The

Education Department is the single largest employer in this State. It is a very large bureaucracy, and it always needs to maintain effectiveness and efficiency. That is one of the policies under which this Government went to the people last year—to provide efficiency, excellence and equity in education.

I once again challenge the Opposition to produce evidence of its very serious allegations against the management of funds in the Education Department. Yesterday I sought advice from the Auditor-General regarding whether or not he had any concerns about over-expenditure of this type in any of the budgets of the Education Department. I am pleased to say that the Auditor-General was able to confirm that the department's budgets and accounts were in order. However, I welcome the investigation by the Public Accounts Committee into a number of aspects of the activities of the Education Department. That is only right, proper and healthy for our education system, and it is an opportunity for the honourable member from another place to either put up or shut up in his most outrageous attacks on the education system.

Last week he said that we were going to close down schools as a result of the budget process. There is no basis in truth for that statement. In fact, the honourable member said that he was quite prepared to close down schools as long as there was community consultation. That honourable member has continued to peddle rumours without foundation on a whole series of matters with respect to schools in the education system. He does a great disservice to the very good education system that we have in this State and the tremendous commitment that is given to that system by thousands and thousands of teachers, parents and children. The honourable member also does a great disservice to his own credibility and that of his colleagues in the Opposition.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport advise the House of any possible savings to the STA if it was to adopt the old proposals, recently being peddled out in new clothing, of smaller buses for off-peak periods, the letting of tenders for bus services in outlying areas, the sale of the STA Roadliner, and the introduction of part-time work? It has been put to me that there will be few savings, if any, if the full proposals are introduced. It has also been put to me that a great deterioration would occur in the service provided to the public if private bus operators were introduced, and that that would require large subsidies or greatly increased fares to the consumers.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I noted the Opposition's tactics yesterday. As obviously this is STA week in South Australia, I should say something on behalf of the STA.

Mr S.J. Baker: How's the inquiry going?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Very well and, if the honourable member is patient, in the fullness of time he will be satisfied with the type of inquiry to be instituted in the STA. First, regarding fares, the Leader of the Opposition was quoted yesterday as saying that there had been a 71 per cent increase in fares since this Party has been in office. However, figures can be used as one wishes to use them, and I would point out that, when the Leader's Party was in office, it increased the one and two section fare by 100 per cent, the one and two zone fare by 75 per cent, and pensioner and unemployed fares by 100 per cent. If people wish to use percentages on small denominations, they can make figures say whatever they wish.

I would point out to the Leader and his colleagues that the fare box recovery in South Australia for the STA is between 25 and 30 per cent. That is the average of all the authorities that I saw when I was overseas recently. In addition, those overseas authorities, especially in America, had their own taxing powers—horror upon horror—which they used to introduce property taxes to subsidise operations. In Portland, they had pay-roll taxes to help make up the deficit, and practically all the authorities had what is known as the gas tax, which is a levy on fuel to make up the deficit. The STA fare box recovery is on the same percentage as were all the authorities that I saw overseas, so the criticisms of the STA concerning the fare box recovery are most unfair.

These hoary old chestnuts by the Opposition were trotted out yesterday. When the Liberals were in office between 1979 and 1982 they considered them and rejected them, and I suppose that the same reasons would apply for rejecting them today. Members opposite are keen on reform when in Opposition but much more tardy when in Government. I will deal with the four areas of criticism: first, with smaller buses. The full bus fleet that we have in South Australia is used fully for peak periods in the morning and evening. The Opposition says that, after the evening peak, all our large buses should be driven into the yard and the drivers transferred to smaller buses that would have to cope with the evening, and presumably weekend, demand. For people who have even a basic understanding of business management to suggest that we should have two fleets of buses means that we would never get the full use of capital plant, because at any one time half the bus fleet would remain idle.

Mr S.J. Baker: Has this matter been examined?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes; it has been examined and re-examined and each time it has been rejected, by both the Tonkin Government and this Government.

Mr S.J. Baker: What about Hong Kong?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will talk to the honourable member about Hong Kong some other time. I know of no other example in the world where the system suggested by the Opposition has been introduced with benefit to the taxpayer by reducing the subsidy required. Therefore, I merely point out that that hoary old chestnut has been considered and, with good reason, rejected.

As to letting out bus services to private tender—and the member for Florey has indicated what that means—private operators will want to be able to charge fares equivalent to the STA's, so they will need a huge subsidy. With the fare box recovery for the STA, 75 per cent of the cost has to be made up in subsidy, and it will be the same for private operators. Either they will charge the real cost of the service they provide (I have talked to them, and that would mean extremely high commuting costs for the people of Adelaide) or they will look for a Government subsidy. The truth of the matter is that they would look for Government subsidy, as has been stated publicly and as has been admitted in my discussions with people who provide commuter services. In fact, I have correspondence from people who provide commuter services seeking additional Government subsidies.

The member for Florey chaired a committee a little more than two years ago which looked at the future of the roadliner and made certain recommendations and stated that it should be given a two-year trial. Up until the last two years the roadliner showed a profit, so I do not know how getting rid of the Roadliner, which was then showing a profit, would reduce the STA's overall costs. Fortunately for Opposition members, this year it did not show a profit: it is in the red. We would be forced now, to make the charter service com-

petitive, to buy new buses, etc. That service is now part of the economy package that the STA is considering.

Turning now to part-time employment, I point out that a federal award is involved. Members opposite are going to introduce penalty clauses and permanent part-time employment, and South Australia is going to change a federal award. The last time this was suggested in Australia was in Tasmania, and bus services all over Australia stopped, because the unions, then and now, are not prepared to accept permanent part-time employment. In Government, the Liberal Party understood this, but in Opposition the Liberal Party is a little less responsible and wants to promote this matter. If ever this matter is dealt with in Australia it will be dealt with in the appropriate places. It would be futile for the South Australian Government to be even suggesting that, because it would be a form of aggravation which would cause considerable concern to my colleagues, the other Ministers of Transport around Australia, as it did when the Liberal Party was, I think, in government and this was tried in Tasmania, when everyone went out.

Do not let us theorise about this: let us be practical. Members opposite have thought about this suggestion; they have considered it and rejected it. I would be interested to find out what information they have that makes it a good idea now when it was not such a good idea when they were in Government. In fact, we have been through all this with the previous member for Davenport. It seems to me that the present Opposition spokesman for Transport, who has been interjecting frequently, is well on the way to joining his other two colleagues. It is a very good tactic by the Leader of the Opposition to give his brightest member—although I would have to question that now—the transport portfolio in the shadow Ministry, because very soon they are not in Parliament at all. I am looking forward to the member for Bragg joining his colleagues in private business again.

PORT ADELAIDE LAND SALE

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister of Marine confirm that, at the time he, as Minister of Marine, signed documents to sell three parcels of land owned by his department to a Port Adelaide hotel, the Minister was also a shareholder and trustee in the company which owns the hotel? If so, was the Minister in a conflict of interest situation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Documents in my possession show that on 2 October last year the Minister affixed his common seal to the transfer of three parcels of departmental land to Mallens Colac Hotel Pty Ltd, owners of the Colac Hotel, Port Adelaide. The cost of the land was \$75 000. The documents also show that at the time of this transaction the Minister, with Mr M.J. Young, held shares in this company in trust for the ALP. The Minister was also Secretary of the company until his resignation from that position on 15 October 1984.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is true, as the honourable member says, that I was a director of the Colac Hotel with the Port Adelaide Federal Electorate Committee, and I resigned from that position—I forget the date of my resignation. I had a \$1 share in order to become a director—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: —of the hotel, and I have since resigned my position. It is true that the directorship of the Colac Hotel approached the Department of Marine and

Harbors seeking to purchase land adjacent to the hotel that was surplus to the department's requirement. The directors negotiated with the department, the land was signed over to them, and they paid the price. That was all authorised through me.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF DONOR CARDS

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health, ascertain whether any action has been taken recently to establish a national register for people who have signed their intention on donor cards and Natural Death Act forms? Since the Natural Death Act 1983 became operative I have been requested a number of times to be a witness for persons declaring their intention. As there is no formal register, these people have expressed concern that the form could be overlooked or not complied with in circumstances beyond their control. As the majority of these people with whom I have dealt on this issue are 50 years of age or more and, as in many cases they do not have a living spouse, their expressed concern is of genuine intent. Therefore, my constituents would be pleased if the Minister would consider this matter.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question and I appreciate its importance, even if members opposite do not seem to do so. I shall be delighted to refer this question to my colleague the Minister of Health in another place and seek an urgent reply for the honourable member.

PORT ADELAIDE LAND SALE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Marine confirm, concerning the sale of the land via his department to the Colac Hotel, that this land was not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: —offered at public auction but rather that the transaction was arranged by an exchange of letters? If that is so, will the Minister explain why the transaction was undertaken in this way?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The transaction was undertaken in accordance with Government policy and that was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The land was offered to the local government authority, which expressed no interest in it whatever. It had no opposition to the purpose for which the Colac Hotel required the land, and the transaction was carried out in accordance with Government policy and was all above board.

FRUIT EXPORTS

Mr RANN: Can the Minister of Agriculture advise what potential there is for the expansion of exports of South Australian fruit to South-East Asia and Japan? Recently, when visiting Malaysia, I was advised by the Australian Trade Commissioner and others, that Malaysia offered prospects of significant increases in the sale of oranges and other fruit produce from South Australia. I was also advised that our export program was being frustrated by lack of follow-through by some exporters, thereby giving an advantage to our competitors, including United States and Florida oranges.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I spent about a week in Japan with the Senior Horticultural Export Officer, Mr Ian Lewis, and two days in Singapore. Later, I met representatives from the EEC in Brussels and discussed the issue of potential for horticultural product exports from South Australia. Also, we met representatives of Sainsbury's, in London, to discuss the potential for horticultural exports to those supermarkets, and that, I think, is one of our greatest potentials in the United Kingdom market.

We face many problems in entering, penetrating and holding a permanent share of the horticultural export market. Some relate to shipping space and air space and need to be urgently addressed, and the current national and State horticultural export committees will be addressing those problems with industry representatives. In fact, this morning I met with the South Australian Horticultural Export Committee and discussed those problems which we have assessed to exist in the Asian and European markets and which prevent access to those markets for South Australian commodities or products.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Mitcham obviously has not done his homework. It is one minor problem in the whole array of complaints that we receive from Japan, from South-East Asia and from Europe. Major problems include the consistency and quality of supply, the style in which our products are packed and arranged, the number of exporters who operate in the area and the need for our producers to come to understand the quality of product required by Japanese, Singaporean or Malaysian consumers in their own markets.

We need to address those problems. One of the minor issues raised was the disputes that occur on our waterfront or in our shipping docks in Australia.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Eyre seems to be an expert on it. I do not think he is, or that he has done his homework on this. I met leaders of industry from all levels and had the opportunity to explore extensively questions in relation to their demands and needs. I think the message is loud and clear and I reiterate it. This is supported by people such as Westbrook Haines, who is probably well known to those who bother to listen and who are in the know as Mr Kiwi Fruit, an expert in gaining access for horticultural products and the person who initiated the New Zealand break into the horticultural market.

One important factor is to get producers in South Australia—and nationally, I believe—to understand the demands placed upon the products and the desires of consumers in overseas markets for the type of commodity we can produce. That needs to be urgently addressed and, certainly, it has the support of many people within the industry who have expertise in the area.

In summary, we have a great potential to develop permanent markets. We have problems to overcome. Some of them I have mentioned, and others include fruit-fly infestation in various parts of Australia, a problem that tends to worry the Japanese, who do not understand the States issue and the fact that South Australia is free of fruit-fly. We have to explain that to them and develop techniques, which are currently being worked on, to enable us to provide access to those markets for our commodities. We have a great potential for permanent supply to those Northern Hemisphere markets.

NATIONAL TRUST

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say what representation he has made to the Federal Government on behalf of the National Trust of South Australia in support of the case lodged by the Australian Council of National Trusts with the Commissioner of Taxation seeking relief from the fringe benefits tax and, if the Minister has not already made representations to his federal colleagues, will he do so? Whilst the total cost to the trust on a national basis is estimated as being at least \$200 000, the cost to the trust in South Australia of the fringe benefits tax on just four of its historic showplace properties is reckoned to be in the region of \$8 000, with the total cost in South Australia being nearer \$20 000.

The trust would be severely handicapped by such a financial burden, and access to and security of such places as Ayres House, Beaumont House at Beaumont, Collingrove at Angaston and the former vice regal residence, Marble Hill, could be placed at risk. This would not only make priceless national assets vulnerable but it would also diminish the focus of attention which such places give to the various tourism regions in which they are located.

The trust regards as inequitable the taxing of volunteer management committee's time, work and initiative on behalf of the State and the nation. Trust members and all those concerned with our heritage look to the Government for vigorous support for the trust's case for exemption from the tax.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have had various discussions with Mr Lewis, the President of the National Trust, about tax relief for people who hold heritage items. As the honourable member would probably be aware, this is a matter that this Government has raised with Canberra, also in relation to the related matter of the ownership of land which is under heritage agreement for native vegetation, and the like. I do not recall any direct representations from the trust about the particular aspect of this matter raised by the honourable member. I will search the correspondence just to—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member always likes to jump in first. I was working towards some sort of reasonable answer to her question, if she would be a little patient. As I was saying, I will search the correspondence to determine whether or not a direct approach has been made to me by the National Trust. As I say, I do not recall the matter being raised with me by Mr Lewis in any recent discussions that we have had. I will also have the legislation examined to determine whether what the honourable member has said seems feasible under the legislation or indeed achievable under any sort of reasonable amendment to it. I am quite happy to keep the honourable member informed on the progress in this matter.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NOISE CONTROL ACT

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say when the Government will introduce amendments to the Noise Control Act to provide protection to residential zones which abut commercial zoned areas? This is very much a vexed question, not only within my district but also, I understand, for my colleagues in other parts of Adelaide. I have received complaints from many residents

who live in my district and who are having excess noise difficulties with a well-known establishment. The Minister will recall that on 27 March I wrote to him stating what I considered to be deficiencies in regard to the Noise Control Act, and I went on to say:

For example, under the existing Act [the establishment in question] is in a commercial zoned area and at the boundary of the commercial area and the residential zone the prescribed maximum permissible level of noise is prescribed as 60 decibels. If one moves further away into the residential area the maximum permissible noise is still 60 decibels.

Moreover, in this case my constituents' houses are separated by only the West Lakes waterway which provides little or no reduction in the noise level from [the establishment] *vis-a-vis* a normal situation where buildings, houses, etc., effectively assist in reducing the decibel readings.

While I am aware that the noise control section of the Department of Environment and Planning has had ongoing discussions with the establishment in question and it is doing its best to overcome the problems brought to me by my constituents, I ask when the Act will be amended to provide the necessary safeguards for my constituents who have been, I suggest, more than patient in putting up with this problem over many months.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is the Government's intention in this session to bring down legislation along the lines canvassed by the honourable member. I have no intention of being presumptive as to the decision of Parliament in the light of such a Bill being put before Parliament. However, should such legislation be successful in its passage it will, I believe, secure the objects that the honourable member expects of it. I am fully aware that this sort of problem exists from time to time. It is something that I think, in future, possibly can be avoided by trying to ensure that zoning, as understood in the traditional Planning Act way, takes account of problems that can arise where one has a residential area cheek by jowl with either an industrial or commercial area.

In fact, the member for Bright has inherited from me such a situation in the southern part of his constituency. Since the member for Albert Park was coy as to the nature and name of the establishment to which he refers, I will respect that and not be specific, except to point out that my departmental officers have investigated the situation and find that it is quite clear that no action can be taken in the form of the legislation as it exists because this establishment, being in a commercially zoned area, is required only to adhere to the 60 dBA limit. Again, I do not wish to be presumptive, but following the passage of legislation it would be not unreasonable for the prevailing residential 45 dBA standard to apply. I understand it would also be not unreasonable in terms of the normal activities of this establishment that that happen, anyway. Thereby, the honourable member and his constituents, and many others, will receive some appropriate relief.

FRUIT JUICE

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: My question is directed to the Deputy Premier, representing the Premier. In view of concerns in the Riverland that the sales tax exemption on fruit juice containing more than 25 per cent Australian juice may be removed, and a statement by the Riverland Development Council (which was appointed by this Government) that many growers would be wiped out by such a move, what specific submissions has the South Australian Government made to the Federal Treasurer to oppose removal of these exemptions, and what guarantees can the Minister give that they will remain in place?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not have that specific information. I will obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

DAYS ROAD SOCIAL CLUB

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I direct my question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Mr Gunn: Are we going to have another aquatic centre?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: What action, if any, does the Minister propose to take in relation to a report by Mr Gordon Harrison to the Racecourse Development Board regarding an organisation known as the Days Road Social Club Incorporated? For a number of years the Days Road Social Club Incorporated has held a lease from the Enfield council for some 16 hectares of land at Angle Park. There is also in effect a deed of licence between the social club and the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club. Mr Harrison's report refers to inequities that exist with the present arrangements and recommends that certain action be taken for more reasonable and equitable arrangements to be made by all parties concerned. He also recommends that if this does not happen the matter should be subject to legislation.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: During the honourable member's question I heard the member for Eyre ask whether it was going to be another aquatic centre. I say again that this shows the knocking attitude of the Opposition in relation to the success that has been achieved by the Government. It is quite obvious—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. Barracking from members on my left is most out of order and, in particular, it is very much out of order for a member to start thumping the desk.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The aquatic centre is another success of this Government which has been acknowledged by interstate and overseas competitors and coaches. It was one of the efforts of the former Minister that has not been noted again by the Opposition in its attempt to be a pack of knockers.

In relation to the Angle Park greyhound club and the Days Road social club, the honourable member referred to Mr Harrison's report, which was presented on 21 April 1986 and is currently with the Racecourse Development Board. I intend to wait for a response from the board concerning the matters raised by Mr Harrison. It is most appropriate that the board address the issues in the report (and the report deals with several serious issues) and I will then act, given the consideration by the board and its recommendations to me.

SMALL BORE RIFLE RANGE

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport confirm that the feasibility study conducted by his department into small bore rifle sites has recommended the extension of the Virginia range? I understand that the Glenelg site was scrapped several months ago after discussions with the Department of Aviation, that the possible use of the Beverley pughole site was rejected, and that the existing State-owned Virginia range is now to be extended and upgraded to provide for small bore rifle shooting.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have not yet had the opportunity of seeing the report, although I understand that it has been completed. I have discussions planned with the Small Bore Rifle Association, I think for tomorrow, and, until I have seen and digested that report and have had

discussions, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the matters raised. We have looked at several sites and have been through the process originally, as I explained last week in reply to a question, in regard to the West Beach site. I referred to the confusion thrown on us as a consequence of the initial approval in principle from the Department of Aviation which was later rescinded when it was asked whether it supported having such a development on the West Beach site.

As a consequence of that decision from the Department of Aviation, for which we waited seven months, we had to review our position and facilities, and have done so. I indicated also in reply to the honourable member's question the costs of the feasibility study of all of these facilities, which costs are minor in terms of the overall cost of the project. We have considered various locations, which have been considered and referred to in the report to me, but I have not seen it as yet. However, I will do so within the next 24 hours and, hopefully, in discussions with the Small Bore Rifle Association we can come to a speedy conclusion.

CIGARETTE SMOKING

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Education investigate the problem of cigarette smoking among schoolchildren in South Australian schools with a view to making cigarettes less freely available to under-aged smokers? I have received the following letter from the Principal of a high school in my district:

Recently this school was included as part of a survey of some 650 schoolchildren's smoking habits, conducted by the Health Promotion Branch of the South Australian Health Commission. Besides reconfirming the disturbing finding previously found in other South Australian surveys that nearly 40 per cent of 14 and 15 year olds smoke, it was discovered that some 57 per cent of smoking children had bought new packets of 15 cigarettes in the past month. As someone concerned about the growth and development of children, I find this development most serious. It seems clear that these small packs have been introduced by the Philip Morris company as an obvious marketing tactic with children. In fact, their low price and the concealability were given as the main reasons for purchase by the majority of those who had bought them. I am writing as an expression of community support for any moves you may be considering to take in the control of smoking with children.

My constituent suggests three possible solutions, the first of which relates to the price of the item, the second to banning the sale of cigarettes in packs of less than 20, and the third to taking action under the policing powers to ensure that delicatessen owners, and the like, do not sell cigarettes to minors. Will the Minister investigate this problem and consider the three solutions suggested by my constituent?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which raises an issue of considerable importance to the community and, I am sure, to all members. As he has indicated, an inquiry has already been conducted and much work done both in the Education Department and in the Health Commission concerning preventative measures and deterrents and, indeed, a broad based education program to discourage young people from smoking. The figures referred to by the honourable member indicate that this is a matter of sufficient importance and incidence in the community to raise our concern and that we should perhaps be pursuing further measures.

This matter was the subject of legislation, I think about 12 months ago, when administrative responsibilities for policing the legislation were rearranged and additional provisions were added to the existing legislation concerning the sale of cigarettes to minors. Perhaps it is a little too early to judge the effectiveness of that legislation or to say whether

it should be further reviewed, but certainly, in conjunction with the Minister of Health, I shall be happy to consider further the matters referred to by the honourable member's constituent. The Minister of Health has developed a wide-ranging strategy to discourage smoking not only by children but by all people in the community. Indeed, I have seen some effective television advertisements and other advertising material aimed especially at young people. I suggest that an effective campaign is already under way in this State. Once again, we need to assess its effectiveness, what we can learn from it, and what additional measures can be undertaken.

This matter cannot be simply resolved by legislation or indeed by development of Government policies and strategies: it must be embraced by the whole community, especially parents, and there must be an education process within the home as well as in the schools and in the broader community. I very much commend those schools that have taken up educative programs within the general thrust of their curriculum and general programs, as well as the Health Commission on the vigorous way in which it has embarked on a preventive campaign in this important area of community health.

LICENSING COURT

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Education ask his colleague the Attorney-General to investigate and report on the reason for delays in decisions being arrived at on matters currently before the Licensing Court? I am informed by a South Australian company manager representing an applicant for a tavern licence that there have been extended delays in decisions being made by the Licensing Court. Extremely few decisions appear to have been made over the past year or longer, and these delays are obviously proving costly to investor applicants such as this one who have had land and finance committed to projects for a long while.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I trust that the honourable member is not reflecting on the Judiciary. Neither the Attorney-General nor the Government treads into the domain of the Judiciary regarding the way in which judges make their decisions. However, it is obviously in the community's interest that, if there is an undue delay or if other problems occur regarding the proper administration of justice, that matter should be the concern of the Attorney-General, and I will ensure that the honourable member's concerns are passed on to my colleague.

LIFE JACKETS

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Marine review the safety regulations governing the provision of life jackets for children on houseboats? This problem involves the situation where houseboats are hired, which is a common and popular practice in South Australia. One of my constituents who hired a houseboat for a family holiday has told me that he was alarmed to find that there was no life jacket on board that he considered suitable for use by young children. Although the correct number of life jackets was provided, apparently no account was taken of the fact that some of the passengers were children.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The honourable member has asked whether I will review the regulations in relation to this matter. Quite frankly, I do not think that is necessary, because in South Australia we adopt the USL standard for

life jackets on houseboats and other craft, and I refer to the uniform shipping laws, which are determined by a national authority. That code specifies coastal life jackets for houseboats, and I understand such life jackets are of only one size, with long cords enabling adjustment to bodies of different size.

I would be happy to have the marine surveyors examine this matter to ensure proper life jacket sizes for houseboats. It is the responsibility of the houseboat operator to provide life jackets, and it is also the responsibility of the hirer to make sure that the operator has the correct type of life jacket. The life jackets are not meant to be worn continuously on the houseboat, but are meant to be used in an emergency, and if they are worn continually on the houseboat they could deteriorate with wear and tear and become useless for the purpose they are intended. I shall be pleased to have the surveying officers investigate this matter and ensure that suitable sizes for children are available.

EYRE PENINSULA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise this House on the progress being made on the construction of the Eyre Peninsula Community College at Port Lincoln and say whether the project is on schedule, bearing in mind the delays that have occurred, as a result of the wet weather, in the pouring of slabs, etc. More particularly, does the Minister expect that the courses planned for next year will be taken in the new complex?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can advise that the project is, by and large, running to schedule, although weather conditions have delayed some of the work. I recently had the opportunity to visit Port Lincoln and to see not only a number of other very interesting features in the city but also the progress on the building site. On that day they were getting ready to pour much of the concrete slab work for the main building. That has since taken place and I believe that the concrete slab work is two-thirds completed, with preparations now being made for the structures to be built on top of the concrete slab.

At this stage we anticipate that work will be completed by September next year at the latest, although we are not necessarily anticipating that courses will be commencing in the building at the end of 1987: at this stage we are scheduling a start in 1988. The simple reason for that is that many of the courses will require equipment to be fitted on site in the new building and, although you can install filing cabinets, desks and chairs over the weekend, you cannot install some of the heavy equipment quite so quickly. It would be fair to say that we are really operating on a 1988 start for the course work in that college, with a September 1987 completion of the building. I can assure the honourable member that, if it is possible to do anything earlier, we will certainly endeavour to do so. However, progress is roughly on schedule, and I am certain that students and staff at that college will be pleased to move into their new premises from 1988.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: GRAND PRIX TICKETS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr INGERSON: I would like to make two points: first, to clarify the position that led to the asking of a question last Thursday, and, secondly, to comment on the ministerial statement where I believe there has been misinformation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: My comments are in relation to misinformation in the ministerial statement. Last week the Opposition was approached by the holder of two Grand Prix passes which had been purchased by cheque made payable to the Minister. The tickets were marked 'Guest' and allocated no price: on the face of it, they were complimentary tickets. All I asked the Minister to do last Thursday was explain the circumstances in which those tickets were obtained and sold: there was no allegation in this House. All the Minister had to do was put the facts before the House, as he saw them, and as he has done today. Rather than do that, the Minister, outside this House last Thursday night, had an officer of his department make a telephone call demanding the return of the gold passes. On Friday a lawyer's letter was written threatening legal action against a member of the public for presenting the facts, as the person concerned saw them, to the Opposition. In relation to the ministerial statement today, I would like to make a couple of comments.

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member to adhere more closely to what is involved in making a personal explanation from his belief that he has been misrepresented.

Mr INGERSON: I was just—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has not yet finished. The honourable member will resume his seat until the Chair has finished speaking. The honourable member certainly cannot, by way of introduction to his personal explanation, say that he is going to comment on what the Minister may or may not have said; he can merely point out where he has been misrepresented.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Labour to order.

Mr INGERSON: The statement was made that the Grand Prix office had issued tickets with similar information at that time. The BASS ticket people were issuing two sets of tickets at that time—one marked 'Guest' with '00' shown on it and one marked 'GP', also with '00' on it. That statement needs correction, having been checked by me yesterday with both BASS and the Grand Prix office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: As to the ticket selling arrangements having been rectified, that is not the case: they are still exactly the same as they were at that time. I am sorry that the member for Adelaide is not here, but I would like to correct the statement attributed to him, by saying that I do not have any tickets to the Grand Prix, nor have I received any tickets from the Grand Prix office. On behalf of the Opposition, three weeks ago I telephoned Dr Hemmerling and asked him if the conditions that applied in the previous year for the purchase of tickets would be the same. Dr Hemmerling advised me to arrange, on behalf of the Opposition, for any member who wished to purchase tickets and they would be charged through his office at \$180. I would like to reaffirm that: no tickets have been purchased by me or, on my behalf, by any member of the Opposition, and that is quite contrary to the statement emanating from Mr Duigan in the ministerial statement. I have no tickets.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave was granted to the member for Bragg to make a personal explanation, not for any other member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BUDGET

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In my reply to a question by the member for Light earlier today I may have said that I had contacted the Auditor-General with respect to allegations that there had been a massive \$8 million budget blow-out in the Education Department. In fact, I had had contacted the senior auditor responsible for the Education Department and not the Auditor-General personally, and I believe I should make that clear to members.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): By leave, and pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972, I move:

That the members of this House appointed to the Public Accounts Committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House today.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for all stages of the following Bills:

- (1) Agent-General Act Amendment Bill,
- (2) Statutes Amendment (Rural and Other Finance) Bill,
- (3) Supply Bill (No. 2),
- (4) Planning Act Amendment Bill (No. 4),

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 7 August. Page 200.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Last Thursday I was speaking in this debate about trade unions and industrial matters and I intended to continue to speak on that matter, but today I would like to speak on a different topic because since last Thursday I have received from a constituent a letter allegedly signed by Bill Hayden, Commissioner for Foreign Affairs, on the letterhead with 'Australian Commonwealth' printed on the top and headed 'Commissioner for Community Relations, ACT'. A reference number is shown, and the address provided is the Commonwealth Bureau for Community Relations, Canberra, ACT. The letter is addressed to one of my constituents. Surprisingly it was sent in an envelope bearing the words 'South Australian Government' and was posted in Wayville. Probably the worst piece of racist material that I have seen for many years, the letter states:

The Australian Department of Commonwealth Relations has elected you as a participating household in our new 'lend a helping hand plan'.

The letter continues:

... [you] have been assigned a typical group from Vietnam to be guests in your home for the next few weeks.

It also states:

To ensure you are able to make the necessary accommodation arrangements the family will consist of father, mother, five children, wife's brother, husband's grandmother and her sister.

The letter also points out how people can obtain portable toilets, stretchers and tents from a certain company, indicates that people will be able to obtain recipes for food for their guests from Vietnam, and states:

So as not to inconvenience you, we shall supply adequate supplies of curry powder, rice, chicken and powdered goats milk. If approval can be obtained from council, we hope to be able to provide you with two milking goats to ensure that fresh milk can be made available to the family. Free immunisation will be given to you and your family against typhus, cholera, tuberculosis and leprosy.

The letter continues:

No doubt you will want to meet them at the airport. We suggest you hire a mini bus for this happy occasion.

The letter is signed:

'God bless you; Yours in friendship,
B. Hayden, Commissioner for Foreign Relations'.

This is one of the worst pieces of racist material that I have seen in some time with its bucketing of the Vietnamese community in South Australia.

The constituent who approached me is an elderly lady and was most distressed about having received this so-called letter. She said that she had approached a number of Government departments because she was distressed that she would have to try to provide this accommodation, and so forth, for these people. Obviously, this letter comes from a neo-fascist group that is distributing this information. From talking to some of my federal colleagues, I understand that this literature has been around for some time. Certainly, it is alarming that we have such fascist people and bigots—the worst racists in the community—peddling this garbage throughout South Australia.

It is worth while for the responsible Minister in South Australia to investigate the use of South Australian Government envelopes in the distribution of this racist material in the community. I believe the Minister should try to track down these people and prosecute them, because I do not believe there is any room in the South Australian community to have this racist element peddling such garbage and trash around the community and causing such unnecessary concern.

It may well mean that this letter, falsely printed under the name of 'B. Hayden, Commissioner for Foreign Affairs', contravenes the Post and Telegraphs Act, and if that is so I hope that these people can be prosecuted in due course. I am concerned that this activity has been going on for some time. These gutless wonders out in the community are not willing to stand up and be counted or show their faces. Instead, they sneak around like the scum they are, peddling this sort of rubbish in the community to cause unnecessary concern.

This is not the first time that we have heard such statements about people from Asia. Indeed, many years ago, when I was a young buck, the post-war migration scheme commenced in this country and similar activity was directed to people from the Baltic countries and subsequently to other immigrants from Europe. In condemning these racists with all the strength I have, I refer to the magnificent contribution to Australia by migrant groups not just in terms of their industrious way of life but also because they have contributed greatly to our country's increase in wealth. I have mixed with many migrant groups over the years, both before and since coming into Parliament, and I speak of their contribution from experience.

I believe every member of this House acknowledges the tremendous contribution made by all sections of the migrant community in Australia, particularly South Australia. I have learnt a great deal from many migrant groups, especially those within my electorate. Certainly, I have enjoyed their company frequently. I hold no truck with this racist rabble out in the community and I hope that the Minister responsible in South Australia—I believe it is the Minister of Transport—will look at this matter of the use of South Australian Government envelopes.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I first endorse the view expressed by some of my colleagues in that I trust that the Government will invite His Excellency to accept a second term as Governor of South Australia. The manner in which His Excellency and Lady Dunstan have undertaken their viceregal duties, particularly in this our Jubilee year, has been a great tribute to them as much as it has been a great service to the State of South Australia. They have discharged their duties with dignity. They have re-established the role of Governor and restored public respect for and confidence in that high office. As a result, they have earned the admiration and respect of all sections of the South Australian community.

His Excellency's speech began by attributing to the Commonwealth responsibility for this Government's economic and financial problems. However, the Premier's own inability and unwillingness to recognise and respond to the growing economic difficulties South Australia faces are becoming more apparent each day. He turns a Nelson's eye to them. He does not want to see the rising unemployment figures, the growing number of bankruptcies, and the decline in car and retail sales. I suggest that he might turn to Abraham Lincoln for some advice. The first American President once said:

I am a firm believer in the people. If given the truth, they can be depended upon to meet any national crisis. The great point is to bring them the real facts.

I know that last Thursday in this House, in response to the latest grim news about the State economy, the Premier said that all South Australians must pull together; that we should have consensus so that we can confront our problems together.

When I heard that, I thought for one moment that the Premier was a ventriloquist's dummy. After all, talk about consensus and about coming together is something we have heard many times before from someone else—from our Prime Minister. What has the Hawke brand of consensus led to? It has led to the highest taxes in our history, the highest interest rates since the Great Depression, the lowest value for our currency ever—some trilogy! When the Premier talks vaguely about consensus now, he should define the principles around which he wants to build consensus. I suggest that what he needs to be talking about now, certainly, is what the Federal Treasurer is seeking: strict limits on Government spending, significant wage restraint, and lower expectations about what governments can and should do.

I have no disagreement with those principles, but let it be recognised that when, over the last three years, the Liberal Party has stood on those principles we have been described as the practitioners of confrontation rather than consensus by people like the Premier, who wanted Australians to believe that they could live in an Alice in Wonderland of bigger government with lower taxes and rising living standards with less work and effort.

Now that the election is over things, of course, are quite different. Taxes and charges are going up again, the spending

cuts are being implemented, the promises are being jettisoned—and the Premier is still calling for consensus. I put the Premier on notice now that the judgment the people and the Liberal Party will make about his Government will be based on the comparison between what he promised at the election and what he delivers, and it is no good the Premier saying now that things have changed; that the Commonwealth has tightened the purse strings; that the economy has deteriorated. All the signs were there before the election, yet the Premier went on promising and promising, and criticising the Liberal Party for an alternative base on less government spending and lower taxes.

The Premier will have to learn that facts do not cease to exist simply because they are ignored. The economic indicators may have been ignored by many people at the last election, but what they meant then and what they are resulting in now remain reality, and nothing the Premier says or does can alter that. There will be no consensus from the Liberal Party when the Government breaks election promises; when the interest rates remain high; when the dole queues lengthen. We will criticise the Government for that, because that is not only our right but our responsibility.

Let me also look at this question of consensus in a wider sense. In this our Jubilee year we all need to recognise that South Australia is at a crucial turning point in our economic history. We also all need to recognise what needs to be done now to turn our economy in the right direction. As we look at our economic history, we can conclude that, over the last 50 years in particular, a significant Government role in the State's economy has been established and generally accepted, and more and more people have become dependent upon Government.

It is, of course, one of those quirks of history that it was a Liberal Premier who started us down that road. It was Playford who took a State lacking in natural resources and apparent advantages of location for industry and gave South Australia's future a whole new dimension. He gave the State a power system, a water network and a Housing Trust. That was a response to the economic circumstances of almost 50 years ago, when Australia believed that it could develop and prosper insulated from international economic factors and pressures.

That is no longer the position. Our floating currency, apart from anything else, has changed everything, so in this our Jubilee year, while we celebrate the past, let us all agree that for the future there must be some fundamental changes. In the context of consensus the House will recall that Playford's policies were generally supported by the Labor Party at the time. At the time that Playford was putting those policies forward for the expansion of the South Australian economy—and there can be no doubt that Playford laid a very solid foundation for this State—the policies of the Liberal Party were supported in basic terms by the Labor Party.

I trust that it may now be possible to forge a consensus based on a common understanding and acceptance of the new conditions and the new challenges that we face. I throw out that challenge to the Premier and his Government: will they grasp the new reality, the need for some far-reaching changes in attitude and in added action? I hope that all members will accept in these days of dollar shock and trade trauma that, even at the State Government level, action is possible to free up the economy so that it is more responsive to the opportunities of tomorrow, because a deregulated and more competitive State economy, with less government interference and fewer burdens on industry, is essential if we are to confront what is the key issue in South Australia's economic future: our ability to increase our exports, espe-

cially into the massive potential markets of the Asian Pacific region.

An export led diversification of our economy over the remaining years of this century can be achieved through a cooperative approach by the public and private sectors in confronting the underlying difficulties our economy faces. In a more immediate sense, there should be agreement amongst members of the House on a wage, industrial and fiscal policy which includes the following key elements based on some fundamental changes in attitude: a wage freeze until at least mid-1987; opposition to the ACTU superannuation push; scrapping of the fringe benefits tax, capital gains tax, superannuation lump sum tax and assets test; no real increase in Federal and State Government spending for three years; the introduction of a compulsory work-for-the-dole scheme. Also, at the State level, the Government not proceed with its current proposals to impose changes in workers compensation and industrial safety laws which will only increase costs and union power at the expense of jobs.

Any realistic plan to deal with our immediate difficulties must include that action, action put by the Liberal Party at its Federal council meetings, action endorsed by Liberal leaders around Australia consistently over the last six months at meetings of those leaders. Where do the Premier and Government stand? They have supported in full the union wages and superannuation push. The Government went before the Arbitration Commission during the last national wage case to do so. On the Federal Labor Government's new tax measures—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The way the economy is going under Labor policies there will not be any company profits in the next 12 months to two years, let me assure the honourable member of that.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Obviously the member's lack of business skills is really coming to the fore. The honourable member is not aware that financial balance sheets usually work about 12 months behind the real impact. Let us look at the balance sheets next year at 30 June and the year after that, and we will see the net effect of Labor's policies nationally on the economy and on company profits in this country. That is why the unemployment rate is starting to rise in South Australia—because the net effect of Labor's policies is starting to bite where it hurts: the small business operators in this country. On the Federal Labor Government's new tax measures, we have heard support from the Premier only—support for the fringe benefits tax, support for the capital gains tax in particular and at the last tax summit.

In relation to the fringe benefits tax, I note that the Premier started to retreat today after every other Labor leader in the country was prepared to stand up and say that the fringe benefits tax needs a major review. However, our Premier meekly and mildly comes in as tail end Charlie, having been dragged there and having been embarrassed into a position of having to take on his Federal colleagues on the net effect of the fringe benefits tax and its impact on the community.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, he is a 'Johnny-come-lately' Premier. The sad fact for South Australia is that the fringe benefits tax will have a disproportionate effect on our State—a worse effect than that on any other State in Australia. We now have tail-end Charlie standing up for the interests of South Australia. Only today did we see some retreat from that position of last week when the Premier of South Australia said that Brian Burke was on some futile exercise in trying to amend the fringe benefits tax. It is futile all right,

because Brian Burke now has Bob Hawke and Paul Keating admitting that some changes are needed. So much for the acumen of the Premier of South Australia, and so much for his ability to stand up and fight for South Australians.

We saw this Government in its first term increase Government spending by more than 52 per cent, which is well over twice the rate of inflation. In relation to workers compensation and industrial safety, we have had only more sell-out to what amounts to union demands. The unions oppose people doing some form of work in return for the dole—even those people who are willing and indeed anxious to undertake such work. With union opposition, this Government's opposition automatically follows. It is interesting to note the public reaction and support for the 'work for the dole' scheme being implemented in this country. It is a scheme that the Liberal Party supports, and I support it. The reality we now face—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: There is no doubt that the majority of Australians support that principle. The reality we now face is that nationally there is continuing uncertainty about our economic future, highlighted by the dramatic fall in the dollar. On a regional basis the key indicators show that South Australia's economy is declining at a faster rate than that of all the States in Australia. However, just nine months ago in his election policy speech the Premier said, 'Our recovery is a reality. It is all coming together.' So said honest John! I ask the Premier today what recovery? Report after report confirms that it is not coming together. Rather, it is falling apart. Not even the roar of the Grand Prix will drown out that message again this year. Yes, South Australia is leading — it is leading the national economic decline.

Let the House consider the following key indicators. In relation to the labour force, South Australia's unemployment rate is above the national average. In relation to growth in employment over the past 12 months, it is at the lowest level of all the States. The teenage unemployment rate is 22.7 per cent—the highest of all the States. In relation to bankruptcies, South Australia faces more than 1 000 bankruptcies in our Jubilee year—the most since the great depression. Yet a member opposite has the hide to say that company and small business profits are up in this country and in this State at the moment. The member should look at the statistics, which prove him quite wrong.

In relation to capital investment, the latest figures indicate a 16 per cent downturn for South Australia, which is the worst record of any State. Falling investment means fewer jobs for the future. Interest rates are high and likely to climb yet again, because of the continuing exchange rate crisis induced by a lack of confidence in Labor's economic policies. The average family, as well as businessmen and businesswomen, is bearing the brunt. For those who can still afford to contemplate home ownership, taking out an average home loan today will cost \$28 a week more than it did a year ago. We all remember Labor's promises that interest rates would fall and that the ceiling on rates would remain. That was quite specific during the election campaign, and it was quite clear. Those promises meant as much as the Premier's promise not to increase taxes. Interest rates are now 3 per cent higher than they were a year ago.

I note that the member for Fisher laughs at that: he laughs at the promise given by the Premier and the Prime Minister during the election campaign—a promise subsequently broken with interest rates going up 3 per cent. I suggest to the member for Fisher that he does a little doorknocking in his electorate, which is a major mortgage belt area and where people on the average family income are really straining under Labor's policies. It is not only high interest rates that

have affected mortgage and home repayments, because high inflation rates have affected household budgets in the goods that they buy weekly in the supermarkets. That is not to mention Labor's taxing policies which are now costing jobs on factory floors: for example, Mitsubishi has gone back to a four-day week. What is next—a three-day week? That is a direct result of the policies which the member for Fisher stood up and supported during the last election campaign. He has subsequently sold out his electorate and has clearly broken every promise made to his constituents subsequent to that election campaign.

Mr Tyler: Who wrote this?

Mr OLSEN: The member for Fisher can laugh at these people of his electorate who are struggling to pay off their mortgages.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I am glad that the member for Fisher acknowledges that he is laughing. That is appropriate for *Hansard*. We will make sure that his constituents receive a copy.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: He's not laughing.

Mr OLSEN: He is laughing. He acknowledges that he is laughing about his constituents having to pay off their high home loan mortgage repayments under Labor. In relation to building activity, with more and more young families being denied the dream of home ownership through Labor's crippling interest rates, building approvals have gone down by almost one third in South Australia. In relation to motor vehicle sales, it is the same story—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: We had a 30 per cent decline, yet the honourable member says that we are still ahead. What an inane interjection. Let us talk about motor vehicle sales. It is the same story in motor vehicle sales, where jobs are on the line in South Australia in particular. This is where the fringe benefits tax will have a disproportionate effect in this State. It will be not only for Mitsubishi, because any member can ask any motor vehicle dealer in South Australia how many employees they have retrenched. I know of six motor vehicle dealers in one location where the number of employees has been reduced from 43 to 22 employees. That is a direct result of cost pressures that are being applied to the small business sector at the moment. That has to stop or we will see a massive escalation in unemployment. The 4 300 people who were added to the unemployment queue last month will be nothing compared to what will happen over the next six months if we do not recognise that some of the economic directions that are being implemented at the moment are quite wrong and are hurting ordinary South Australians and ordinary Australians.

In relation to motor vehicle sales, the dive in the dollar and, as I said, the fringe benefits tax have pushed registrations in South Australia to their lowest level since 1970 — the lowest level in over 16 years. In relation to the restaurant trade, the fringe benefits tax and Labor's other taxes in addition are also crippling our vital tourist industry. Lunch trade in our restaurants is down 41 per cent, and that does not only mean jobs for waiters and cooks: it includes the people who supply the fish and bread rolls, and the dry cleaners who launder the tablecloths. A whole range of industry is directly related to the restaurant trade. Retail sales, a key barometer of consumer confidence in the economy, show how uncertain consumer mood is in South Australia. Growth in retail sales in South Australia is the lowest of all mainland States.

Labor's federal and State taxes mean that consumers have less and less to spend in the way in which they choose to spend it. Over the past 18 months the family on the average

wage has lost \$27 a week in disposable income through Labor's new federal taxes, as well as the fringe benefits tax, the capital gains tax, the assets test, and the tax on superannuation lump sum payments. State taxation increased more in South Australia than it did in any other State over the past three years—more than at any time in South Australia's history. That is the track record of the current Administration. State Government revenue raising between 1981-82 and 1984-85 was up 59 per cent.

Mr Tyler: As a result of the recovery.

Mr OLSEN: If the honourable member really believes that, I suggest that he take an elementary course in accounting.

Mr Lewis: The want is to believe that the earth is flat.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is quite capable of making his contribution without assistance from anyone claiming to represent Christopher Columbus or any other person.

Mr OLSEN: In addition to that 59 per cent—a third more than the national average—the per capita State tax take last financial year was \$12.07 a week. When the Premier came to office it was \$7.37 a week. It has gone up at about twice the rate of inflation. What we are trying to do is maintain people's spending power—purchasing power. We are trying to maintain their ability to repay their home loan, buy their car, and educate their children. However, what this Government has done has reduced the capacity of family budgets to meet those commitments. It is prepared to get bigger itself and tax at twice the rate of inflation, while the average person's pay packet has not increased anywhere near the same amount. This has meant that every household budget has been shrinking as a result of the direct taxation policies of the South Australian Government.

Such a record comes as no surprise because it is what the Opposition predicted before the last election. What we said has proved to be correct. There is no doubt that the bread and circuses are over. If the Premier still believes Labor's election slogan that South Australia is up and running, he would be well advised to hang up his jogging shoes. The Premier is losing the race. South Australia is running last, and the statistics prove it. The Premier gives up and is not prepared to take up the argument with Canberra.

In Western Australia Premier Burke has admitted that Australia can no longer afford the holiday leave loading. He is prepared to lead a delegation to Canberra to lobby against the fringe benefits tax. The South Australian Government has shown no interest in coming to grips with the issues that affect ordinary South Australians. The average family trying to make ends meet has been crushed more and more by higher and higher taxes, and there is less Government consideration of the family needs.

I know that some of the options I have put forward today are difficult for the Premier to contemplate. After all, it is well understood that there is union constituency for the Government to obey. It does not want a bar of any talk about getting rid of a wage freeze, about opposition to the superannuation deal, or about work for the dole scheme. These are the hard options. I acknowledge that. However, more and more these options are becoming acceptable to ordinary Australians, who now realise that we must accept some short-term pain for long-term gain if we are to get the fundamentals right in our economy in the future, and for the well-being of my children and those of every other member of this House—the future generations of South Australians.

The results of the Sydney by-election, but a week or so ago, speak for themselves. The working-class, so called, deserted Labor in droves because enough was enough. They

simply have had the pressure that has been applied by Labor Governments. The working-class is doing the same throughout the country. They do not want to be locked into the Hawke/Keating/ACTU trilogy which serves only narrow interests at the expense of the majority of ordinary Australians.

The Premier would be doing his Government, as well as South Australia, a great favour today if he were to repudiate the statement he made on 15 November last year that Keating's economic policies are correct and need support. Since our federal Treasurer's last performance at the ALP federal conference, the dollar has dropped 5 per cent in value on a trade weighted basis. The Premier needs to endorse the proposals that I am putting forward today to show that he is also determined that this slide must stop if the living standards of all Australians are not to be permanently and irreparably reduced.

We need a wage freeze to check a new round of inflation and stop the supermarket spiral eating into the pay packet, and to give business more confidence and certainty to plan ahead and create new jobs. We need to recognise that the ACTU superannuation deal is another cost that the economy cannot afford in the present circumstances. The South Australian Government must reverse the position that it put on this case at the last national wage case hearing. We need to support the move to scrap the fringe benefits tax, the capital gains tax, the superannuation lump sum tax and the assets test. To pay for this, we need to accept that there should be no real increase in Federal-State Government spending for the next three years. Rather, Governments should look at the priorities of their spending and ensure that there is no wastage and inefficiency. We have just seen millions of dollars going down the drain at the World Three Day Event. The greater part of the overrun occurred under the administrators who were put in by the Premier, who took control of the event away from the organising committee. However, the Premier does not want to accept any responsibility for the overspending of some \$880 000 by the Grand Prix officers and Miss Davis, who set a new budget and refused to give it to the organising committee and who said that executive decisions needed to be made.

One cannot have it both ways. One cannot get all the credit and stand up front when the buck comes home to roost. We see another example today of the Youth Music Festival. Some \$400 000 was lost on that event which was organised by the Education Department, chaired by the Director of that department, and administered by a departmental officer. Already the Government is starting to say, 'This is nothing to do with us. This is a Jubilee event and the Jubilee board has to pick up the buck.' I have news for the Government: the Jubilee board will not be picking up the buck for that event. It rests fair and square with the Government administrators and the Minister of Education, who today, in answering a question, acknowledged that he had sought budget requirements from his officers relating to the event. The Minister talked so much that he talked himself right into accepting responsibility for the deficit and overrun of the Youth Music Festival. The responsibility for that rests with the Minister of Education, who had oversight of that event from day one. He admitted so today in answer to a question.

As a sign that it is prepared to be resolute to reduce, rather than increase, cost pressures on business, the South Australian Government should give an immediate commitment that it will not proceed with its current proposals to force through workers compensation industrial safety changes, no matter what union officials may say. There is

at least now one universal united view amongst interest groups that are opposed to the Government's measures.

Before the election we had from the Government full page advertisements saying that the Government and the unions could work together with business to bring in a package of workers compensation reforms that would wipe 44 per cent off premium costs on workers compensation. After the election, the Government modified its proposal a little to the extent that an independent study identified that, instead of a 44 per cent reduction in premiums there would be a 28 per cent increase in premiums.

That represents just a 72 per cent error factor regarding one piece of legislation. No wonder that all interest groups in the community representing small and big business and many other sections are totally opposed to the Government's workers compensation proposal: all that such proposals in their current form would do would be to add further to the cost of business and all structures of government including local government.

We need to instil more determination in our young people. We should also tell the Prime Minister to have the courage of his convictions for a change and proceed with the 'work for the dole' scheme. The Prime Minister's reluctance to proceed with this proposal since his address to the nation is symptomatic of the paralysis of will that is gripping the Labor Party as it confronts serious economic policies. In other words, there is crisis management of the national economy of the country at present. Decisions are being made on the run and then altered on the run. These problems are the direct result of the expectations created by Labor three years ago, but now we see the reality of the results of its policies. Labor promised more government but said that it would not need to raise taxes. It promised more money for education, for health and for welfare, but our education standards are declining, hospital waiting lists are getting longer, and poverty is increasing.

The average family, paying more and more in tax, becomes frustrated and frightened wondering where it will all end. Let us make no mistake about it: concern and anxiety are growing in the community about job security and about where the Government is going at present. Fear concerning Australia's future is gripping the community. One has only to consider the savings bank deposits, which are a direct reflection of people trying to bank against and to save against future unforeseen difficulties. It is a fear that we cannot sink with submarine deals or race away from in Grand Prix cars. It is a fear that we can alleviate only by showing to the community and to our electors that we recognise the problems and that we have the guts to do something about them. The measures that I propose will be a start.

The credibility of this Government is on the line not only because of economic failure: promise after promise in a variety of areas made at the last election is just being jettisoned. We have education cuts, the failure to reform the parole system immediately, the failure immediately to establish South Australia International to help export performance, and the failure to proceed as promised with the entertainment centre. I do not doubt that the entertainment centre will be deferred just long enough so that, two weeks before the 1989 election, it will be opened. The member for Mawson may laugh about it, but this procedure has been discussed by Caucus. We have been promised an entertainment centre, but it must be held over so that some other bread and circuses can divert the thoughts of the people from economic reality to get us over the election hump.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: You don't suggest that the Labor Party manipulates things like that, do you?

Mr OLSEN: We have seen it done in the past. The Labor Party misreads the electorate, which has had enough of that. The Government should get back to the basics, because serious problems in the community must be tackled and solved. Another promise that has been broken concerns the ever-rising taxes and charges. In this regard, about 460 charges and taxes have been increased over the past nine months. Indeed, a whole range of Government fees, taxes and charges has been increased despite promises to the contrary by the Government that it would not increase taxes and charges.

We have the failure to deliver the promised 44 per cent cut in workers compensation premiums, the failure to match health promises, and the Premier's own doubts about the submarine project even when anyone who dared question his bullish statements during the recent election campaign was condemned as being anti-South Australia. The Government's program for this session is but a pale imitation of the gloss and good times in which the Premier parcelled the Labor election campaign. However, now that the election is out of the way, he has begun to talk about the need for spending cuts, about restraint and equity to use the Prime Minister's latest vogue words. These needs were apparent long before the election, but only the Liberal Party had the courage to talk about them. The key function of the Opposition is to keep Government honest and, in the session ahead, we on this side will have little trouble in exposing the dishonesty of this Government.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I wish to refer to certain matters contained in His Excellency's opening speech. When the speech is referred to as His Excellency's speech it is often not realised that the speech is nothing more than a statement by the Government of its intended program for the coming session of Parliament. More especially, it is an opportunity to promote propaganda, involving past achievements and future hopes, before members of Parliament and the public generally. Therefore, when the speech is referred to, especially by the press, as the Governor's speech, we should realise that it is the Governor's speech written by the Government on behalf of the Government, as a publicity stunt, regardless of which Government is in office, stating what the Government has done and setting out the program of what the Government intends to try to achieve during the coming sittings.

First, I express my condolences to the relatives and friends of the late Hon. Albert Hawke, who represented Burra Burra in this Parliament for a short time, eventually becoming Premier of Western Australia. Although I did not know Mr Hawke, I knew Charlie Harrison, who was the first member for Albert Park in this Parliament. I respected him for his views, and he stuck by those views. He was a good friend in the corridors. Never a vicious man, he was a companion and friend to all. He stuck to those ideals in which he believed and worked hard for those whom he represented in this place. Charlie was always honest in his attitude and his approach to politics, and I pass on my condolences to his family and friends.

Since becoming a member a few years ago, I have noticed that gradually the individual, the backbencher in this place, has been pushed aside. The Executive and the political machine have taken greater and greater control of the operations of Parliament. The idea that Parliament is a place where members are elected to represent their constituents has gradually been destroyed. For example, since October last year, before the most recent election, this Parliament has sat for only 14 days, covering a period of nine months. Now we read in the press that the House faces a big backlog

of Bills, and the change in Standing Orders, made on 31 July of this year, is referred to.

What a disgrace! We are told that we have a backlog of 100 matters that the Government wishes to have discussed by Parliament, yet we have sat only 14 days in the past nine months. What do the people pay us for? I am told that the answer lies in the fact that the Executive is still running the State. In other words, there is a clear indication that the individual member, the person representing the electorate, no longer counts to any great degree in this Parliament.

When I first entered Parliament there was a two hour Question Time, during which individual members could first explain the question and then ask it. There were always days during a session when members ran out of questions. What happened? We had promises from people who now hold positions in high places—people who were members of the Government of the day (a Labor Government at the time)—that there would not be long answers, there would be short answers. We have learnt from that, however, that promises by people who are no more than birds of passage in this Parliament—here today and voted out at some future time—are worth nothing. Members at a future time say that it does not matter what has been said and that one can always argue an interpretation of Standing Orders.

When I first came here a person had unlimited time to speak. Both Labor and Liberal members have been known on a couple of odd occasions to speak for more than three hours, one person having spoken on Scientology for three hours and 20 minutes.

An honourable member: He doesn't hold the record, though.

Mr S.G. EVANS: No, a Liberal member spoke longer. Previously, a member spoke for about eight hours. I was prepared to suffer that because I believe that in a democracy you must allow it. We then decided that we would reduce the hours, and we have gradually forced upon the Parliament the attitude that you can speak for only 20 minutes on normal Bills, and in this debate it is now back to half an hour. It will not be long before it is said that it should be only 20 minutes. Other people do not give a damn what happens in another person's electorate because it is unrelated to them and they are not concerned.

The latest news on this matter has been put out by the Deputy Premier in relation to using the guillotine, and it was addressed to the Leader of the Opposition. The final paragraph suggests that the Independents, the minority group, might be considered. In a democracy they are the ones who really should be considered and their rights guaranteed.

There has been discussion in recent times about increasing Housing Trust rents. I call on the House from all sides of politics to support an increase in rents and support the signing of documentation to the effect that as long as those members remain here they desire a change to be made whereby people pay a reasonable rent for reasonable accommodation when they can afford it. We have people within our community receiving incomes of over \$50 000 who are renting Housing Trust accommodation at what the trust calls market rents and which I say are not market rents.

I ask members to take notice of the capital value placed upon three-bedroom homes, in this case and see if they think it is not very moderate, as I do: a three-bedroom home at Elizabeth Vale, with \$70 a week rent and a capital value of \$55 000; Rostrevor, a rent of \$71 a week and a capital value of \$62 000; Prospect, a rent of \$71 a week and a capital value of \$71 000; Marion, a rent of \$70.50 a week and a capital value of \$78 000; Noarlunga Downs, a rent of \$69 a week and a capital value of \$52 000.

Mr Tyler: Happy Valley?

Mr S.G. EVANS: If the honourable member wants some figures for Happy Valley, I will give them. I am selecting areas where people are not paying a realistic rental for their homes. I will give a comparison for the member for Fisher involving Happy Valley. There is a family in Happy Valley who have a take-home pay of \$450 a week; the repayments on their home are \$357 a month; they borrowed \$35 000, virtually over a lifetime, and the council rates are \$311 per year. The water rates are \$240, or slightly more per year. This family bought a motor car for \$5 500 (which they borrowed) which was subsequently repossessed by the police because the person they bought it from had stolen it. The repayments on that car are \$199 per month and they are trying to buy their own home. How can they live in such a situation compared to the people in Housing Trust homes to whom I have referred? The people most disadvantaged are very often those trying to buy their own homes.

Another point in addition to Housing Trust rentals is that they include council rates, water rates (including excess), sewerage rates, and insurance. People on incomes exceeding \$40 000 or running businesses which pay \$20 000 per year tax are living in Government subsidised housing. However, this other category of person who just has a tradesman's wage coming into the home and who has young children and high mortgages, which are caused by our socialist Government in Canberra, are really struggling to survive.

I will back any measure to put the rents up to more like \$100 to \$110 a week, because that is what these people can afford to pay. These people could be given the alternative of having 12 months to get their financial position in order and then we will sell the house to them, allowing any improvements they have made to be deducted from the price of the house. We could then use the money received from the sale of those homes to build houses for the people who really need them.

Another area of wicked waste in this society is caused through our zoning laws. In Europe and other parts of the world, one sees shops and business houses with accommodation built on the floor above. This accommodation gives the shopping centres security from break-ins and thieves, and it gives the individuals residing there an opportunity to live in an environment close to shopping and other facilities, freeing them from the burden of paying over \$100 a week for a motor car. However, here we say that a person cannot build a home above a shop. Commonsense suggests otherwise: there is air space above it, and it is already a commercial zone, so it is not going to affect the environment, and many people would be prepared to live above that shop. Pensioners living in a home on their own, or perhaps any couple—just a husband and wife—do not need a three bedroom home, but their friends, their environment and social activity is all within that community.

We subsidise people through the Housing Trust (speaking of the really disadvantaged), because we charge them from \$20 a week for single people to \$27 a week for double accommodation that probably costs \$50 000 or \$60 000. We are subsidising them by up to \$70 a week and, if one takes council rates and other charges paid by the trust into account, we are probably subsidising them by about \$80 a week.

Why not say to pensioners that we will change zoning laws, so that they can allow disadvantaged families—they can select their own tenants from trust lists—to live in suitable accommodation? We could allow pensioners to receive that income without taxing that income. Such a program would be saving money. If pensioners received \$40 or \$50 a week for the use of a flat or part of their home

for a disadvantaged family rather than taxpayers having to subsidise accommodation at a rate of about \$80 a week, there would be a saving for the community. We will not do that, yet in the community there is an abundance of accommodation lying idle.

An *Advertiser* article of 12 August 1986, written by Kym Tilbrook, states that 39 500 households, or about 100 000 people, are waiting for trust accommodation. Where are those people? Do we see them in the gutter? Do we see them sleeping at the East End Market or down at the beach? Where are the 39 000 households? I will tell the House where many of them are—they are people who have decided to use the system and put their name on the list. It is much cheaper to use the system than to try to buy their own house, because Government taxes have got so high.

Another aspect is that it is easy for a couple to agree to separate. One partner can apply for a trust home and, having done it three or four years ago, they are ready for the day and they can see one another as regularly as possible, because no-one checks them out. People who share such accommodation are exploiting the system.

Parliamentarians know it is happening, but we have failed to govern: we have not acted to tackle the Housing Trust area because we are frightened of losing votes. At the moment I can talk about the matter freely, because I do not have much trust activity in my area. I admit it. However, the House should not condemn me for that, because I made these comments in the '70s as the then shadow Minister of Housing and the ALP ran a campaign against me.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: That may be why I lost the job. If the member for Fisher is saying that I should be dishonest in trying to protect those disadvantaged groups in the middle who are trying to buy their own homes, let him say it, because they are the ones carrying the burden.

In another report Mr Paul Edwards, of the South Australian Housing Trust, said that there is a large gap between what we should receive from rents and what we actually receive. He said that possible solutions included increasing the rents for tenants not on subsidies or rebates and adjusting the scale by which reduced rents are measured. The report states:

The solution may well be found in increases in rents, but you could not ever expect a tenant to cover the market rate cost of housing in their rent,' he said.

I agree with all of what he said, except the last point: we can expect those who have high incomes and who live in Housing Trust accommodation to pay the actual tote odds, the sort of rent that people out in the community are paying—up to \$150 a week. Why should people with incomes of \$50 000 to \$60 000 a year be able to rent accommodation for \$74 a week (I believe that is the highest Housing Trust rent) while people in the community have to pay up to \$150 a week and still raise their children and pay for their car, and so on? I make a plea with the trust in this matter.

Another matter that I wish to raise concerns South Africa. Certainly, I hope that I get an opportunity in private members' time to move a motion on this matter, because I cannot understand why countries such as Australia and others have joined the band wagon in seeking to impose sanctions against South Africa, while still dealing with a country such as Russia. Certainly, I do not condone apartheid or provisions in the Chinese or Malaysian constitutions separating different ethnic groups. I will not be a hypocrite and urge sanctions against South Africa when a country such as Russia has people held in prison for religious and racist reasons and even puts people in mines where they will die. Russia has fought in Afghanistan and over seven years has killed more than a million Afghans. Russia has

had the affront to claim that it was invited to Afghanistan to kill the Afghan people. What sort of hypocrisy is that?

If we are to be fair dinkum, we should tell South Africa that we will apply sanctions against it and do the same to Russia. Instead, the Federal Government invites the Russians to bring tractors to Australia and we are arguing with America about a wheat deal with the Russians and about the sale of our wheat. The same situation applies in respect of other countries. In the same matter, I refer to the former Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, of whom I was a great supporter. He had a great opportunity in 1975 to do what the people wanted of him, that is, to put this country on the right track economically and take on the union movement by breaking the bloody-minded power it had. He failed to do that, and paid the penalty.

I do not know why Malcolm Fraser is involved in the South African controversy. Only he can answer that question. Perhaps at some future time he might be nominated for the Nobel Peace prize or elected as Secretary General of the United Nations, but I will not be a hypocrite and say to South Africa—

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member can laugh. Let him say to the Russians in respect of Estonia, Latvia, the Ukraine and many other countries, as well as Afghanistan—

Mr Rann: I am talking about your credibility and not international relations.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I will take the honourable member on about that and see whether his tongue is as truthful as it should be.

I now refer to child abuse, a subject that concerns me greatly. Certainly, it is time that this Government, this Parliament and the Australian Parliament told the public what is meant by the term 'child abuse'. I do not know the interpretation. The wicked behaviour that has just come to light in New South Wales cannot be condoned by any society, and no doubt the two adults involved must have some mental problem, whether resulting from illness, drugs or alcohol we do not know. However, this represents extreme behaviour towards some of our own kind. Most people would not treat their animals or pets in such a way. My concern stems from picking up a paper and reading recently of child abuse cases in the United States. A *News* report of 8 August states:

Child sexual abuse on increase; one in two girls are sexually abused before their eighteenth birthday, according to the latest figures from the US.

If we 47 Parliamentarians were part of the United States community, by the time they are 18, more than 50 per cent of our daughters would have been interfered with. That is sexual abuse, not child abuse. The report then went on to say that at least one boy in four is a victim, a figure much higher than that previously indicated. So, 25 per cent of all boys in America are interfered with sexually before they are 18 years of age. I do not want to believe it: I do not believe it. If it is true, for God's sake let us say to Americans, 'Stop having children!'

We then come home to this country and we find some other statements. I quote from an article by Jenny Brinkworth on 12 August 1986 in the *Advertiser*, under the headline 'Girls "sexually harassed" at school':

They used to be called bullies, these nasty little boys who teased girls, but today there is a new term for that sort of thing—sexual harassment.

That can be misleading to many people who read it, because that talks about boys saying to girls 'You can't play in this

part of the school ground. You go behind the toilet or over under the trees.'

I do not believe the that average Australian interprets that as sexual harassment. It is sex discrimination, if you like, discriminating against the other sex, and that has become involved in this area of sexual harassment or child abuse. The *Advertiser* of 12 August carries this comment:

'Child abuse cycle worsening', says expert.

This is a report from a Sydney conference taking place at the moment, stating that in one recent US study of 576 cases only 8 per cent of the accusations of sexual abuse were found to be untrue. The report continues:

'Children don't lie for the sake of lying', Dr Krugman said. Neglect was by far the main child abuse problem in the US. Around 45 per cent of the 1.732 million children abused each year were neglect cases. 'It's the dirty-home syndrome where children as young as two or three are left alone for eight or 10 hours a day', he said. These children were often victims of their parents' failure to provide adequate food, hygiene and shelter.

So on top of the 50 per cent of the girls and 25 per cent of the boys abused in America, we have another group who are abused through neglect, so one can assume that about 80 per cent of the children in America are either sexually abused or neglected by the time they are 18. I do not believe it.

We have to decide how we are going to tell the community what we mean by child abuse. The case in Sydney is obvious, but what do we mean as the areas of sexual abuse now that fathers are being encouraged—which is the tradition today—to have a greater interest in the babies and young children than they did in earlier days when the father was seldom home, and fathers are now encouraged to help change nappies, feed children and do the things which, traditionally, they did not do to any great degree in the past?

Are we now saying that, if a mother happens to push the penis of a young child or baby three or four times and says, 'That is not like Dad's', or if a father, wiping a young child who has still not been toilet trained completely, tends to wipe in the area of the vagina more than some people might say is enough to shift any waste material, that is sexual abuse?

Or are we talking about fathers or males inserting some object into or playing with the vagina of a girl more than they should, or are we saying that sexual abuse is where a father or a male sits with a child, with no shoes or socks on the father, and gives what used to be called when I was a child a gee gee up and down on the foot when the child does not have any clothes on? Is that a form of sexual abuse? I want to know and the community wants to know what it is, because, according to reports coming out, 70 or 80 per cent of our community are abusing their children in some way.

I will give one example very quickly. A constituent of mine had a child of 11½ months, one of four under six. The mother is a registered sister, with experience in nursing, intensive care and emergency cases. The father is also in the health care field. (I do not wish to identify them too closely.) The mother took the child to the Flinders Medical Centre because a bit of hair had cut into the child's toe. She removed part of it herself. A male intern said, 'I don't think there is any problem.' She saw that there was, but a female doctor looked at it and said, 'No, there is no problem', and a surgeon looked at it and said, 'There is no problem.' The mother went home and found another bit of hair and removed it, and from that point on all that family had was harassment from people at the Flinders Medical Centre saying 'How did it happen? Who did it?'—in other words, child abuse—until a community welfare officer called at the door and said to the father, 'We want to talk to you

about this particular instance.' I say that that is abuse of the system.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I rise to support the motion and add also to the condolences and the wishes to the families and friends of members who have passed on; that is, Mr Hawke, who had an outstanding career in politics both State and Federal and Charlie Harrison, whom I did know in passing and for whom I had a lot of time. I certainly know of the respect in which he was held in the community. I would like to pass on my condolences to his family.

I listened a short while ago to the Leader of the Opposition, talking about the changes and the difficulties in our community. There is Mudginberri, for instance. There is Brian Burke in Western Australia changing the conditions of employment of his employees; there is the Tasmanian situation and there is VicRail laying people off, so there are—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: There are changes in the community: things are happening. I think in his position Mr Burke certainly, as Premier in a Labor State, can make those decisions. He is certainly courageous and is making decisions that he sees are there. On the other side, we have Tasmania, a Liberal State, making the same decisions. So, there are changes around—and who knows where that will take us?

I shall raise first a matter I have raised here before. I am sure that there will be some sighs when I mention it, but it is important. I refer to the matter of fire protection at Port Adelaide. I am pleased that the member for Price is here, because he, obviously, has exactly the same interest in that area as I have. I also see the Chief Secretary. Both members have a concern in the fire area and as they are in the Chamber I will not have to send them copies of *Hansard*.

The concern for fire in my electorate is based very much on fact. It is a very old area in some sections, with old weatherboard houses. It ranges through, obviously, to brand new houses.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That doesn't reflect on the member?

Mr PETERSON: Very old and weather beaten? No. There are areas of great danger in case of fire and, we are isolated because of the river and the bridges. The other area of concern is the storage of flammable material on the peninsula. That is a self-evident fact: it does not need to be explained or expounded, but that is a fact of life which has been recognised by the Government. When the Hon. Frank Blevins was Minister of Labour I asked for and received figures relating to the volume of flammable materials stored on the peninsula. The figures are as follows: terminal storage and major industrial users of LPG, 1 809 kilolitres; flammable liquid, 196 683 kilolitres; the minor storage of gas was nine kilolitres; and flammable liquid, which I assume was in garages and so on, was 1 041 kilolitres. So, there are significant amounts of flammable liquid there.

I refer to an event of some 12 months ago within a fuel terminal where I understand that safety conditions were right up to the mark. The facilities include all possible safety precautions for loading truck transports and rail transport with flammable liquid and, in general terms, conditions are as safe as possible. There was an incident 12 months ago where, unfortunately, a person was killed. A fire occurred at the facility, where the best safety measures and safety procedures are used. However, even in that environment

there was an accident, and that clearly illustrates that something can happen and can go wrong.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You could have been left without an electorate.

Mr PETERSON: The member for Gilles says that I could have been left without an electorate. That is not quite as amusing as it first sounds. If a fire occurred in that area, the Minister of Marine would no longer have any worries because he would not have a port to worry about; the member for Price would lose half his electorate, and I am sure that Semaphore would be located several feet farther west. It is true that there is a very great danger if something happened.

With the knowledge of this inherent danger it was with some amazement that I read a report compiled by an engineer from the Department of Marine and Harbors, Mr Bateman, in July 1985, which is only 12 months ago. In this House I have asked the Minister of Marine several times about the upgrading of safety facilities but, to this date, nothing has occurred. In the past 12 months there has been a tragic fire in the safest possible environment. This report was compiled before then. To my knowledge—and I am sure that I am right—not one single step has been taken to improve the situation. Not one length of hose, an additional tap, a spray nozzle for firefighting equipment or a fire extinguisher has been put there; nor has there been any change to security precautions. Not one single step has been taken to improve the situation.

I want to get Mr Bateman's report on the record because, as far as I know, it is not a public report. If anything goes wrong down there, I do not want anyone to say that they were not aware of the situation—even though the odds of that occurring are very long. However, if the maximum precautions are not taken, no-one can come back later and say, 'It is not my fault.' If something goes wrong down there, someone will be at fault. As the member for this area it is my duty and responsibility to inform the Government of the situation. The other day I heard the member for Eyre say that the elected Government is there to govern. That is fair enough, but it is our job as elected members to tell the Government where the problems are. If the Government acts on those problems, that is its choice. I do not want anyone coming forward later and saying that they did not know about the problem or that there was no problem. I will quote exactly from Mr Bateman's report, which was presented to the Marine and Harbors Department over 12 months ago. As I have said, since the presentation of the report not one thing has been done.

Part of the report includes a section headed, 'Refined petroleum products imports'. This section is broken up into comments about Port Adelaide, Port Pirie and Port Lincoln. I suggest that the members for those respective areas should obtain copies of the report and read what it says about Port Pirie and Port Lincoln.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Are they dangerous, too?

Mr PETERSON: According to this report they are in a very serious state, and things could happen. In relation to the port of Adelaide, the report states:

Facilities for refined petroleum products imports in the port of Adelaide are unsatisfactory in many ways—

this is the Government report. It continues:

The major problems are: inner harbor berths are too shallow to accept even the least draft tankers fully loaded.

This is important when one considers the safety of ships. If there is not enough water, a ship cannot be brought in; it cannot be swung around or safely manoeuvred to facilities, as happens when there is plenty of water. The report continues:

Inner harbor berths are not sufficiently isolated for flammable cargo berths and have poor access.

This is another one of the problems. During Question Time today we heard a question from the member for Albert Park about industries adjacent to residential areas. This is what happens in older areas. The oil berths were there years before anyone built there; houses and other industries have built up alongside them and there is a dangerous situation. It is very dangerous when things go wrong. I was down there on the night of the fire in the terminal berth, and I know that people from the cement works were not very cheery about their future. They were ready to evacuate because they are adjacent to the terminal berth. So, there is that problem to start with. The report continues:

Berthing is permitted only in daylight hours.

That is generally the policy at Port Adelaide, anyhow. Generally, ships do not go up and down the river in anything but daylight hours. The report continues:

Inner harbor berthing structures are old, a maintenance burden and inadequate for today's ship size.

Again, that brings a problem. The berthing facilities are not there and the safety is not there. Adequate and safe berthing facilities are required. This is a significant point and is probably the key in what I am trying to say at the moment:

Firefighting standards are inadequate at all berths, with virtually nothing at M, N and OH4. J berth is the best in the port, but only complies with level 1 of the AAPMA—

I think that is the Australian Association of Port Management Authorities—

recommendations on tanker terminal safety. Level 2 is the minimum desirable level.

So, we are not even up to the minimum desirable level for firefighting equipment at the berth. The report goes on to talk about Outer Harbor 4. I believe that Outer Harbor 4 is no longer used because of the danger that was highlighted in this report. So, to that degree they have taken a step. The report continues:

The ideal answer to the port of Adelaide problems would be the provision of a new steel and concrete dolphin berth, suitably isolated from all other activities and equipped with full firefighting facilities. Such a berth would need to be at Outer Harbor to avoid the limitation of the 9.1 m inner harbor channel [the depth of the channel]. This implies the provision of a pipeline to Largs North/Birkenhead adequate to allow full rate discharge of full cargoes at Outer Harbor.

To relocate at Outer Harbor, unless it is off the main channel, creates a danger. The report continues:

In the unlikely event of a decision to dredge the inner harbor channel to allow a grain facility at 28 berth, a petroleum products berth could alternatively be located in the inner harbor, perhaps in the vicinity of the existing N berth.

I might say that, after the fire last year, a proposal was released within a matter of weeks to dredge a new berth and set up a new set of dolphin points and a single point discharge for all berths. That plan was reported in the paper, but I do not have it with me. That move was publicised as 'the great step forward'. However, not one thing has been done. Not one bucketful of silt has been dredged and not one bucket of concrete has been poured to do that.

The report also talks about the depths of water. Dredging is a very expensive operation. To make berths safe requires considerable dredging. That would be good for the dredging section of the Marine and Harbors Department but very expensive for the State. The report explains why different companies have a different outlook on the terminal situation and states:

The draft limitations of the inner harbor berths are not particularly embarrassing to Shell as they are able to arrange their shipping from Geelong in such a way as to lighten at other ports en route. BP, shipping entirely from the west, will be arriving at 9.4 m draft however—

Which is deeper than the channel at low mark—and will have to lighten at Outer Harbor before proceeding to M berth.

That can be done no longer because that berth has been closed because of the danger. The report contains some pertinent comments about the danger of the berths. This needs to go on the record, because I do not want anyone saying that they did not know about it. In relation to J berth, the report states:

Shell have freehold land immediately behind J berth and leasehold land downstream of K berth. Under agreements expiring on 31.12.2015 Shell have exclusive rights over J berth and the department has an obligation to maintain structures and depth. The nominal length of the berth is 128 metres whereas the Shell tanker *Conus* is 178 metres in length.

This is an example of the problems that exist all the time. The report continues:

The timber berthing structures are old and quite inappropriate to the size of the vessel.

I am pleased to see that the Minister of Marine is now in the Chamber, because he can now hear the safety aspect first-hand. The report, talking about J berth, states:

The location of the berth, from a safety point of view, is poor. Other vessels berth in very close proximity, in H and K berths. This presents a hazard to them in the event of a fire or spill during operations and there is a risk of a berthing accident. Portions of Shell's own installation, together with significant parts of Adelaide Brighton Cement's adjacent installations are within 100 metres of a tanker in J berth, as are ships berthed in H and K.

This clearly shows that ships are very close together at the different facilities and, if anything goes wrong, there is an immediate danger. The report continues:

Access for firefighting appliances is very limited. Small vehicles only can enter along the bank from the south as far as the manifolds. There is no vehicular access to the bank from the north. A fire tender can only approach the ship through the Shell depot and then only to the manifold area.

This indicates that, if fire spreads through the Shell berth and to the terminal, one cannot get firefighting appliances to the connection point. The report points out that to get to a fire on a ship one has to pass through a facility. In relation to firefighting facilities the report states:

In considering the matter of firefighting facilities, it must be recognised that the first and most vital requirement for a tanker berth is isolation.

That is not included in the berths, which are adjacent to industries and relatively close to residential development. Across the river is the silo berth, and the cement berth is alongside. If there was a spill in the river, one could not get down there. Further down the river is the Electricity Trust, and who knows what would happen there in the event of a fire. The report continues:

No amount of firefighting equipment can ensure that a catastrophic event cannot happen.

I have been saying all along that the best steps in prevention do not guarantee that nothing will happen; they only lessen the degrees of seriousness. The report adds:

It can only reduce the probability of the incident reaching any level of seriousness.

The report talks about the AAPMA recommendations, and states:

The AAPMA has published a set of recommendations regarding firefighting facilities at tanker terminals. The recommendations indicate requirements to deal with three levels of emergency:

1. Fire at the manifold—

the manifold is where the connection comes from the ship to the shore—

These recommendations are in two parts:

- (a) instantly available facilities
- (b) facilities able to be brought into immediate use.

One has to include both these factors. As I understand from the report, they are very limited and not up to Australian standard at the berths. The second level of emergency is:

Limited fire on board. Fire is assumed to be confined to one row of tankage across the ship but may be anywhere in its length.

This is where the fire is within the ship. The third level of emergency is limited tanker disaster. In this regard the report states:

Port authorities and others responsible for tanker terminals around Australia are generally regarding the second level (referred to variously as table III or level/phase/section 2) as the minimum standard. Many ports are in the process of upgrading to this standard—

Port Adelaide is not amongst them, but the report talks about Port Adelaide—

Facilities at limited tanker disaster levels are seen, for the lower throughput terminals especially, as not realistically achievable. (The implications of this for Port Pirie are obvious).

None of the berths under discussion has facilities equivalent to level 2 and only few approach compliance with level 1.

Therefore, we are totally below the Australian standard. In relation to J berth the report states:

By virtue of its proximity to the Shell depot, this berth has a pumped water supply. Shell provide a trailer-mounted foam monitor and tank. The installation substantially meets the level 1 requirements (fire at manifold).

The fire unit has to pass through petrol foam to get to a fire at the Shell depot. In relation to L berth the report states:

By virtue of its proximity to the Mobil depot this berth also has a pumped water supply. A foam supply is available from Mobil in sufficient quantity to meet level 1 requirements, but the foam is neither instantly available nor available to be brought into immediate use, and therefore level 1 requirements are not fully met.

In relation to M berth the report states:

This berth has mains water supply only.

All members should know that water used to fight an oil fire is practically useless. Foam and other equipment is required to fight these fires. The report continues:

Pressure and flow are inadequate even for the instantly available component of level 1. There is no foam equipment on site.

In relation to N berth the report states:

As for M Berth, except that a Caltex pumped water supply is available at a distance.

As part of the firefighting measures for the area the report refers to the two Port Adelaide tugs *Tusker* and *Tarpan*, as follows:

The tugs *Tusker* and *Tarpan* have considerable firefighting power and can meet the water and foam application requirements of the level 3 (tanker disaster) recommendations for vessels of the size calling in port of Adelaide. The vessels operate at Port Stanvac as well as in the port of Adelaide and may be absent for an extended time on a tow around the coast. It is possible for both vessels to be away from the port of Adelaide together. Even when in port, response time can be quite extended due to engagement in towing operations, or because the crew are off duty. While either would be of invaluable assistance in coping with a disaster level situation they cannot be considered as reliably contributing to protection at levels 1 and 2.

So much for the best floating firefighting equipment in South Australia—it cannot be relied on. In relation to the fire vessel *Karlool*, the report states:

The fire vessel *Karlool* has very limited capabilities. Only water can be delivered from its fixed monitor. Very limited foam stocks are carried and foam can be directed from hand-held equipment only. This vessel's main contribution in the event of a tanker fire would be to assist in cooling, to limit the spread of the fire.

If the fire is on shore and not on the tanker, there is a tanker between the vessel and the fire, which could be at the manifold or along the pipe. Therefore the *Karlool* could not help or even get to the fire. This indicates the need for shore-based facilities. A terrible problem exists at the ter-

minals. I would like the members for Port Pirie and Port Lincoln to read the report and note what it says about their facilities. The Chief Secretary is in the Chamber and has heard about these problems. The member for Price has heard everything I have said, and I will give him a copy of the report so that he knows what is going on.

While on the topic of fire prevention, I now turn to fire stations. I think back in 1981, during the life of the previous Government, a report was compiled by Mr Cox about the rationalisation of fire stations in the Adelaide metropolitan area. That report contained a recommendation to balance the fire coverage and it seemed at that stage that the existing Semaphore fire station would be removed. About 6 000 residents of the peninsula signed a petition to retain the fire station, and it was retained. Since then, we have been fighting for an upgraded fire station on the peninsula.

In this regard, two sites have been considered: the first was at the corner of Strathfield Terrace and Victoria Road, Largs North, but this was discarded because of an underground fuel line running to the terminals about which I have been talking; another site has now been selected further down the road, at the corner of Wandilla Street and Victoria Road, and the upgrading of the station has been proposed. The present station, which is an old single unit station, must be at least 100 years old and it does not cater for the type of fire that we could expect if something went wrong. It has no back-up facilities, including a telephone; Port Adelaide fire station has such facilities, including a telephone.

Recently, I attended a mock fire exercise at a major industrial plant on the peninsula and, if everything had gone to plan, much damage would have resulted before the arrival of the fire unit. Admittedly, some dead time may have been included in the total time between the commencement of the onsite exercise and the arrival of the units, but it took the units considerable time to get to the site of the mock fire.

On the peninsula, we need an upgraded two-unit fire station that is geared to fight the type of industrial fires that we can expect. Recently, the *Messenger* reported that the Port Adelaide fire station was to be relocated, and I have nothing against its relocation on the Bower Road extension. Indeed, that would at times give better access to the Peninsula. However, we need an updated fire station on the peninsula. We could be isolated in the event of the Port Adelaide unit's being engaged somewhere else. We need upgraded and extended firefighting facilities, and the Government should consider this matter in regard to its budget situation.

I now wish to refer to possible cuts in the education budget. Recently, I have received a considerable quantity of literature, including a document entitled *Into the 90s: Guaranteed equal opportunities for R to 7 children*. I have received many signed photostated documents, and I take this as evidence of an active campaign in the community in this matter. Many points in the correspondence make sense. Only today, I received a pamphlet in an envelope marked 'Media release', so I assume that copies went to all members today. Regarding resources in the education system, the distribution of those resources, and alleged inequities in the system, I have received many letters from my constituents, so it is only fair to raise these matters here and now. I do not know what the Government intends to do regarding its education budget and I believe that plenty of other people, like me, do not know where we are going with that budget. However, it seems that there is some rationalisation in the air. Some of the points contained in the proposal make sense.

In reading it through it seems to me that teaching staff is one of the main resources that they do not really talk about. If you are downing students at high school level, surely to some degree it is a matter of rationalisation of staff as much as anything else. Tomorrow I will put a question to the Minister of Education on this subject, because there does not seem to be much Government information on it. The program has been around for some time but there certainly has not been anything made public apart from the information put out by the Primary School Principals Association.

I think it deserves a balanced response, which I will request from the Minister to send on to my constituents to let them know what the Government thinks of this proposal. On the face of it, many of the points made make sense and deserve consideration. The Government may have considered the report and the Minister may have an answer, but so far I have not heard anything about it. As education has received a considerable battering lately, I think that we should get an answer.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I express my condolences to the family of Charles Albert Harrison, the former member for Albert Park in the years 1970-79. I pay my compliments to His Excellency the Governor of South Australia on the way he presented his speech at the opening of this forty-sixth session of Parliament. It was interesting to hear that this Government recognises that the economy is in a disastrous state, even though it was put in milder terms in His Excellency's speech, which states:

Our nation is facing a major test of its ability to adapt to difficult economic times. During the first half of this year, our economy has experienced a sharp change . . .

Some change! Anyone with an ounce of economic sense could see it coming a mile off. Premier Bannon and Prime Minister Hawke should vacate their offices forthwith and their respective Governments should follow suit. That is what the electorate at large is seeking. People are increasingly saying to me, 'John, isn't there some way by which the Labor Governments can be forced to vacate the Government benches?' It is times like this that I am sorry we do not have a few Sir John Kerrs around.

The reason Premier Bannon should vacate his office is simple: he is a liar. This Government won office in 1982 under completely false pretences—namely, that there would be no new taxes, no tax increases and charges would not be used as a form of backdoor taxation. The people of South Australia who voted for this Government have been fooled—

Mr RANN: On a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker, I draw the House's attention to the use of unparliamentary language by the honourable member in calling the Premier a liar. I suggest that he withdraw that statement.

Mr MEIER: What I said was that the reason Premier Bannon should vacate his office is simple—he is a liar.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Would the honourable member withdraw that, please.

Mr MEIER: Madam Acting Speaker, if it goes against Standing Orders, I will withdraw it. However, it is a pity, because it is the truth.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to withdraw, or we will have to deal with the matter further.

Mr MEIER: I will withdraw it, Madam Acting Speaker. As I was saying, the people of South Australia who voted for this Government have been fooled, doublecrossed, and made a laughing stock. I have lost count, but I believe that over 450 taxes and charges have gone up since 1982—some promise! Unfortunately, as with dictators and military usur-

pers, once a leader is in power it is often difficult to throw him out. I think the case of President Marcos clearly illustrates that. So, Premier Bannon is here by default.

What about Prime Minister Hawke? From 1983 to 1986, Prime Minister Hawke has taken Australia from being one of the strongest countries economically in the world to being a banana republic. He has ruined this place that I have been proud to call my home. Never in the history of this nation has more incompetence been shown by a Government.

Whereas our dollar was one of the strongest currencies when the Liberals left office, now it is fast approaching a state of worthlessness. Whereas overseas investment and confidence in Australia reached great heights under Prime Minister Fraser, now the money is pouring out of this country; and, whereas interest rates were at a very manageable level under the Liberals, they are now the highest on record and threatening to go even higher.

The Liberals' achievements were even more spectacular when one considers that for three years prior to going out of office there had been droughts across Australia which hit our rural sectors severely, whereas since Hawke has been in power the seasons have been excellent. Compared with Hawke, former Prime Minister Whitlam is beginning to appear as an angel, and we all know how Whitlam brought this country to its knees.

Now, in an endeavour to drive further nails into our coffin, the fringe benefits tax, better known as the 'take all incentive away tax', is upon us. While the whole of Australia is saying, 'No, no, no' to the tax, the perpetrators, Hawke, Keating and Chipp, are saying, 'Yes, yes, yes.' Actually, I am too generous saying the whole of Australia, because here in South Australia this Labor Government fully supports the tax. Do members recall when the Liberal Opposition last September moved the following motion:

That this House deplores the move by the Federal Government to tax the use of motor vehicles supplied to employees by employers and the adverse effect it would have on the motor industry and its employees in South Australia and calls on the Government to forward these views to the Prime Minister.

One of the few members on the Government side who bothered to join in the debate was the member for Hartley. Whilst his contribution showed the Government's lack of understanding, his opening remarks clearly summarised the attitude that his Government held. His opening remarks were as follows:

I oppose the motion because it is nothing more than another cheap attempt by the Opposition to gain as much political mileage as it can from the Federal Government's proposals for tax reform.

However, his contribution was nothing compared to the Premier's response when, only last week, the Leader of the Opposition asked Mr Bannon whether he would lead a deputation to Canberra to oppose the fringe benefits tax. The Premier's answer would have been unbelievable had it not been for the fact that we all heard it and it is recorded in *Hansard*. In relation to going to Canberra, he said:

At this stage it is an exercise in futility and I am not terribly interested in such exercises.

Later, he said:

I will not unreasonably raise the hopes and spend time, effort and energy on a useless pursuit at this stage.

What a slap in the face for his Labor colleague, Premier Burke, in Western Australia; what a dereliction of duty towards all South Australians; what a let-down for every business and every farmer in this State, let alone for the thousands of workers who will suffer.

Part of the Premier's reasoning for not going to Canberra was that the Federal Government was locked into place, yet last Friday—8 August—the headline on the front page of

the *Advertiser* read 'Government looks at big changes in perks tax', and the opening paragraph states:

The Federal Government is considering major changes to the fringe benefits tax in the August budget.

A couple of paragraphs later on it states:

Senior Government sources said last night that they believed the Government was also looking at alternative means of raising revenue and might be considering a new indirect tax.

Even the incompetent Treasurer Keating yesterday acknowledged changes may be looked at before the budget, yet our Premier said that to believe that we should achieve some change in the Federal Government's attitude is absolute nonsense. Some nonsense, some negative attitude and response!

It is not only Australian newspapers reporting the gloom. I was recently overseas and noticed that overseas newspapers were also telling readers the true story. On 3 July 1986, the *Business Standard* had the headline 'Hawke sinks into economic mire'. On 11 June 1986, the *Financial Times* stated:

The seriousness of the situation was underscored recently by the Federal Treasurer, Mr Paul Keating, who warned that Australia could drift into becoming a banana republic if tough measures were not taken immediately. The whiff of panic which his remarks precipitated led to an open disagreement between Mr Hawke and Mr Keating.

Further on, the report stated:

The terms of trade [referring to Australia's trade] are now at their lowest levels since the depression.

They are overseas newspapers commenting on Australia's situation. What an indictment! Whereas Labor has messed up Australia during the period when our trading partners have gone from strength to strength and conditions have been helpful for any Government in power, in the immediate future the Government will face some real problems in the rural sector, a sector it has chosen to ignore for far too long.

The sale of our grain—especially wheat—is a cause for real concern. Whereas major overtures should have been made a year ago or more, this Government is acting only now. It is a bit late. The United States subsidising of wheat sales to Russia and China is irresponsible, but the writing was on the wall last year when the US farm bill was being discussed, but this Government ignored the warning signs. No wonder the farmers have had to form a Farmers Fighting Fund. While the previous Liberal Government recognised that rural Australia produced 40 per cent of Australia's exports and actively helped the industry, this Government is only just finding out that the rural sector is on its knees. The fact that Labor is in power provides the total explanation of why the Farmers Fighting Fund had to be established.

I am pleased that in His Excellency's speech reference was made to the fact that the Government 'acknowledges the need to support the rural sector'.

Mrs Appleby: It always has, and still does.

Mr MEIER: That's news to me. I trust the Government will keep its promise, that 'New ways to help the rural community adjust to changing economic circumstances will also be investigated.' I am always wary of the word 'investigate'. Many areas have been investigated over the years, but very often little or no action is forthcoming to remedy a problem. Nevertheless, besides the immediate problems of overseas markets and rising costs due to the low value of the Australian dollar, I believe that one important area that needs investigating, that needs attention, is how to encourage youth to stay on the land. In many areas it is a real problem to get a son or sons to stay on the farm and I guess one should not exclude daughters in that regard, if

they desire to stay. Why should young people stay on the land when the future looks so bleak? However, without the next generation of farmers our balance of payments will look even worse. Today, farming increasingly involves considerable technical and scientific know-how for one to maximise one's returns. It involves a lot of hard work, considerable risk, and long hours which, hopefully, more often than not, will produce positive results in the end.

Mr Groom: What did you do in Government for three years to help the farmers?

Mr MEIER: If the member for Hartley would listen, he will understand that the problem is that today the sons of farmers do not see any incentive to go on. Let us consider some of the reasons why that is so. Unfortunately, increasing costs, high interest rates, lower returns, and, for people who wish to employ someone, high workers compensation payments, holiday loading and long-service leave, and now the honour of paying fringe benefits tax for employees—that is, the employer must pay the employee's tax—all make the younger generation sceptical of taking on such an enterprise. The answer to the member for Hartley's question as to what happened in the past is that in the past incentives were not needed; farming was economically viable. However, in the past two or three years, and more recently in the past six months or a year, things have become almost unbearable and young people just cannot see any future on the land. Yet, we must encourage them. The farmer receives no guaranteed holidays, long-service leave, over-award payments or 17.5 per cent holiday loading, and no guaranteed income. He is on a rough deal.

Mr Groom: Where was your long-term planning when you were in government for 30 years? What did you do to assist the farmer?

Mr MEIER: The long-term plan was going along just fine. If one looks at any graph showing spending, one can see that disaster struck in the Whitlam years, when Government spending skyrocketed and threw everything out of kilter. Fraser then got in and he managed to stop the escalation.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr MEIER: If the honourable member does not believe me, I will provide the graph for him in the next day or so, as soon as I can find my copy. The Liberal Government managed to stop the excessive spending and we virtually had it on an even keel. In relation to the six-month wages pause, let us be honest and recognise that politically it was perhaps not a good move because the electors said that they did not want a Government taking money out of their pockets. However, it was a good move. Hawke came in right at the end of that period and said, within a matter of only weeks, that things had started to improve. He said that his Government's policies were showing straightaway that the country was on the right track. That was absolute nonsense but unfortunately, of course, many electors accepted that. However, it was due to the Fraser Government's good work over the preceding years, its hard, slogging work that the country was where it was. Now, within three years it is apparent that Hawke has ruined the country. He will probably become the most hated Prime Minister that this country has ever had, because he has brought Australia to its knees.

I return to the point that I was making: if we must continue to rely on agriculture, if we want our rural towns to progress and if we believe that Australia will benefit from our agricultural commodities, the future of the potential young farmers needs to be addressed by the Government.

I am very pleased that the Minister of Agriculture has heard those last few points. I now turn to a different matter,

one that is of considerable concern to many residents in Goyder, namely the proposed horse racing meeting to be held on Sunday 28 September at Balaklava. I have been contacted by quite a few constituents in Balaklava who are upset at the unilateral decision of the Minister of Recreation and Sport to hold this Sunday race meeting.

To me, it is another case where no consideration has been given to the views and concerns of local residents. The sooner the Government learns to consult with people before steamrolling them with its decisions, the better off we will be. I have been asked in this matter to put forward several questions to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and I trust that the Minister is listening and will provide answers to the following questions forthwith. These questions come directly from correspondence I have received:

First, will the Government show moral leadership and refrain from introducing legislation permitting horse racing with betting facilities on a Sunday?

Secondly, why is it that the Government and the committee of the Balaklava Racing Club Incorporated seem to be playing politics with respect to the proposed race meeting at Balaklava, and each seems to leave it to the other to make the necessary statement with respect to responsibility?

Thirdly, is the proposed race meeting for Balaklava on a Sunday being encouraged because TAB betting has decreased through the gambling which takes place in the Adelaide Casino?

The approaches to my office are also being reinforced by a petition which opposes the holding of race meetings on Sundays at Balaklava for the following reasons:

(a) that Sunday race meetings interfere with family activities;

(b) that Sunday race meetings interfere with the worship and church activities of many people;

(c) that Sunday race meetings, if permitted, would cause local church people who supply considerable support services to mid-week and Saturday race meetings to divide their loyalties between their church and work at the local racecourse; and

(d) that permission for a race meeting at Balaklava on Sunday 28 September 1986 would set a precedent for future race meetings on Sunday at Balaklava.

I trust that the Minister will give immediate consideration to the many concerns expressed.

I now turn to a matter concerning health. The Adelaide Children's Hospital is regularly used by country patients and has been a lifesaver in many instances. Often, parents and children are rather distraught when they have to drive down to the hospital and, to add to their trauma, they invariably find it difficult, if not impossible, to find a legal park for their car close to the hospital. One has to be very lucky to get a park in the hospital's underground car park, yet there is more open space around the Adelaide Children's Hospital than around any other hospital. I believe that the parking problem has to be addressed immediately, especially with parking tickets going at \$8 a pop.

City parents have a much greater opportunity to take a bus or taxi to the hospital; country parents need to park at the hospital. I trust that the Minister of Health will address this problem so that what might appear as a minor snag for city residents, but is a major snag for country residents can be rectified.

Mr Lewis: That's a bit optimistic, given his record.

Mr MEIER: You could be right. Another matter that has concerned me is the continuing problems with water supplied to the electorate of Goyder. Only this very day, as members would have heard, I presented a petition signed

by 562 residents of South Australia which said that there is an urgent need for the provision of a reticulated water supply to the rural landholders in the hundred of Moorowie and the residents of Hardwicke Bay for the following reasons: first, many existing wells in the hundred of Moorowie have completely dried up or are drying up; secondly, the carting of water during the summer period is becoming time consuming and excessively expensive; and, thirdly, because of the increasing number of permanent residents of Hardwicke Bay provision of a guaranteed water supply is essential.

This problem has been going on and on and unfortunately it is getting worse. I am again pleading with the Minister to give urgent consideration to extending the reticulated mains water supply because in the long run it will see an increase in productivity in this State on southern Yorke Peninsula, and it will be beneficial to all residents of this State in the long term. Certainly, I will be having more to say about this matter on a future occasion.

There is the additional problem of some existing water supplies absolutely choking up. By 'choking up' I mean that the water pipes are blocking to such an extent that no water, or very little water, is coming through. The worst area would appear to be Wakefield Plains from approximately Windsor down to Two Wells and extending towards Gawler.

Mr Lewis: It's not as bad as Karoonda or Swan Reach on a hot day—the water stops running.

Mr MEIER: It also stops running at Windsor. The worrying thing is that on several farms real problems have occurred when livestock have become most distressed through having no drinking water, let alone human beings, who would love to have a wash or shower, themselves having no water. This matter has to be addressed. In fact, I am in the process of writing to the Minister of Water Resources seeking an urgent deputation so that at least some of the line can be replaced before this summer.

In the Two Wells area the problem is much greater in the long run from the viewpoint that the population is increasing significantly and the water supply is inadequate now, so how can it possibly cope with the needs in the near future leaving aside the poor quality of the water? Only the other day I spoke to a constituent who had ruined some of her good clothes. Thankfully she took up the matter with the appropriate department and received \$105 compensation for the damage done to the clothes. This is not the way this Government should be acting—by giving compensation for damaged clothes. It needs to address the problem of replacing the pipes or cleaning up the water. So those problems are still with us.

Finally, I was dismayed recently to learn of the action that occurred at Clare High School when a student was forbidden to attend that school because of the country from which she came. I am all the more concerned because I happen to be a member of the organisation that sponsored that student, namely, Rotary International. I believe that Rotary goes out of its way to try to promote understanding between the peoples of the world. It just amazes me that teachers should be the ones who instigate a policy of apartheid. In fact, more teachers than anyone else have complained to me about what has happened at the Clare High School. There are many fine teachers in this State, upstanding citizens in their own communities, and they are most concerned at the reflection cast on the profession as a whole.

Probably the worst thing is that this is supposedly the International Year of Peace, a year put aside for peace. One way we can show peace is by showing love and understanding towards a student from another country. Whether or not we agree with the principles of that country is irrelevant, but no way has Clare High School, according to the news-

paper reports, shown that understanding. Perhaps it is exaggerated even more because last year was International Youth Year, and it happens to be a youth who has been singled out in this action. I just trust that that high school will be able to put forward a statement in due course so that the student hopefully might have some realisation that there has been a misunderstanding in this very tragic occurrence in this International Year of Peace.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I rise to support the motion this evening and, in so doing, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the untimely death of Professor Don Stranks at the weekend. Professor Stranks, during his working life, gave considerable prominence to the needs of the academic community. He served his students and fellow staff members extremely well, and in fact served the whole University of Adelaide and indeed the Adelaide community in a way which I believe will certainly ensure his place in the history of Australian universities and, indeed, of South Australia. His contribution to the State and to debate in Australia about technological change, about academic standards and about Government responsibility for tertiary education was certainly something which placed him in a position of definite leadership in this area. I know that every member of this House, and indeed all his friends and colleagues in this country, will deeply mourn his untimely passing.

The next matter I would like to raise with the House is one of many which have come to my attention in the many months during which this Parliament has not been sitting. It is unfortunate that members of Parliament have not had the opportunity in recent times to draw attention to some of the problems which occur in their communities and electorates. I believe that this House provides us with an excellent opportunity so to do; we are constitutionally obligated so to do, as my colleague the member for Semaphore mentioned during his contribution to this debate. A topic of real concern to people in my electorate is school maintenance. There is no doubt that the standard of maintenance of existing school buildings has deteriorated substantially in recent years. In the present economic climate, maintenance is one of the first casualties of budget cutting frenzies. There is no doubt that the razor gangs, both of the Tonkin Government (which was somewhat more prominent in its activity) and the more subtle versions of the present Government, would see maintenance as an area of prime opportunity when it comes to reducing budget deficits and reducing Government spending. This is true certainly of all Governments of both ideological colours which have been seen in recent times, at both State and federal levels.

Unfortunately, maintenance is a hidden responsibility of Government. It is a funding commitment to which the public are not often made aware until it is too late and almost irreversible for many of our public buildings. It is certainly true for many schools, and I know from personal experience it is true of schools in my electorate. School councils are often drawing my attention to the deficiencies in the basic facilities and maintenance of those facilities in their schools. They are not always talking about the need to increase staffing resources or to increase ancillary staffing resources, although those things certainly occupy their attention. However, what is becoming more apparent is the fact that the repainting of schools, the repairing of leaks in roofs and the fixing of large holes in paved areas which children play on and which form into large puddles during winter storms are the issues which are in many ways causing just as much concern to the education community, to parents and children, as are the more emotive and more public

issues of funding cuts in education staffing and education resources generally.

Unfortunately, the Government finds it all too easy to cut maintenance in areas of public funding, particularly in school funding. Those items are gradual; each is small; and the consequences of deferral are not immediately apparent and dramatic, as they are when ancillary staff numbers are cut or when teachers' salaries are debated. But, unfortunately, the consequences for our schools are just as dramatic in the long term. I was a pioneer pupil at the Elizabeth Grove Primary School, I am very proud to say—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: It is, and I hope that I reflect the training I received at that school. The fact is that the school has not been repainted since I was there in grade 1. I will not enlighten the House about exactly how many years that has been, but it is a substantial number of years, more than a quarter of a century. It is a matter of great concern to me that teachers and parents have to repaint an assembly hall for a school's Jubilee year to have it looking reasonably presentable for visitors. Temporary wooden classrooms at that school are in abundance, as is the case on other campuses in the State, and their physical condition is deplorable. At the west primary school, at which I am a frequent visitor, there are still large holes in parts of the playground: subsidence has caused the asphalt to sink and large water traps have developed.

Although the Minister is quite sympathetic when these problems are raised with him, unfortunately he has very limited funds with which to deal with them. But while it is no doubt true that various Ministers of Public Works in recent years (and I am thinking of the Hon. Dean Brown, more recently the Hon. Jack Wright, and the member for Napier at present) have all been very well aware of and sympathetic to the need to increase maintenance funds, and indeed have conducted running battles with their respective Treasurers and Cabinets in the fight for funds, these areas are simply not vote winners, as new schools are.

In the economic stringencies we face in the mid-1980s, which will no doubt continue into the late 1980s, it is essential that the Government give increasing attention to the maintenance of existing assets, assets which have been created over the past 50 years. There should be less attention and priority on new assets, although they attract more media attention and, during election campaigns, it is better to have one's photograph taken in front of a new construction. There is no doubt that the assets that this State has built up over the years are now in a state of real decline and, unless the Government addresses that issue more vigorously with higher allocations to maintenance and smaller allocations to the construction of new facilities, existing buildings in existing communities will be subject to greater hardship.

There is certainly growing concern among residents of developing areas, and I draw attention to the recent comments made by the Mayor of Salisbury in that context. I am sure that you, Madam Acting Speaker, are aware of those comments. The Mayor pointed out with some irony, and to some extent with tongue in cheek, that his residents should vacate the Salisbury area and move to Golden Grove. While he might not mean that literally, he is drawing the attention of the community to a very real problem—established communities are, to some extent ignored in favour of glamour developments, such as Golden Grove. As the Minister of Transport indicated in response to a question I asked last week, the construction of the new Golden Grove connector road is mandatory under an indenture approved by this Parliament because it is part of a new development.

Therefore, because there is only so much money to go around, inevitably existing areas that deserve greater allocations of funding will suffer. Indeed, we need only to consider the rumoured contents of the PAC report (which I understand is shortly to be made public) concerning the replacement of existing public utility assets in this State to see what enormous consequences face us if we continue to neglect existing assets in favour of glamorous new buildings, new sewerage works, new waterways, new roads and new highways. I am sure that that report will detail problems in this State which are similar to (although on a much smaller scale) the problems that already face countries like England, where water systems have existed since the time of the Romans. The United Kingdom is now faced with billion dollar bills and deficits to replace those facilities. Certainly, South Australia does not want to find itself in that position and alert attention by the Government and the relevant Ministers to those problems—

Mr Gunn: It means a reallocation of priorities.

Mr M.J. EVANS: That is quite correct. I have drawn attention in my earlier remarks to the fact that we must move away from the glamour areas and towards the necessity to replace and maintain what we have. We must address that problem first, making allowances for new facilities where necessary, but giving the priority to ensuring that the things we already have are properly looked after and that the communities that are established continue to prosper before we address the need for new communities to be established.

It has been trendy over the past 20 years in this country to look at growth, and to measure our success in terms of growth. However, growth does not always reflect the quality of life enjoyed by the vast majority of our electors and residents in this State. It is about time that Governments and Oppositions shifted some of their focus and attention from strictly analysing growth *per se* more towards analysing quality of life.

When challenged about his economic management, the current Federal Treasurer nearly always responds in the classic way treasurers do by pointing to growth figures—growth in employment, growth in the size of the economy, and growth in the number of fridges and motor cars sold last year. While those things are relevant they also reflect an increasing demand on readily exhausted natural resources, increasing pollution in the countryside and our cities and ever higher population densities in established areas.

I believe that if we are to squarely face the issues of the 1980s and 1990s then growth is one of those things we must look at. It is no longer true to say, in the current economic climate, that if we are growing we are improving. Quality of life is just as important and must take equal place in the political agenda with raw growth statistics. I will now briefly turn my attention to a parochial dispute and a matter which concerns my electorate, but which I believe has consequences well beyond it, that is, the foreshadowed closure of the James Hardie factory at Elizabeth. That factory was one of the first established in the Elizabeth area and has been operational there for some 30 years. The plant is a credit to those who own and operate it. I have visited it several times, both in my capacity as Mayor of the City of Elizabeth formerly and, more recently, as the member for the area.

Unfortunately, the company recently decided to close the plant, which manufactures concrete asbestos pipes. One of the substantial reasons for that closure was sustained pressure from a small section of the trade union movement in this State—indeed, in this country—that all forms of asbestos are dangerous and evil, and must be immediately eradicated no matter what the cost. While I am very ready to

agree with the view that asbestos, like other hazardous products, is dangerous and where possible should be removed from the community and from buildings, and certainly should not be used in new facilities, there are some limited circumstances where a product like asbestos can serve a useful purpose.

One of those applications is in concrete asbestos pipes. The James Hardie company at its manufacturing facility at Elizabeth had developed a very safe and effective technique for incorporating asbestos fibres in a cement matrix. That matrix was then sealed through the use of very high temperatures and pressures in autoclave units on the site so that the asbestos was locked firmly and chemically, as well as physically, inside the concrete matrix of the pipe.

As a result it is almost impossible to acquire a fibre health hazard from a concrete asbestos pipe. Of course, it is possible. If one were to take a piece of sandpaper or a sanding machine to a concrete asbestos pipe, one could then no doubt generate hazardous fibres. Some would be asbestos fibres and some straight concrete particles, which are readily available in the community, but are quite dangerous if inhaled.

I suggest that in fact very few competent—and indeed even incompetent—workmen would take to a concrete pipe with a sanding device. It is well known that in fact there are techniques which have been demonstrated for cutting those pipes. They are perfectly safe and do not generate asbestos fibres or particles which would injure health. I suggest that there is a far greater risk from those pipes falling onto people than there is from asbestos fibres being breathed.

Some people have referred in the local press to this matter, and I refer particularly to letters in the *Elizabeth Gazette* of 5 August 1986 from Mr Jack Watkins, of the Australian Building and Construction Workers Federation, and from Mr Tony Bush, President of the Building Trades Federation, which stated that the member for Elizabeth is soft on asbestos and that the member for Elizabeth encourages the use of asbestos. The article states:

He said the statements served to protect an industry which had killed thousands.

'The B.L.F. are, it seems, always fair game for pseudo-Labor politicians (including Labor Party members) when they need to swing the blame from their multi-national friends' doors when they have been found out.' Mr Bush said.

That is ill-informed criticism, if ever I have heard it, because my statements were directed quite clearly strictly towards those particular products, the concrete asbestos pipes, and not towards the broader use of asbestos when it is sprayed on air-conditioning ducts, on pipes and the like, and in between walls. Those activities, which I do not support—and never have supported—are quite dangerous, and I do not agree with them. I suggest that, in the form of a concrete matrix, it is in fact a very reasonable and safe use of the product, and far safer than storing thousands of litres of arsenic and copro-cyanide compounds in a factory in the Port Adelaide area and then releasing that into the water supply.

Unfortunately, partially as a result of pressure from these people, the manufacture of these products will be discontinued and no doubt that will mean the loss of jobs in the area and also a substantial cost to the community. The E&WS Department faces a significant bill to replace those pipes with other pipes, and those new products will not last anywhere near as long as the concrete asbestos pipes, so I ask those who so readily criticise those of us who try to put forward a more reasoned position on the use of asbestos pipes not to say that, by so doing, we are condoning the indiscriminate use of a dangerous product—which certainly

I am not—but to look at the more rational point of view that, in particular forms, that product can have a public use.

From my inspection of that factory and my views as to the use of those pipes, there is no way that they constitute the kind of threat that those people would have us believe they do. I think it is appropriate that they should review their position in that area and, rather than pressuring the State Government to ban all those uses (although they might just as well do that now, because that was one of the last remaining satisfactory uses of asbestos and it has now been closed down), they should look at the responsible action, for example, of the Premier, who supported my request that the Victorian Premier should be asked to reconsider his ban on those pipes. The Premier did that and, in writing to the Victorian Premier (Mr Cain), which action unfortunately was unsuccessful, he supported the use of that product in the community because of its economic advantages and because of its relatively safe construction and constitution. I think that those who are critical of the use of this product should take a leaf from the Premier's book and view the operation more rationally and less emotionally.

Turning to Housing Trust rents, I believe this is a very topical matter and one that will certainly again come before the House in the not too distant future. The Minister of Housing and Construction recently made it quite clear publicly that he does not intend to preside over a Housing Trust that is rushing headlong into an STA type of deficit—and I could not agree more. That is a responsible and reasonable position for the Minister to take and at least he is addressing that point while the deficit is still within manageable proportions and before the rot really sets in.

However, I am quite concerned to see that he is foreshadowing another *ad hoc* rent increase at a time when he has in his possession what we presume to be a responsible and wide-ranging look at the broader question of Housing Trust rents and the anomalies which the rental structure presently incorporates. Unfortunately, over many years now, the Housing Trust rent subsidy schemes and rental assessment schemes have come to incorporate many anomalies, provisions which have been added on an *ad hoc* basis over a period of years. As problems arose in the community they were addressed by individual amendments to rental schemes, and the end result is something like the Income Tax Act—full of loopholes and anomalies and certainly unfair to many people.

I believe that it is appropriate that we should now conduct, as the Minister has done, a broad-ranging review of that to determine just where these anomalies are and just how we might best address them. But there is no point in taking from those who are just a little above the poverty line in order to give to those who are below the poverty line. That is not the form of redistribution of income or wealth of which Robin Hood, or even the Minister of Community Welfare, would have approved. I suggest that to perpetuate the present scheme—indeed, to extend the anomalies by rent increases at this time without the overall review that the Minister has promised this House—would be an unfortunate and retrograde step. I look forward to urgent action by the Government to bring this report forward, to have it publicly debated and to have whatever responsible recommendations it might contain to rectify those anomalies put into place as soon as possible.

I assure the Minister, as he would no doubt well know, that many of the tenants out there—and he and I both represent a large proportion of them—are becoming incredibly confused about just what the rental policy really is. They have had rent freezes, rent deferrals, rent increases

which have been discounted and rent catch-ups, and now they are faced with rent reviews and another *ad hoc* rent increase. That simply is not a good way to run that kind of business: a coordinated State and federal strategy is required to provide a responsible approach to income security, housing and all those related issues. I believe that, if the Government addresses those matters now, it will save itself some grief in the next 12 months.

I would like also to address a related matter; that is, the planning issue, which is related to something that we are to discuss this evening. I have no intention of trespassing on that debate, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to last year's report of the Planning Appeal Tribunal. As members may be aware, the Planning Appeal Tribunal in one form or another, either under the previous Act or under the Act promulgated by the previous Government on the eve of the election, has in it an appeal mechanism whereby decisions of local councils, the State Planning Authority or the State Planning Commission may be appealed against.

To give members some comparison, I state that in 1967-68 22 appeals were lodged with the then tribunal; by 1972-73 this had increased to 208; by 1981-82 it had jumped to 802; and by 1984-85 it was 1 371. As members will detect, that rate is increasing greater than exponentially, and I suggest that the tribunal is no longer able to handle that kind of pressure. In fact, what do we see from the results of those appeals? We see that in just under 9 per cent of cases the decision of the planning authority was completely reversed. However, of those, more than half were reversed because the applicant for consent indicated that he no longer wished to avail himself of the consent; in other words, in only 4 per cent approximately of the cases was any reversal undertaken by the planning tribunal on real grounds; 96 per cent were not so. That is, in my view, an enormous and indeed condemning statistic of the planning appeal system that we have; 96 per cent of appeals went through and were not taken to any substantial conclusion or changed. That is a ridiculous situation, in which I believe there is an enormous waste of resources, on both the local government and State Government levels in continuing that process where fewer than 4 per cent of cases have any real meaning to them.

Local government itself, of course, must bear some of the responsibility for that, because I suspect that some councils, knowing that the appeal system exists, are not taking the hard decisions but are taking the popular decision, knowing that it can be reversed on appeal, if there is merit in the original application. That is an absurd position and is a denial of the responsibility of local government, which was elected to take those decisions and which indeed should do so. But, while this Parliament continues to offer the easy escape of the present free appeal—free, that is, to the objector but not to the applicant—the community will inevitably suffer.

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

Mr M.J. EVANS: Some of the appeals which are lodged and which are successful would be so as a result of what might be called legal or technical grounds, where the council has made a genuine error of fact or law in interpreting the circumstances of the appeal, or perhaps where in remote cases or unusual cases some element of corruption or fraud has been involved.

Rightly, those appeals should be heard and dealt with accordingly, but few of them succeed on their merits. So, what is the value of third party appeals? What is their main justification in this context? The Planning Appeal Tribunal

stresses that one of the main points in favour of it is that it gives the public some exposure to the planning process. In other words, it has an educative value. While I fully support the concept that we should further educate the public in the planning processes of the State, I do not believe that we should do it at the expense of the appeal structure. So, I commend strongly to the Minister for Environment and Planning that he review the appeal process and structure to ensure that only appeals of genuine legal and technical concerns get through to the tribunal, that councils are encouraged to review their own decisions and discuss their decisions with objectors where they are dissatisfied with the result of the appeal process, and to try to solve problems at the local level, thus minimising the impact on development in this State and on the whole legal planning process. That would be far more satisfactory to applicants, objectors and, in the end, to the Public Service of the State.

In conclusion, I would like to refer briefly to the question of time limits on debates in this Chamber and the process that the Deputy Premier put in place today whereby all this week's proposed business must be completed by 6 p.m. on Thursday. Failure to do so will simply result in that business being put through without debate and without any reasoning taking place on the clauses of any Bill that might remain uncompleted at that time.

While I find the procedure under which we are working this week not unreasonable—the House could certainly complete the measures before it by 6 p.m. on Thursday; there is no doubt about that—the fact that a motion has been moved in this regard is a little nonsensical.

Given that there is no doubt that we can complete the business in that time, why do we need that kind of time limit? If it is intended that those time limits be applied more stringently in the future and brought closer and closer to the actual time that the debate takes to the point where we eventually start cutting into debating time with those limits, I would find that situation quite intolerable.

There is no reason why this Chamber should not be permitted to do what it was elected to do and what its members are paid to do, that is, debate the measures before the House. Many measures spend months if not years in contemplation and debate within the community and, within the affected sections of the community—be they trade unions, industry or whatever—and there is no reason why this House should not be given the same privilege of at least a reasonable debating time to discuss such matters.

I do not really see that it is terribly consequential if the sittings are extended by a few days or a couple of weeks if that is what it takes to fully debate the measures that are presented and to achieve a degree of understanding of all the clauses of all the Bills that come before the House. I do not believe that any Bill that comes before this Chamber is of a trivial nature, such that it can be approved without debate.

The idea that a clause in a Bill may go through without debate when someone wishes to discuss it is quite intolerable to me and, if we get to the stage where the Government is moving that kind of motion, I will oppose it. The fact that the Deputy Premier has chosen to move the motion in a way that is fairly harmless is an interesting first step. I wonder whether it is the thin edge of the wedge to soften us up for a subsequently more Draconian process, perhaps not in this session or Parliament. Who knows what a successor of his on either side of the House might do with that precedent once it becomes firmly established in the procedures of this place? We will end up guillotining through measures of considerable importance and length simply so that they may be debated by another place where perhaps

for this Parliament at least some of the real action takes place.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): On behalf of the electorate of Victoria I would like to thank the Governor for opening this session of Parliament. I congratulate him on his service to South Australia, and also his wife, Lady Dunstan, for her support for the Governor's service to this State. I state my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, as Queen of Australia.

In my first Address in Reply speech I dealt with the productive capacity of the area of South Australia that I have the privilege to represent. I referred to the percentage of this State's rural and industrial production that comes from the electorate of Victoria. On this occasion I want to deal with some of the facts of life that this State and nation must face to earn our export income, which is the only way we have to maintain our standard of living.

The Federal Treasurer has made one single courageous decision that has enabled the world to judge our performance as an exporting nation: with one stroke of the pen, the Treasurer took on board the Liberal Party's platform of deregulation, and he floated the Australian dollar. I applaud the decision; it has enabled all our trading partners to scrutinise the financial management of our economy. But what have they found? They have found a country which, through wage indexation and excessive wage demands—which I might add are never based on productivity or the state of the economy—paying ourselves too much. This country has been taking in its own laundry for far too long. The increase in wages followed by the increase in prices syndrome has eventually, of course, made our internal cost structure non-competitive. Much of this is caused by bloody-minded union action in blackmailing industry generally, together with senseless demarcation disputes, especially in the transport and waterfront areas. In any other country in the world, especially socialist countries, those actions in interfering with the country's right to trade would be treated as treason—and treason it is in this country.

Our trading partners have also found a country which has penalty rates, holiday pay loadings, and a number of public holidays that are not found anywhere else in the world. Also, our workers compensation legislation encourages people to stay off the job. Further, we have a social welfare system that we cannot afford, and now there is a new disease called RSI, which is most unusual because it is a disease caught only by employees; employers seem to be immune. The world is laughing at Australia as our currency crashes. This will continue, of course, until certain parts of the union movement realise the damage that they are doing and that they have done to this country's reputation as a reliable trading partner. Surely, their behaviour must be subject to action in a civil court. At this stage I state categorically that I am not anti-trade unions: they are an essential part of our capitalist system. Only in a capitalist society can free trade unions exist, and they play no part in a socialist society.

Having praised the alleged world's greatest Treasurer for his courage in floating the dollar, I wonder when he will deliver the other half of the formula; that is, to give us a strong dollar. No country or state can live beyond its means for too long, and the presentation of a balanced budget seems to me absolutely necessary. It is a fact that, since the Government of Gough Whitlam in 1972, no Federal Government has been able to balance its budget and, of course, until that happens the world will continue to judge us as a potential banana republic.

The final result of the non-balancing of our budget is now being seen with our increase in interest rates. The fact

is that to balance our budget we have to borrow more and more money, and no investor will invest in a country whose currency is devaluing against all others. It is interesting to note that we have even devalued against the Papua New Guinea kina. So, to attract foreign funds into this country, interest rates are now being kept falsely high.

I want every member of this House to realise the reason for this country's and this State's malaise. It may be more difficult, of course, to convince the members on the Government benches than to convince those of us on this side of the House. Interest rates are on the rise again to attract foreign money into this country to balance the budget. Unemployment is rising again because we are a high cost country, paying ourselves too much money and are non-competitive in a highly competitive market.

I want all members on the Government benches to understand that not only are their Canberra colleagues responsible for the fringe benefits tax and the capital gains tax but also for high interest rates and increasing unemployment caused by deficit budgeting. Having dealt with the causes of our State's parlous situation, I would now like to look at some of the factors which are inhibiting our desperate need to gain extra export earnings and, I hope, to stop our standard of living falling further and, whether we like it or not, that seems inevitable with the present scenario.

As a trading nation, this country still relies on the ability of our primary producers—including mining and energy—to provide the backbone of our national wealth which, of course, in the end affects the standard of living of us all. Although not totally reliant on primary production, a slight recession in our ability to sell on world markets causes severe problems with our national accounts. There has been a small increase in exports of manufacturing goods, but we cannot ever hope to be competitive with the cost of labour we have in this country, compared with the cost of labour in other countries of the world.

Slowly but surely our standard of living drops, our ability to purchase high cost manufacturing goods diminishes, and our only hope is to produce more goods for the world's markets at a reasonable price. That means controlling and overhauling our attitudes to wage fixation and becoming a reliable and stable supplier of those goods to our customers, with a special emphasis on becoming a reliable and stable supplier.

But, what do we see reported in the *Advertiser* last week? John Lesses, Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council predicts possible disruption in the key areas of the waterfront, power, transport and building industries as some unions use their industrial muscle to succeed in their objectives. The left wing unions at their meeting in South Australia argued that the Government has already lost the confidence of the wage earners because of the decline in their living standards. I can assure them that, unless there is a turnaround in attitude, the decline in living standards is only just beginning.

On the productive side of the ledger, it has been stated by Ian McLachlan, President of the National Farmers Federation, and supported by Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures, that 20 per cent of Australia's wheat farmers will have a negative income this year. Their standards of living have already been dramatically affected.

How does the demand for more money and less work and the use of industrial muscle to insist on that demand fit the present situation in Australia when part of our major productive force has a negative income? If, in the presentation of the 1986-87 budget by Treasurer Keating there is no restraint on wage demands and no reduction in Government spending which will inevitably have an effect on the

living standards of all Australians, then the end result by international judgments will be far more dramatic than the fiscal medicine that we must take.

May I paint one quick picture for the House. In Australia 25 per cent of employment is now provided by the Government. Great Britain is now below us at 22 per cent; France, a socialist country, 16 per cent; and Japan, 7 per cent. Look at the relationship between the yen, the pound, the dollar and the franc and those figures. If one looks carefully, one will see that there is a very close similarity between those employed by the Government in each country and the faith in the respective currencies. While the fall in the value of the Australian dollar has been dramatic and will affect the standard of living of us all, the producers of this country, if given a chance, can capitalise on that position, and that will be in the interests of us all. We must remember, too, that those most efficient producers by world standards are not subsidised in the same way as our EEC competitors nor, in some cases, as the American producers. We need to go out into the world and sell, and we need to understand what the markets of the world want and provide the products that those people need. We need people with entrepreneurial skills—people who understand how to sell. The first thing we need to understand, of course, is that quality products will always be saleable, and obviously the most important thing is that we need to deliver—and deliver on time.

Let me give a typical example of what has happened to destroy one export market. The green triangle—an area in the South-East of South Australia and in western Victoria, which is one of the most productive areas in Australia—with the consent and the support of both this State's Government and the Victorian Government, sent a trade mission to Singapore. The results of the mission were most encouraging, and several firms had very positive results.

I would like to quote the debacle that followed just one attempt to establish an export market, as follows:

Strike on docks gets under potato grower's skin—An South Australia potato grower is spitting chips about the national dock strike because it has delayed the opening of a new export market. The strike, which ends this morning, has forced South-East grower, Kentish and Sons, to sell locally a shipment of potatoes destined for Singapore. The company feared shipping delays would cause the potatoes to deteriorate before they reached Singapore. The eight-tonne consignment was the company's second shipment to Singapore to be affected by industrial action on Australia's docks.

Last month a similar shipment was delayed on the docks at Portland, Victoria, because of industrial action. When the shipment reached Singapore the potatoes had sprouted, reducing their market value. The latest order had been sent to Port Adelaide in the hope of avoiding the dispute, but when it became apparent the strike would spread, the company decided to sell the consignment locally. Kentish director, Mr Malcolm Kentish, said his company would not have been able to afford the damage which would have been done to its reputation if a second shipment reached Singapore in poor condition.

He would not say whether the company would continue to try to enter the Singapore market. 'We got caught up in the last lot (of industrial unrest)', he said. 'Now we have got to be more responsive to the problems we have got here'. Mr Kentish said it had taken several trips to Singapore to get the order. 'We beat the Dutch and other grower countries to the deal,' he said 'Unfortunately yesterday we had to send a telex to our buyers saying we could not deliver.' Mr Kentish said this failure would damage Australia's reputation as a supplier. 'They (the Singaporeans) don't give a bugger what our problems are, they laugh at us,' he said. 'What we have to understand is they don't grow anything, they are manufacturers and suppliers of labor and technology.'

Surely, this loss should not be borne by the producer. Surely, this country cannot afford to have bloody-minded, self-interested union officials dragging the nation down on its knees. Surely we must have laws to make these people realise the insanity of their actions. It has been most interesting to read a statement put out by our part time Minister

of Agriculture while on his recent flying visit to Japan *en route* to the Commonwealth Games. He was in Japan inspecting the marketing chain for produce and holding talks with the Japanese Government officials and leading importers. 'The time is ripe for South Australia to become a regular and reliable supplier to Japan,' Mr Mayes stated. What a joke! How can it be, when governments allow, and in some cases condone, strike after strike in those areas that affect our export income and therefore our living standards?

Remember the United Trades and Labor Council Secretary's statement that he could see unions in key areas, such as the waterfront, power, transport and building industries, using industrial muscle to succeed. Succeed for what end? We see that as a further nail in the coffin of Australia's ability to sell and deliver to the world's markets a quality product on time. Suggestions have been made that producers, such as Kentish, should not be subjected to this sort of treatment and should be indemnified against the losses that they have incurred. While this may solve the problem of the losses of the efficient producers, it does nothing to indemnify the losses to Australia, its name, its standing in the world markets or its standing with its future trading partners.

The answer must be more substantial than just the indemnity of personal losses. Where any organisation or group of people do harm to the future trading abilities of Australia—which affects the standard of living and the future of every Australian—the Government should have the power to seek compensation from that group on behalf of us all. In other words, if we as a nation are to succeed, there should be power to take civil action against those groups that are trying to undermine the country—not by the employer (as in the Mudginberri dispute) but by the Government. The decision of the court in awarding \$1.7 million damages to the owner of that business against the meatworkers union is a watershed in curbing lawlessness in this country and, if we widened provisions to enable all exporters and the Government to stop the thuggery that is being perpetrated on those who are trying to export and earn desperately needed export dollars, it would enhance the reputation of Australia as a trading partner.

There must be ability to take civil action against those organisations that interfere with the free flow of goods to our overseas customers, and that will in turn help to maintain our standard of living. This nation's primary producers are now competitive and capable of meeting the challenge because of the fall in the Australian dollar. It is only in the primary production area that we can meet the challenge. Has any Government or Parliament enough guts to pass legislation to ensure that these subversive elements in our society pay for the damage they are doing to us all, which finally affects the standard of living of us all?

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): In speaking in this debate following the opening and speech by the Governor on 31 July, I am very conscious of the need for the people of our State to better understand the political system that provides us with the style of democracy which has seen this country develop socially and economically. I feel strongly about this matter and I am always pleased when our school age children show keen interest in the Parliament and those who serve as elected representatives.

I was most interested recently to read of a United Kingdom MP who is actively pursuing the education of students in the procedures of Parliament. The method used is what would be called a travelling road show, complete with a trunk of robes, wigs and symbols of office. Mr Gerry Neale, MP, from Cornwall, England, sets the scene for 200 students

to role play the procedures of Parliament, including the clerks and other office bearers.

Here in our own State, the Hon. Barbara Wiese and South Australian Senator Crowley held a series of Upper House tea parties, which were most successful in ensuring that the process of Parliament was learnt in a pleasant and constructive way. Those schools that have provided their students with the opportunity to address the political process of the parliamentary system should be recognised for their contribution. They are ensuring that our students approaching adulthood can assess for themselves rather than being influenced by the media, printed or visual, which has generally been able to set the tone for issues and not be queried effectively, because the community is not sufficiently informed of the parliamentary system.

As the member for Brighton until the electoral boundary changes, I wish to place on record my appreciation for the support I received from the constituents of the areas that were redistributed into the seats of Fisher and Bright, now represented by my colleagues on this side.

As the first member for Hayward elected to Parliament, I reaffirm my commitment to all residents of the electorate of Hayward to continue to be accessible, to work to improve existing services and to fight to establish new and much needed services and facilities for the youth, the aged, families, individuals and groups. In making this commitment I believe that the ingredients in achieving community improvements are community involvement, effort, participation and action.

I would now like to turn to a subject that I hope will illustrate the importance of community interaction and its effect on the commercial and social environment of a community. Many years ago, as communities based on agriculture developed, there also developed a need to centralise the exchange of goods. Therefore, village fairs became regular functions. Later still, the area in which they were held—the village square—became a permanent institution. At the same time, as the commercial core of the village was established, so too the community's servicing needs emerged and began to establish headquarters in the central area. We saw the development of many familiar services. General stores sprang up, blacksmiths set up their forges, the barber set up his chair, the bank was established, there was also the baker, the draper, the ironmonger, the advocate, the apothecary, the doctor and, of course, a tavern and boarding house, and a constabulary set up with a ball and chain. All these businesses became a recognisable part of the village square. This square served those people who chose to establish themselves as families or individuals in the surrounding environment.

By various means of transportation, such as wagons, coaches and in some cases trains, people were brought to the square or adjacent points. Churches and schools were erected to service the growing population and hospital facilities were provided. So the village square became not just the commercial centre, but also a place of social interaction. It was a place where people from all levels of society could meet, socialise and do business. It was often also a central point where events of a political or religious nature took place. Here public announcements were made. Here people would assemble to take part in festivities or watch entertainments.

The village square became, in essence, a centre for the arts as well. Rulers and civic leaders would organise spectacles in these areas which would feature musicians, actors, dancers and singers at one time or another. The fruits of the labours of the local artists were displayed here. Of course, the artists who sketched and painted, and later

photographed events and structures, have left us with a visual record of the history of the village square.

I have raised this topic and provided the background to enable me to make a comparison between the village square of years ago and its modern manifestation—the regional shopping centre. As an example of today's version of a village square I will use the Westfield Shoppingtown at Marion. The first great difference to be noted in comparing the two is that, whereas the former grew and became the central point that attracted community growth, the latter was imposed on an already existing community environment. The community, in a sense, gave way to enable a modern village square to grow. The regional shopping centre, as exemplified by Westfield Shoppingtown, has many things in common with my first example. Transportation brings consumers and visitors to the door—some 420 buses per day in 840 movements put down, pick up or provide an exchange for passengers. In the centre tenants provide a broad range of goods and services, for example, food, clothing, furnishing, banking, pharmacy, medical, dental, and also Government agencies, which includes the Hayward electorate office from which I am able to serve the constituents I represent.

Other aspects in common with the village square are ones that have always attracted my interest, namely, the social environment and commercial advantage of the community that has access to the centre. The commercial and social aspects can and do at times come into conflict, recognising that the customer attractions such as media advertising, performing artists and, interesting displays all contribute to attracting community participation. Also, there is the climate environment which attracts the community to visit. Many aged and other people will gather in the malls for the purpose of being cooler in summer and warmer in winter. People use the mall also as a venue to meet friends, gather in groups, or visit as tourists.

Over the years it is the group gathering aspect that has created the most significant conflict in such centres. The gathering of young people is seen as being the highest potential for trouble and much emphasis has been placed on how to deal with this influence on shoppers, tenants and property itself. Management of regional shopping centres have a heavy responsibility in ensuring that tenants' businesses are not disadvantaged by the actions of irresponsible behaviour. Customers, individuals and families want to shop in an environment that is safe and provides a behaviour standard that is free from unacceptable language, fighting, alcohol, drug induced behaviour, and nuisance actions.

Many methods have been pursued in an attempt to control this type of behaviour and added conflict has arisen when all youth have been seen to be potential troublemakers. Over the years of my experience in retail management, in such situations each generation of youth has produced a core of 20 or 30 ringleaders, who have created the type of disturbance that I have outlined. Police and security personnel have attempted to ensure that the environment of such centres meets the required standard set by the community and, in most instances, I might say that they have done so in a sensitive and caring way. However, the behaviour of youth has continued to be a matter of concern which must be continually addressed.

On 26 March this year the Minister of Health and Community Welfare launched a most unique project at the premises of Westfield Marion. A refurbished bus arrived on location in the car park and the launching was the culmination of almost two years of discussion, consultation, planning and action. The planning committee consists of a broad range of community and youth representation,

including Westfield management, officers from the Department for Community Welfare, representatives from Darlington C2 Division of the Police Department, Commonwealth Employment Service officers, Marion council aldermen, youth members and me, as a local member.

Since the official launch, a tenant of Westfield has been also placed on the management committee. The project was funded from Commonwealth and State funds and a substantial input of facilities has been provided by businesses serving the community. The Marion Mobile Youth Project employs two youth workers and a clerical assistant, with a priority brief to determine the needs of young people, to refer them to other agencies and to provide information on issues such as health, employment, training, housing, finance and counselling, which is sought on a whole host of issues. To give some idea of user contact, I quote from the recent June report of the management committee, which states that the number of individual young people making contact with this venue was 558 for the month of June. Of this total, 235 were female and 323 were male. The main issues raised by young people were unemployment, employment, accommodation, family relations, peer group pressures, drugs, education, boy-girl relationships and finance. Workers responded to these issues by providing information, advice, counselling referral and advocacy.

Given the unique nature of this project, the research component will provide a basis for consideration of the provision of venues and services to assist the young people in the area. The aims of the research component will be to identify influences such as authority, drugs, alcohol, dangerous substance sniffing, group dynamics, physical environment, seasonal and climatic factors and economic patterns of behaviour; contact and establish communication with the youth and address external influences affecting behaviour such as family, social, cultural and economic; assess and identify means of establishing programs, venues which will benefit the youth of the community as an ongoing project at the end of the present funding; and provided to youth an information flow of human service facilities in existence in the community which can benefit their specific needs.

A number of regional shopping centres throughout Australia are interested in the outcome of the funded period of this project. The information being compiled, hopefully, will see a change occur in the method of dealing with and providing for the young people attracted to regional shopping centres for social interaction. The second matter, which also relates to shopping complexes, is parking for the disabled of our community who utilise regional shopping centres.

Mr Gunn: How many more pages of this stuff have you got?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Rann): Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: In good faith, management sets aside a number of spaces and indicates by use of the international symbol for the disabled that these parking areas are for the use of disabled persons. It is also worth noting that each space for the disabled is wider than normal to ensure free movement of wheelchairs, walking frames, crutches, oxygenator units, etc. Also, these spaces have been generally located close to entrances of buildings to ensure convenient access for the disabled.

I am continually angered by the selfish, rude, unthinking, uncaring, able-bodied people who blatantly use these parking areas. However, it pleases me to know that their free run at disadvantaging the disabled will come to an end in the near future. The cost of their action will have a dollar sign when amendments to the Private Parking Act, 1965

are addressed in this session of the Parliament, as noted in His Excellency's speech. I thank the Minister for her action and also the many people who have supported my call for change.

I will now indicate the areas of change that I will be pursuing to provide more effective assistance to those people I represent as a member of the Government in this Chamber. I am pleased to note the intention of legislation to address the security of tenure of people who have chosen, and who will choose, commercial retirement villages as their place of residence. As I have been involved in highlighting a number of the anomalies which are present and which are causing much disquiet, I am sure that all responsible persons will support moves to effectively address a number of disadvantages that have come to light. The Commissioner for the Ageing mentioned this in his first report, brought down last year, and the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, in his June 1985 report, indicated the following:

My officers were represented on an inter-departmental working party formed to consider an appropriate legislative framework for resident funded retirement villages. I am concerned that the existing controls are inadequate and that the vulnerable community groups do not have a responsible level of protection when entering into complex transactions.

Further, a research report with recommendations have also been prepared by the Consumers Association of South Australia.

I can only reiterate that changes are required. I will continue to push for effective fencing amendments to the Swimming Pool Safety Act 1972. Evidence I have presented in this House, and further evidence I have obtained from Western Australia, has convinced me that one child drowned is too many, especially if effective preventive action has not been taken.

The provision of information is an important aspect of any community. Government agencies, non-government groups and general information relating to the community are the essence to a healthy environment. I therefore support the planning work being undertaken by the Marion community forum for the future provision of a venue that will provide not only information but also an effective referral agency.

I turn now to some exciting activities that are to take place. On 2 September the Corporation of the City of Marion will celebrate 100 years of service to the community. I formally congratulate Mayor Hodgson, elected representatives of council, the administration and workers for the service that council has provided and developed in those 100 years.

It is significant that as we celebrate 150 years of European settlement of South Australia we also celebrate 100 years of a local government body. To me it is significant that the original area of Finniss Street and the adjacent area which is in the electorate of Hayward provided the beginning of the council which we know today and which serves some 70 000 ratepayers and spans some 25 square miles. My best wishes go to all for the celebrations throughout the time allotted.

Last but by no means least, I record my thanks to my staff, who continue to keep pace with me. Their support and loyalty is appreciated and, given that I have taken on a new role as Government Whip (which does not come with staff resources), I also thank them on behalf of my colleagues who I am sure find a pleasant voice at the other end of the telephone or receive their communications on time. Peace in the family, in the community, in the State.

the country and the world is the ultimate aim of each and every one of us.

Motion carried.

AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 August. Page 188.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I indicate at the outset that I am not the lead speaker for the Opposition in this debate; the lead speaker will be the Leader of the Opposition, who is temporarily occupied with an appointment. I am happy to indicate to the House that we support the Bill. The office of Agent-General has been of long standing in London. On the occasions that I have visited London, usually on parliamentary business, I have had cause to use the Agent-General's office, and I have been well satisfied with what I have seen of it. I think it is well for us to remember that London is the financial capital of the world.

We do have some ties with Britain in particular which I would not like to see severed. However, in this changing day and age there are, no doubt, some changes that we would like to see in the operation of the Agent-General's office, and the Leader will take up that point in a moment. I am pleased that the Government has introduced this Bill. It seems to me a bit prescriptive to suggest that the Agent-General should be appointed for five years—no more, no less. There are many circumstances, I dare say, where someone would be prepared to serve in that office for less than five years. It is a very desirable appointment. I do not doubt that Governments of various complexions might wish at some stage to appoint someone for a lesser period, anyway. It is not a major Bill, and we support it. As I have indicated, the Leader will expand on my remarks.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I will be brief in expressing support for the Bill. I have had the opportunity of looking at the proposals in a committee of the Australian Labor Party, and I fully support them. Also, I support the sentiments of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who said that it is important that we continue to maintain a presence in London. I agree that London is the financial capital of the world and will continue to influence, to a certain extent, the input of foreign capital into Australia and South Australia. It is important that we have a presence in that city.

The importation of foreign capital has now become more important for South Australia than the diplomatic presence which we used to have and which was the main function of the Agent-General. I support the proposition that we ought to be looking at a change in the way that that office has been operating, especially in finance, trade, investment and tourism.

I, too, have had the opportunity of visiting London, and I have utilised the services of the Agent-General. I must express my appreciation to the former Agent-General for the kind cooperation that was extended to me, especially in my study of local government in seaside areas. The then Agent-General extended to me the courtesy of providing a full itinerary which opened doors that I had not had the opportunity or time to open from Adelaide, and I am grateful to him for that.

There is no doubt that this side of the activities of the Agent-General will continue. However, I can foresee the time when it will be necessary to offer to someone who has

the expertise a position for less than a five year contract, as is now the case. I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that any appointment ought not to exceed five years but ought to be up to five years and that from time to time Governments in South Australia will be in a position to offer something less than five years.

I agree with the sentiments expressed in the second reading speech that from time to time this will permit a younger person who is actively involved in business, the professions or some other career, time to accept a shorter contract in order to take on this activity. This is a very wise decision.

I have heard the Leader of the Opposition say from time to time that there ought to be some presence in Asia. I think he mentioned Hong Kong, as a possible base for a South Australian presence, and I have no quarrel with that. I do not believe that there ought to be any reduction in the office of the Agent-General in order to achieve that possibility, because the office of the Agent-General can now assist South Australian industry, especially as we have recently had a large devaluation of the Australian dollar. Even though there are problems with the European Common Market, it will give us an opportunity to utilise some of our goods and services in that area.

I noticed that representations from other States in London concentrate strongly on tourism. This is an area that should be looked at in relation to the additional business activity that we seek for South Australia. Although there was not a strong application of tourism by the Agent-General when I had the opportunity to visit London, I believe that this is an area to which we should strongly turn, however. So, the appointment of someone who has particular expertise in that area is a vital consideration. This is a commonsense proposition, and consequently I support it.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): As the Deputy Leader has indicated to the House, the Opposition supports the Bill, which seeks to introduce a degree of flexibility in the term of appointment of Agents-General for South Australia in the United Kingdom. At the outset, I acknowledge the contribution made by the former Agent-General, Mr John Rundle, while serving in that position and, like the member for Henley Beach, I acknowledge the invaluable assistance that John Rundle gave to me on two occasions when I was visiting the United Kingdom. On one occasion I was on an overseas study tour and on the second occasion my trip was for the specific purpose of contacting those people associated with the Roxby Downs project, more particularly BP, and touching base with Kockums and HDW. In that respect Mr Rundle's services and assistance were invaluable, and I want to publicly acknowledge that.

In addition, I suppose an indication of the value of John Rundle in that position is that, quite clearly, he was the first to identify the possibility of a submarine project, and in doing so he raised the matter with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in South Australia which then started to prepare a detailed assessment that was subsequently picked up and supported by the Government and the Trades and Labor Council. Undoubtedly, that project has bipartisan support in South Australia and I certainly hope that political considerations will not intervene to the detriment of South Australia, albeit that I get the very clear impression that the Government is lowering expectations in the community related to the submarine project.

Be that as it may, politics aside, the project is good for South Australia and to that extent it ought to receive universal and bipartisan support—which comes from the Liberal Party. I hasten to add that I think some acknowledgment should be given to John Rundle for his identification, at

least in the very initial stages of the possibility of that project and his drawing it to the attention of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I wish John Rundle well in the future in his retirement in the United Kingdom. I hope that before long he has the opportunity to return to South Australia.

In talking about the flexibility in the appointment for the Agent-General's office, I think it ought to be said that the Liberal Party hopes that with the revised arrangements common sense will prevail, although I do not expect the Government to do otherwise. By that I mean that I hope that the taxpayers of South Australia will not be required to pick up relocation costs from the replacement of an incumbent on a short-term basis—like every 18 months or two years. I hope that in removing the five-year appointment time and by allowing a degree of flexibility that is not abused and that indeed, common sense prevails because, of course, significant relocation costs are related to that office.

During April last year, the Liberal Party outlined its policy in relation to South Australian representation overseas, part of which has been referred to by the previous speaker, the member for Henley Beach. At the time our policy recognised the changing nature of the role of the Agent-General's office, and a commitment was given that a future Liberal Government would restructure that office so that more emphasis was given to trade and investment matters and less to diplomatic and protocol functions. That is important as I think the role ought to be basically in the commercial area rather than the diplomatic/protocol area.

Britain is now heavily committed to the European Common Market and is no longer the natural trading partner it has been in the past, and we need to recognise that quite significant change in overseas marketing potential in the United Kingdom and Europe versus the South-East Asian region to which I referred before. South Australia has an excellent opportunity to make sufficient inroads into the British and some of the European business communities to establish export markets and investment opportunities, provided we target the endeavours of the Agent-General's Office. There should be a restructuring to give a greater emphasis in the commercial area rather than in the areas of protocol.

In a brief discussion that I had with the newly appointed Agent-General, I was impressed with his clear and concise impression on the direction in which he wanted to take that office on behalf of South Australia. He had some clear goals and objectives on behalf of this State. To that end, I wish him well. It would appear to me that the appointment of Mr Walls is, indeed, a good appointment and an appropriate one, and I wish him well in that position.

The Opposition supports the measure to help South Australia respond to changing trade and investment patterns in Britain and Europe. London is the logical base for the Agent-General's Office, with a greater emphasis, hopefully, in the area of commercial promotion and investment opportunities. I am confident that the new appointee to that position will continue the work started by John Rundle very effectively and efficiently on behalf of South Australia.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I add my support to the comments already made. I think all members of this Chamber will agree with what has been said. I would like to add my thanks to Mr John Rundle. When I was in London he was able to assist me, as I understand he has probably been able to assist every other member who has been able to avail himself or herself of a trip to that country. I gathered from my first reading of the second reading speech that extensions to the term could be negotiated or, more to the point, extensions of the term are not to be precluded. However,

from the comment made by the member for Henley Beach, I am now wondering whether it is in fact a maximum term of five years. I would be grateful if the Premier could explain that, because I would have thought that, if an Agent-General in London had served the maximum of five years, was serving this State well and was fit and able to continue, it would not be unreasonable that he should be allowed to do so. If he were obliged to be brought back or have his charter discontinued simply because of the effluxion of time, that perhaps would not be the best situation. Whilst we are enabling the Government to negotiate a shorter term, it should be equally possible, if a person is serving the State well, to extend the term.

There are merits in having the flexibility to reduce the term. Many people whom I know may be suitable candidates for a position of this kind, but would not be prepared to move away from the country or from their family for a five-year period, whereas a lesser period might be totally suitable to them. All that I have to say has already been said. With the Government having the flexibility of being able to negotiate shorter terms, it opens the door for political appointments to be made by Governments on a term by term basis.

That is the only reservation that I could have with a Bill of this kind because, as it previously stood, it was for a five-year term, which surpassed any normal Government term of three years and it was therefore most unlikely that the reappointment of an Agent-General would coincide with the election of a new Government. I see that as a risk where some Government or Party influence could be brought into the appointment. I hope that I am being purely theoretical in that assumption. I have not seen evidence of it in the appointment of Agents-General in the past and hope that I do not see it in the future. That is a word of caution as it could occur at some time in the future.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to rise briefly to support the Bill because I, like a number of members of this House, have been well served by the Agents-General who have been in London during the three occasions that I have had the pleasure of visiting the United Kingdom since I have been a member of this House. It is important for a number of reasons that the office is continued and upgraded as it serves as a continuing link with our traditions of the Westminster system and with the United Kingdom.

There is great scope to increase the amount of tourism to this State, and the Office of Agent-General could play an important role in that area. Also, in the area of trade, in view of the European Economic Community, it is essential that we have someone who is in regular contact with that organisation and who can report back to the Government on a regular basis. The sort of industries with which I have had some involvement are currently suffering because of the policies of the European Economic Community. I therefore believe that, if the right person is appointed (a person with a background in trade), this office can play a valuable part in assisting and promoting the industries in this State.

During my visits to the United Kingdom I have been well served not only by the Agent-General but also by his staff, who have been helpful and considerate in assisting me to organise programs and giving advice, which has been greatly appreciated by me and my family. The office should continue, and I would be strongly opposed to any move to downgrade the office or to dispense with it, notwithstanding that a need exists to have a presence in Asia or other parts of the world, which I believe is essential. If we were to dispense with the office and allow our interests to be looked

after by the Department of Trade, I believe that we would miss out to the Eastern States. I have had far better service from the Agent-General's Office in London than I have had from Australia House. I will say no more than that. I support the Bill, as it will give greater flexibility to the appointment of officers. I sincerely hope that this office will last for a long time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I thank my colleague the member for Henley Beach and the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues for their support of the Bill. The main issues have been well covered in the debate. I point out that, in reviewing the role of the Agent-General's Office, we are well ahead of the Leader of the Opposition, who suggested certain directions that it might take. That, indeed, has been our policy now for some considerable time, namely that the protocol function is very much a secondary function.

If we are to justify the establishment costs of an Agent-General's Office, which are quite considerable as an overseas post, we must concentrate on the trade and investment opportunities that it provides. We did not start from the viewpoint of being committed to the maintenance of the office of Agent-General. Realistically, Governments both now and in the future must always keep under review the appropriate location of their overseas officers.

It is important, particularly with the formulation of the European Economic Community and its increasing importance as an economic bloc, that we see our representation in that part of the world as very much servicing the wider European community, because so many of the decisions that formerly were taken in Britain and involved bilateral trade relations are now being taken over by the European Economic Community. We are not dealing with the British Government in the same way as before: we are dealing with an economic bloc involving a number of nations. So, we must look to our European representation being in the most appropriate and effective location.

Obviously, one such location would be Brussels, which is the headquarters of the European Economic Community, but our assessment was, after a full examination, that there was virtue in maintaining an office in London. There are some advantages in the Agent-General protocol relationship and in any case, it is a good base on which to service the European continent.

I make this point, in the context of the functions of the Agent-General, that not just is his emphasis turned away from protocol and turned more into trade and investment, but he is also turned away from purely a British, ex-colonial, Commonwealth connection and into Europe. The relationship with Europe and, through Europe, the Middle East and even Northern Africa are very important parts of the Agent-General's role. I suggest that in the current incumbent, Mr Walls, we have someone eminently qualified. He was chosen because of his skills and background in the trade area; he has had extensive experience in the Middle East; and he has considerable knowledge of the Australian Trade Commission and its workings and the way in which one goes about trade and investment activities. He has taken up the job with considerable vigour and enthusiasm, and I think he will serve the State very well indeed.

I, too, would support what members have said about Mr John Rundle. In his tenure of the office, he showed diligence and courtesy and certainly provided a very useful and important base and service to the South Australian Government, to members of Parliament and others visiting London. In April of last year, he accompanied me on an extensive investment and trade mission through Europe,

and again I can only say that he certainly displayed skills and abilities by which we were well served. The role of the office is certainly becoming much more oriented towards that trade and investment area and Mr Walls's appointment marks a further stage along that path, very much related to trade and investment.

As to the points raised by the member for Flinders, the flexibility that is provided by the Act is not meant to be prescriptive. It is just simply a fact that many people active in business in South Australia may be interested in a term of office in London and may be willing to give of their skills and abilities in what is essentially not a very highly paid job (although it is, I believe, satisfactorily remunerated but obviously not one that somebody would see themselves being involved in for the whole of their career). It gives a flexibility which allows us to recruit more widely than we could.

Traditionally, I guess the job could be seen as one that a senior public servant or other eminent personage perhaps near the end of his career could take for a five-year term. I think we have to be much more flexible than that, and a number of businessmen have said to me that five years out of the local scene is too long. If one looks at something of the order of three or so years, then it is a much more attractive position, because they do not thereby lose contact with their business associations and other activities in Australia. In many ways, I think that one of the most desirable persons to take this post is someone actively involved in business who is prepared to take a few years off in the service of the State, knowing that they can come back and either continue to serve the State in some capacity or, alternatively, resume their business and their business functions in South Australia.

That is why we want flexibility. In other words, this is not a political but a practical measure and I can assure the member for Flinders about that. Regarding extensions to the term, again that is not prescriptive. The measure provides for an appointment up to a maximum of five years but, at the end of the term, whether it has been for five years or less, it is quite open under the legislation for a new instrument of appointment to be entered into. The same prescription would apply. In other words, if an Agent-General was appointed for a term of three years, at the expiry of that term it is open for the Government to renegotiate an additional term up to five years under a new instrument of appointment, but continuity would be preserved. There is certainly no intention to say that, if at the end of three years someone is doing a great job and is prepared to continue for a time, they must come back to Australia and the legislation makes it impossible for them to continue. That person can continue under a new term of appointment.

Mr Blacker: But not beyond five years?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: But not beyond five years. Mr Walls, the current Agent-General, will be formally appointed, with the passing of this legislation, for three years. The notional agreement with him is that there will be a three year term, which will be subject to renegotiation at the end of that period. I believe that this is a workable measure incorporating flexibility of appointment, and therefore it will be much more attractive for someone wishing to take on what is a very important job, one which must be very practically oriented and for which we must draw on the skills of people who do not just see it as a post into which to retire or to finish their career but as something that is very much one of the stages of their career in business. I thank honourable members for their support and commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RURAL AND OTHER FINANCE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 189.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports this minor measure, which will allow the current loans (some 234 of them) granted by the State Bank to continue. With the passage of this legislation, no further loans will be granted. The State Bank has played a significant role in providing funds for the development of South Australia. This Bill amends the Advances to Settlers Act 1930, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act 1938 and the Student Hostels (Advances) Act 1961. I could talk at length about student hostels because a number of them are required in my electorate, but that would not be appropriate under this Bill.

These Acts have assisted many producers over the past 50 years. The State Bank went out to the agricultural areas and lent money for the development of rural properties. The other bank in that area was the Bank of Adelaide.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr GUNN: As my colleague pointed out, that bank is no longer with us. In this State's early development only two banks really provided these services. However, I understand that the State Bank has guaranteed to continue this work without the for these measures. This Bill will assist with the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, which took place some time ago.

The Opposition can see the merit in amending these Acts. However, I point out to the House and the Premier that in difficult economic times, such as we have now, it is essential that adequate funds are available to rural producers who, by the very nature of their operations, require large amounts of capital for little or no return. It is in the interests of every section of the community that funds are available to these producers to continue to adequately fence and water their properties, and for the other purposes covered in the legislation. Therefore, it is essential for the Government to guarantee that there will be adequate funds at the disposal of people starting off on rural properties. I know that funds are available from the Commonwealth Development Bank and under rural assistance schemes. However, in many of these cases funds are not often available because of the criteria laid down.

In the past this legislation has been able to fill in some of those gaps. I hope that the State Bank will fill in the gaps that occur from time to time, because many of these people are of limited financial resources and previously were able to avail themselves of these funds. When I had some research done into this measure I was surprised that 234 loans were currently outstanding. However, there is no point in delaying the House any longer this evening. I believe that the State Bank will continue to play the supportive role it has in the past. The Opposition supports this measure.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In speaking to this Bill I wish to raise a couple of issues. I understand that there is general agreement that the Advances to Settlers Act 1930, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act 1938, and the Student Hostels (Advances) Act 1961 are to be amended, and that this has the support of the producer organisations. My one qualifying comment is that I hope suitable arrangements are made for the primary producing sector.

I note that in the Premier's second reading explanation he indicated that there was consultation with the General Secretary of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, who confirmed his support for the action now proposed, provided adequate support for the action now proposed in the area covered by the Acts is available from the State Bank or elsewhere. I would have thought that that was a fairly logical extension of this Bill. It is assumed by this that the Rural Industries Assistance Commission will pick up the areas that were previously covered by these Acts. It is also noted that the 230 or 240 outstanding loans, to which the member for Eyre referred, will be carried through to their ultimate conclusion. This Bill indicates that there will be no further loans under these schemes, and this raises a couple of queries. First, South Australia seems to be in a position where it is not benefiting from federal grants that may be available on a one-for-one basis funded by the State.

I would be grateful if the Premier would explain whether or not my assessment is correct. It is my understanding that when drought, fire, or a disaster of some sort occurs that attracts Federal Government support on a dollar for dollar basis (when the State provides a dollar and the Federal Government matches it), then that sort of funding is not now available to South Australian producers. I understand that, because of this and because of the amending of these two Acts, that type of funding is in question and, therefore, it falls back on the producers to, if you like, work their own way out of the problems and to not be in a position to avail themselves of Commonwealth funding.

Earlier this year there was a considerable water problem in the hundred of Yalanda, which is roughly midway between Cowell and Kimba. In the previous drought that area was assisted by a Commonwealth funded water carting scheme. That scheme was administered by the State, but the Federal Government funded the cartage of water to a central distribution point, namely, the Yalanda tank. That tank was a State Government constructed tank—I think it was a million gallons, but it was certainly a large one—which was filled from a gravel catchment area and a subsequent dam with a windmill. The windmill then pumped the water up into the large concrete tank. That serviced five or six hundreds in the immediate area of Yalanda. Because the State Government did not service those areas, and did not look after and maintain them, that tank has not caught water for some eight or so years and, therefore, it has become a liability on the Government. Because of the lack of service, and with the greater catchment areas being overgrown with trees and vegetation (and therefore totally ineffective in its catchment), that area is effectively without water.

During the last drought period the State Government refused to negotiate for the cartage of water, as it had previously done in the former drought period. It stated that it was then up to the individual farmer to use the Rural Industries Assistance Scheme, or some other avenue to raise funds on his or her own behalf and therefore to fund themselves out of it. In most other instances it is an obligation of the State Government at least to provide some sort of basic service, particularly in a time of drought, such as was being experienced at that time. In one instance a farmer has a 104 kilometre turn-around to cart water. There is nothing more demoralising and so negative as a farmer having to exist on the cartage of water. When there is a 104 kilometre round trip, then obviously the economics of even being in the area become somewhat questionable.

I am concerned that while these measures have served a very useful purpose in the past—and nobody is denying

that—and while it is recognised that the Premier has made statements in good faith, I believe that we have seen assistance to primary producers slip by us. That assistance is available to primary producers in other States, but those in South Australia do not appear to be enjoying the same benefits. I would be grateful if the Premier could comment on that point. I would like to think that I am wrong in my assessment, but it appears that that is not the case and that many of our primary producers are in fact missing out.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): Again, I thank members opposite for their support of this measure, which is a practical one with no great implications. I have listened to the contribution of the member for Flinders and can understand some of the concerns that he expresses; but, in relation to areas such as disaster plans and support for major droughts and other calamities that may affect people on the land, the problem we have is that the Commonwealth has recently effectively imposed a new set of disaster criteria on the States, which means, for instance, that the loss or damage level at which federal assistance is triggered has been raised and a number of the other conditions surrounding the definition of a 'disaster situation' have also been amended.

What that does, effectively, is impose on the State greater burdens which it obviously, to some extent, must bear. However, it does mean that it is impossible to have the same sort of support that may have prevailed in the past. I think that it is a great pity, and it is something that we resisted fairly strongly when the Commonwealth proposed the new arrangements. The Commonwealth makes the point that in a major disaster situation there is still considerable Commonwealth assistance and perhaps over a longer term one could argue that there is even more assistance provided than there was under previous arrangements. But, there are—and I think that the instance that the honourable member quoted of the problem with water supply in a drought situation is a good example of it—situations which do not quite reach that trigger point or qualification in terms of a national disaster definition but still, nonetheless, to the limited area in which they apply, represent major economic problems.

The State's ability to respond to those is more limited, because we are not getting the assistance from the Commonwealth that we have had previously. However, I do not see that as particularly relevant to the subject of this Bill, because, if the honourable member looks at the second reading speech, the various Acts which are the subject of this measure—and he is concentrating particularly on those that relate to the agricultural sector—have not in fact been used to any great extent in recent years. Most of them were the product of the Depression days and the disasters that occurred then. Most were based around the capacity of the then State Bank and Savings Bank to respond with special assistance and lending under particular provisions.

With the amalgamation of the State Bank we now have access to a much broader financial base and a lending policy, which also, I think, means that the vulnerability that the State Bank, for instance, in the past had, which meant it was restricted unless it had special Government assistance under Acts such as this, has in a sense been removed. In addition, the State Bank has stressed that its assessment is that it will be able to provide adequate support from its own resources to do all of the things that these Acts envisaged. If in practice that does not prove to be the case then, obviously, we have to look at it.

I am confident of the bank's assurances and its assessment that that is what it will be able to do. It is not just my

confidence: we had this matter looked at very closely some years ago by a committee which was, in fact, established by the previous Government. It had on it representatives from the Department of Agriculture, Treasury, the State Bank and the United Farmers and Stockowners. They came to the same conclusion; that, if we had a financial institution with the capacity to pick up this function, there was no need for these separate Acts. Now, with the new State Bank in its amalgamated form, we have such an institution. A further check was made and discussions were held prior to introducing this legislation, as I understand it, with the association, which reaffirmed its previous view about it. I guess that all I can do in response is commend the Bill to the House and say to members such as the member for Flinders that if in the workings of the new arrangements there are problems in future the first recourse is obviously to the bank and its policies.

If they are clearly inadequate or fail to cover the situation, it is something that should be taken up with the Government so that we can look at what special arrangements could be possible in that situation. With that invitation, the member should have no qualms or problems in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Payment of money to the Consolidated Account.'

Mr BLACKER: I would be grateful if the Premier could give further information about what is really meant by the phrase 'payment of money to the Consolidated Account'. Does that mean that that money goes into general revenue, where it is not set aside for any agricultural or like purpose to that which was originally intended?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, moneys would go into general revenue. I point out that the earmarking of those moneys in any case came from general revenue originally. Therefore, there is no loss to a particular sector of the community. It may be useful for the Committee to note some of the figures involved. The figures are not quite up to date, but they show a considerable decline in recourse to these Acts. In fact, over the past three or four years the Agricultural Graduates Land Settlement Act, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act, the students hostels and the vermin legislation have had no new loans approved. The only area where there have been approvals has been in the Advances to Settlers Act.

There has been a continuous decline. The latest figure I have for the year ended 30 June 1983, which was before the banks decided not to take on any new obligations under these Acts, is an amount of \$35 000. So, it is really a very trivial sum of money. The outstanding loans total, in combined terms, about \$2 million. Of course, this legislation protects those loans and they will continue to be administered in that way. It is only at the end of that time, when everything is wound up, that this return to consolidated revenue will take place. As the original outlay or support came from consolidated revenue, as I say, once the loans are discharged, there is no loss to the rural sector or to those who were the object of the loans.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 and 4) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 190.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The subject matter of this Bill is of fundamental importance to all South Australians. It is therefore a matter that deserves wide public debate and discussion, and it is a matter upon which all interested groups should be entitled to receive consultation prior to any legislation being introduced in this House. That has not been the case, unhappily, and many people have expressed their deep concern to the Opposition about the manner in which this Bill has been introduced and is apparently to be rushed through Parliament. The Bill does three things.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am advising the Minister about the attitudes of the groups with whom he should have consulted prior to this Bill being introduced in this House. The Bill does three things: it repeals section 56 (1) (a), which provides for a continuation of existing use rights. It repeals section 56 (1) (b), replacing it with what the Minister describes as a more explicit provision. However, many people who have studied the Bill believe they are redundant matter. It redrafts the transitional sections of the Act by relocating them into a schedule in accordance with current drafting practice. Certainly, the Opposition has no quarrel with that. The groups that I have consulted include organisations such as the Building Owners and Managers Association, the Law Society, the Environmental Law Society, the United Farmers and Stockowners, the Local Government Association, the Urban Development Trust and the Real Estate Institute. Those organisations believe that the Bill is unclear and is therefore likely to create even more confusion than has already been the case.

The Bill does not guarantee protection of existing use rights and, therefore, should be opposed. The claim by the Minister that the Planning Act is not relevant to continued use of land but becomes relevant only when further development is proposed is demonstrably untrue.

All in all, there is deep concern among interested bodies about the implications of the Bill. As I said, it will have a fundamental effect upon land value and the operational use to which land can be put in South Australia. Anything that has such a pervasive effect upon people's lives and livelihood deserves much broader public discussion and debate and much closer parliamentary scrutiny than is provided for by the simple scrutiny of this Bill by both Houses of Parliament. The Opposition believes firmly that the Bill should go to a select committee, which was the proposal adopted by another place last year. The select committee never really got off the ground because an election intervened.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It never met.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is right. It is worth noting that at the end, or towards the end, of the first session of this Parliament I asked the Minister for Environment and Planning whether he intended to re-establish the Select Committee on Section 56 of the Planning Act and Related Matters. I pointed out that the select committee had lapsed with the prorogation of Parliament for the election. The Minister replied that I had an advantage over him because he had assumed that the other place had re-established the committee. I found it extraordinary that a Minister responsible for a certain Act should not be aware whether a select committee had been re-established in another place to examine that Act. However, such was the case with the Deputy Premier.

I asked him whether he ever conferred with his colleagues, and he said that he did so from time to time as he passed them in the corridor. One can only assume that, in fact, that is the case, because not to be aware that a select

committee into an Act administered by the Minister had not been re-established is, in our opinion at least, an admission of negligence on the part of the Minister. In fact, I submit that the Minister has been negligent in his approach to this whole question. That view is shared in the community by responsible bodies that have a great concern about this planning question. It is worth putting to the House the views of some of those organisations. The United Farmers and Stockowners has written to me, as follows:

It has been the practice of Government Ministers to discuss pending legislation with the UF&S where that legislation is likely to impact upon our membership. In this case the amendments proposed were not considered by my organisation prior to their introduction into Parliament. I am also not aware that other interested parties were advised of their nature before they were presented to Parliament. Existing use provisions of land are basic to our society. Without them the incentive to invest and to properly manage assets can be put at risk. Further, the rights of individuals may be trammelled. The substance of these changes has been the subject of a number of legal examinations in recent years. It is only proper therefore that there be extensive community input and examination of the proposed changes. This should include existing use provisions in legislation in other States and, if necessary, overseas.

I could not have put it better myself and, in fact, that view really expresses the views of the other organisations. However, other organisations have gone further and have pointed out that the Bill is unclear, that the drafting will only create further confusion, that it will be a paradise for future litigants and lawyers and that the whole question should have been clarified. Had the select committee been able to pursue the matter after being re-established, as we believe it should have been, all the necessary perspectives could have been brought to bear on this complex issue. The Government would have had the benefit of hearing a variety of points of view and the professions involved, notably the planners, surveyors, architects and lawyers, would have been able to bring the benefit of their knowledge to the Parliament to enable us to find a way through this complex maze, in order to let property owners know precisely what they can do with their property.

The words in the Bill 'change of use of land' can be interpreted in any numbers of ways. In fact, I heard a series of discussion papers presented to the Environmental Law Society. Three different professionals, two of them lawyers, were discussing what section 56 means, and I was reminded of the mediaeval arguments about how many angels can stand on the head of a pin. Matters discussed seemed to be matters of such fine distinction and fine interpretation that the words 'change of use' are entirely subjective and in the eye of the beholder.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: It will be in the legislation.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is precisely it—it will not be in the legislation and existing use rights will not be protected when this clause is repealed as a result of the Bill.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister interjects by saying 'Nonsense, nonsense', but the reality is that if Jane Bloggs bought a property in, say, 1970 for use as, let us say, an office complex, with a building on the property which would have permitted expansion of perhaps 50 per cent, still allowing for car parking and all the necessary factors that need to be taken into account, she would have paid a sum of money for that property that she believed was based on continuing use as office premises. This would have involved expansion of that continuing use, and the assumption that the capital value would appreciate on the basis of that continuing use, with her operational use of that property proceeding along the lines that it was going to be an office block.

Let us now suggest that the council rezones that property, and let us assume that this Bill goes through Parliament. It means that the existing use rights no longer have the protection of the law, and the capital value of that property could be very much depreciated.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: What's been the position in the past two years?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister asks what has been happening in the past two years? I think he would be better to ask what will happen in the next five to 10 years, because what the Minister is doing is, in effect, pursuing a course which will result in retrospective devaluation of the capital and operational values of properties. That is not just my interpretation; it is the interpretation of eminent lawyers in South Australia, of people involved in the real estate industry, and of people involved in land development. The Minister appears to dismiss these opinions as being worth little or nothing.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Let us have it on the record: the Minister says they are wrong. The Minister is saying he knows more than the Law Society, the Real Estate Institute and the Building Owners and Managers Association—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Because I am better advised.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Because he is better advised. That beats all arrogance that one has heard from the Minister, and one has heard a great deal in the way of arrogant argument in terms of dismissing the expertise of people who are aware of the area and the complexities and who do not approach the matter with the simple minded approach that the Minister has in this case.

Philosophically, this legislation has the potential to affect every landowner in the State other than those protected by the State itself. I am referring to projects like ASER, and the Adelaide City Council, of course, is exempt by its own decree from this legislation. One is very strongly tempted to think that the motive of the Government in introducing this legislation is that it has an interest in acquiring land without paying compensation, because that will be one of the practical effects if the legislation is passed.

Many Government departments and authorities have that interest in acquiring land without paying compensation. The Minister's own Department of Environment and Planning, particularly in respect of acquiring land for conservation purposes, has such an interest. The Housing Trust, State Transport Authority and the Highways Department have such an interest.

If this Bill is passed, those authorities will be able to pursue that interest of land acquisition, without the need to pay compensation on the basis of existing use rights, which the owners believe that they currently enjoy. I believe that that will lead to immense hardship and injustice, and is something this Parliament should not tolerate.

One of the organisations I have consulted has stated that the proposed amendment does nothing to clarify the problem facing owners enjoying existing use. Indeed, the amendment is silent upon the question of an existing use which has lasted for three years or more before the date when the amendment becomes law.

Other organisations have simply said that there is nothing in the Government's argument that changes protection of existing use rights, and the question is posed that, if the Planning Act is not relevant for continued use, what Act is relevant? If a house exists in an industrial zone is the use protected, and can the owner sell, assured of continued use for the buyer? For example, can a cottage in industrially

zoned Brompton be renovated, including the case of a lean-to bathroom, if there are no existing use rights?

The posing of those questions reinforces my argument that immense hardship is likely to be incurred if this Bill is passed. We all know that the ownership of a home and the capacity of the owner to improve that property as he or she wishes is a very important part of most peoples lives. We all believe, when we buy our properties (speaking particularly of homes), that the right to improve that property is fundamental to the ownership of the land and yet, depending on where the property is, depending on the whim of the council or, more specifically, the council planner, those rights are now likely to be jeopardised as a result of the passage of this Bill.

It is simply not good enough for the Minister to say that he knows better than these eminent South Australian organisations because he is 'better advised'. That is simply not the case. Even if it were the case, it would be a very arrogant assumption by a Minister to make that claim, as the Deputy Premier has just done. We on this side of the House believe that there needs to be extensive public consultation and, despite the Minister's claim that this has taken place, other people do not believe that it has.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That's typical.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, it is typical, particularly of this Minister. One could refer to other projects.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: The Stirling council, over the chair lift project.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, the Mount Lofty development project.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Did you support it?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I supported the concept. I have grave reservations about the details that have emerged since the concept was announced. The amendments are complex, and difficult to read. I have been having consultations with lawyers who are distinguished in this field. If the lawyers themselves acknowledge that they are difficult to read, how on earth does the Minister expect that lay people, property owners and elected members of local councils can understand them and interpret them justly and consistently, as should ideally be the case. It simply will not be good enough for people living in one council area in South Australia to have an advantage over people living in another council area simply because their councillors might have a better chance of interpreting these very ambiguous clauses.

The law should be in this area, as in all areas, abundantly clear for all to see and understand because so much depends on it. Peoples' land is normally the biggest investment that they make in a life time, and this legislation puts at risk the value of that investment. The Bill is principally a Committee Bill and the Opposition certainly trusts that the Committee stage will not be reached until more people have had the opportunity to put their view on this Bill. To quote one letter I have received, the Secretary-General of the Local Government Association states:

I am concerned about the little time allowed for commenting on this Bill.

He further states:

The amendments are complex and difficult to read.

On the basis of the consultations that the Opposition has had in the limited time available to it, and on the basis of the philosophical argument that we simply should not be doing anything at all to prejudice the right of an owner to retain the option to use a property which was developed for what is subsequently deemed to be a non-conforming use, the Opposition believes that if this existing use provi-

sion is repealed in the manner which the Minister is proposing, the whole question of land ownership in South Australia will be thrown into confusion. That will also have considerable economic effects which will have an adverse impact upon the State.

What are investors likely to do when they see that any decisions they make about investment in land and subsequent use of that land are likely to be placed in jeopardy as a result of decisions taken by local government about zoning and non-conforming use? What will investors say when they read of this legislation and realise the immense risk to which they put their capital if they invest it in land in South Australia? They are just some of the multiplicity of arguments against this Bill. We believe that the matter is best resolved by being referred to a select committee, by enabling interested parties to make representations, and by enabling the matter to be aired at length and publicly so that every South Australian can have some understanding of what is being proposed.

This State was founded on the principle of land ownership. It would be a sorry day indeed if, in the State's 150th year, the principle of land ownership upon which the State was founded was placed at risk as a result of legislation of this Parliament. The Opposition fears that that is what is likely to happen, and for that reason, we will be moving at the appropriate time for the Bill to be referred to a select committee.

Ms GAYLER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): This evening I want to elaborate on one of the issues that arises from the urban consolidation debate, about which I referred in my Address in Reply speech last week. In particular, I will refer to the issue of the state of the capital assets in the inner city area and, in particular, the education assets held in the electorate of Adelaide. One of the consequences of the changing population dynamics of larger metropolitan Adelaide is the substantial increase in population in the outer suburban areas and the consequential decline in the rate of population growth in the inner areas. In the Address in Reply debate, I also mentioned the corollary of that situation, namely, that there was an increasing rate of dwelling construction in the inner area. One thing that I did not mention was the nature of the population change that is taking place in the inner area.

The characteristic of the population change that is occurring in the inner suburban areas, in particular in the District of Adelaide, is the increasing number of young families who are moving into the area and who must find educational, particularly primary educational, services for their children. This is illustrated by the fact that all the primary schools in the District of Adelaide are experiencing an extraordinary population boom, particularly in the lower primary arena. Population increases that are being forced on these primary schools in the District of Adelaide mean that, in a number of primary schools, the students in the junior primary classes (namely, reception, grade 1 and grade 2) represent 60 per cent of the entire population of the school. Consequently, more and more space and facilities are needed to provide extra classes, as there is a commitment to ensure that, particularly at the junior school level, class numbers are not higher than 30 students.

The difficulty is that the schools have very small campuses and their facilities are not only limited but also very badly maintained. One of the arguments put forward by educational administrators is that a number of these schools coped in times past with populations five times the size of their present population. For example, the North Adelaide Primary School currently has an enrolment of 220 students, and some educational administrators argue that 80 years ago it had a population of 800 students—it coped then, so why cannot it cope now? That argument is completely unsatisfactory. These schools must cope with changed teaching methods, changed community and parental expectations, changed educational standards and an increasing variety of subjects that are being offered, as well as expanded entrance arrangements for children at the junior primary level. All of the schools in my district were built in the 1890s.

Ms Lenehan: They are heritage items.

Mr DUIGAN: They are indeed heritage items. Some people would wish to keep them as heritage items by providing no maintenance whatsoever. We are now in the 1980s, and these schools are suffering from severe neglect.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: There are plenty of schools like that.

Mr DUIGAN: There are indeed. I understand that it would cost the Education Department about \$12 million to bring those schools to a satisfactory level, a level that is applied to new schools being established in the outer suburbs.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You could almost spend the \$12 million at the Mylor Primary School.

Mr DUIGAN: There is no doubt that that money could be spent in any one district that members care to suggest. I wish to address myself to the consequences of this burgeoning population growth, one being that, because of the size of the building maintenance budget, the assets of the inner suburban educational facilities are being neglected and are declining in comparison with the facilities available to schools in new and growth areas.

I believe that the assets built up by generations of parents and successive Governments deserve to be maintained and replaced where necessary. Schools in these inner areas—and I do not wish to just concentrate on my own electorate although I use that as a starting point—have galvanised iron lean-tos and built-ons that were erected by successive groups of parent bodies to try to cope with increased demands that have been placed on them. They are simply becoming inadequate for modern teaching needs and practices.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DUIGAN: Cracks appear not only in schools in the member for Coles' electorate. In a number of schools I have had dealings with there are severe problems because of the age of the buildings, the movement of these buildings, cracks in the walls and in the joinery, inadequate art facilities and asphalt that is breaking up. Some schools do not have adequate green playing fields.

I suggest that a massive investment of funds be made to maintain these inner suburban educational assets. We must maintain them, because if we do not we will be confronted with an even greater problem further down the track. A specific amount of money must be put aside by educational authorities for the maintenance of these assets.

Earlier this evening I took the opportunity of looking at the Auditor-General's Report for the year ending June 1985. I found that he did not address himself to the issue of putting money aside for a maintenance program of the sort that is necessary to maintain the assets that have been

developed over the years. I think that that needs to be done. While I acknowledge that some moneys have been put aside, it will be increasingly important to identify the value that we ascribe to the assets we have and maintain them in such a way that we will be able to utilise them and so reduce the continuing drain of complete replacement once they fall into disrepair.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to take this opportunity to speak about the hearing impaired children of this State. I want to refer to two particular matters. First, I give my strongest support to the Parents of Hearing Impaired, South Australia. I am sure that all members of the House of Assembly, at least, will have received a letter from that organisation asking for our support and for the support of the Government to assist these children. I have had some personal experience in relation to this matter and have the utmost respect for the people who are making this representation. For something like 18 months the Parents of Hearing Impaired, South Australia, have been trying to have reinstated the course to train teachers for the deaf held at Sturt College. The course was not offered during 1986 because of the retirement of the lecturer. The letter received by members dated 7 August states:

We have attended numerous meetings with Sturt College, Education Department officials and the Australian Deafness Council Education Subcommittee, written copious letters and submissions to politicians, Sturt College and the Education Department, the last communication being on 10 June 1986.

That letter went to a number of people, including Ministers Crafter and Lynn Arnold, Mr John Steinle (the Director-General of Education), Mr Gilding, and Dr Segall. I was concerned when I learnt tonight from one of the persons in my electorate who is closely connected with this organisation that not one response has been received in reply to the letter sent out to those persons on 10 June. The letter requested that a decision be made as soon as possible and that the course be recommenced in 1987. The writers of the letter asked for a decision by 25 July and, as I said, to date no answer has been forthcoming and replies to telephone inquiries have been inadequate. I know that contact has been made again today with the shadow Minister in another place and he is doing all that he can to try to convince the Government of the need to place a very high priority on this matter.

The letter received by all members today is accompanied by a copy of a question asked in the House on 29 October of last year, and we can see from that that the Minister of Education at that time stated that the college had advised that it expected an intake in the course in 1987, albeit in a different form. The Parents of Hearing Impaired are therefore seeking positive action, with no sidestepping or delaying tactics, as pointed out in the letter, otherwise again there will be no course in 1987. These people, therefore, are writing to all members, as duly elected representatives in this State, to take up this matter. The letter states:

The main asset to any hearing impaired child in its formative years has to be a fully qualified teacher of the deaf; and this is in fact accepted by the Government in its policy to have all teachers appropriately qualified and trained. Hearing aids and other relevant equipment only amplify what scrambled hearing the child already has and in the case of the profoundly deaf are generally no help at all. Therefore, the only link between the hearing impaired child and the hearing world is the trained teacher of the deaf. Without the Sturt course it is inevitable that hearing impaired students will be taught by teachers untrained for this specialist need.

We urge you to support the hearing impaired children of South Australia and to fight for the appointment of a Lecturer I/Senior Lecturer with experience in the education of the hearing impaired at Sturt College, to train the teachers to help our hearing impaired

children obtain their full potential, and ultimately take their place as useful members of the South Australian community.

I very strongly support that letter. After all, the sum of money that this organisation is looking for is in the vicinity of \$40 000 and, when one looks at the expenditure of the Three Day Event, The Music Festival, and many other examples, one realises that the request made by these people for this extremely worthwhile cause is very small indeed. I would have thought that \$40 000 could be made available by the Government. I urge the relevant Minister and the Premier of this State to take up this challenge and provide the positive action that is requested in that letter.

The other matter to which I refer is again in relation to hearing impaired children. This situation arose as a result of an approach to my electorate office by the Principal of the Mount Barker Catholic Parish School who was anxious to be able to travel to Chicago to attend a special convention that was being conducted on this subject. The convention attracted the foremost exponents of the oral approach to the education of hearing impaired children. Two important aspects of the program in which this school is involved are cued speech (a mode of communication based on lip reading invented by Dr Cornett) and the Ling approach to teaching speech, which was developed by Dr Daniel Ling. Both those people were to speak at the convention.

The sad part of it is that the Principal was not able to attract sponsorship and therefore was not able to attend that convention in Chicago. He was certainly heartened by the support received from certain groups and individuals. However, as was pointed out to me in correspondence that I have since received, few people seem to realise the severity of the disability or the challenge of teaching speech and language to hearing impaired children.

It was pointed out to me that one airline official, in declining the request by the Principal of that school wishing to attend that convention for a seat on the airline to enable him to travel over there, commented that his company did provide transport in cases involving gravely ill children. The Principal states in a letter to me:

While I can appreciate that there is strong, emotive pressure in such a situation I also discern an irony; namely, that help is available for those at the end of their tether but not at the higher stages of the rope.

A considerable amount of information has been provided to me by the Mount Barker Catholic Parish School regarding the unit at that school. I will not have time to refer to all of it, but the approach to the teaching of hearing impaired children is modelled on the pioneering work of Brother Gerry McGrath and his staff at St Gabriel's School for Hearing Impaired Children at Castle Hill, New South Wales. Children attending the course for the hearing impaired stay for the morning only and return to their local school in the afternoon. The program features Cued speech, which I referred to earlier, a more precise form of communication than signing, which is used to acquire better language and lip reading skills; a special speech program designed by Dr Ling; the use of English as a second language materials and techniques; encouraged use of residual hearing through auditory training, and high expectations of intelligent hearing impaired children.

Much of what is said explains how the course is run. I commend the work that this school is doing for the hearing impaired. If any member of the House is interested, I will be happy to provide the information that I have been given, because I do not have the opportunity to refer to it all now. Both matters referred to dealing with the hearing impaired are extremely important. The first I would ask the Premier and the Minister responsible to take up, as a matter of urgency, because I am sure that every member of this House

would realise the remarkable work that can be done in helping these children.

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

Mr TYLER (Fisher): In this adjournment debate I will talk on the Government's role in recreation, sport and leisure. As members who know me well know, sport has been a very important part of my leisure activities for as long as I can remember. I have always been competitively active and currently play cricket for the Flagstaff Hill Cricket Club, so I certainly have a deal of interest in this area. Modern technology in our present society brings with it a substantial increase in leisure time, and using that time in a pleasurable and rewarding way is clearly one of the most important elements in a successful lifestyle.

Many medical authorities state that the lack of a positive, creative role in society results in emotional disturbance for many people. Socially meaningful activities are needed to avoid the otherwise certain decline in morale. The effectiveness of any lifestyle, any leisure, or any recreational and sporting activity lies in the satisfaction that it gives to the individual concerned. The activity must satisfy one or more of the basic human needs, which are, I believe, the recognition of achievement, a sense of belonging or being needed by a family, club or a social community or sporting group, self expression, the application of abilities and talents, the challenge of new skills, new knowledge and new experiences—and, of course, there are many many more.

If it does this, that is, satisfy the individual needs, persons will not have to participate; they will want to participate. That is a very important requirement that needs to be filled in the area of sport, that is, to want to participate—not have to participate. I was pleased to see that the Department of Recreation and Sport has been very active in this area in recent years. For instance, members would be aware that a women's consultant was appointed to the department two years ago. As members probably would be aware, a State conference was held last year: the Women in Action Conference proved to be an important stepping stage for the gathering of information and opinions from women representing recreation, sporting and fitness interests. Of course, my colleague the member for Mawson was also involved in that conference.

As a result of that important exercise, the Minister has established a Women's Consultative Committee, involving representation of women from a broad range of recreation, sport, fitness and other related interests. It is interesting to note that the committee reports directly to the Minister and is chaired by the Minister's adviser, Ms Jenny Russell. In relation to the involvement of women in sport, I was interested to read an article in the *Advertiser* by the education writer David Kellett. The article, dated 29 July 1986, is headed 'School report equality guidelines approved'. I will read part of the article because I think it states clearly the direction in which we need to go. Unfortunately, the article also contains some criticism by a group that I would describe as 'the people of darkness', namely, the Festival of Light. The article states:

Controversial Equal Opportunity Commission guidelines for equality in children's sport in schools have been approved by South Australian Government and non-government education authorities. The policy is being printed for State-wide distribution in about six weeks.

The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, Mrs Josephine Tiddy, said yesterday an initial draft copy had been significantly amended, but a 'special measures section', which was criticised by the South Australian Primary Principals Association president, Mr Alec Talbot, was part of the law and had not been withdrawn.

The 'special measures' section relates to a temporary program enabling disadvantaged groups, such as girls, to receive separate

coaching in order to catch up to traditionally advantaged groups, such as boys.

Mrs Tiddy said the Department of Recreation and Sport as well as the State's main education authorities—the South Australian Education Department, the Independent Schools Board and the Catholic Education Office—had seen and approved the final guidelines.

That is strongly supported by most thinking people in the community, and certainly in the Government both the Minister of Education and the Minister of Recreation and Sport should be congratulated.

The Bannan Government's objective is to promote the development of a State-wide comprehensive recreation and sport system which will cater for all sections of the community both male and female equally and, of course, for all levels of competence. It is my strong belief that the pursuit of pleasure, recreation and sporting activity is the right of every individual who should be able to select from a wide range of activities as well as select the measure of involvement. The Government, through its Department of Recreation and Sport, acts as a focus for program initiatives in recreation, sport and leisure. It should not be seen simply as a funding source—although the member for Bragg seems to think it is—but it should be seen simply as an agency that is able to provide advice, and coordination, be involved in consultation and act as a catalyst to community groups and organisations.

I believe that the Government's emphasis should be placed on raising the community's awareness of the benefits to be gained in participation, both for enjoyment and as an important contributor to the community's health and well-being.

It is important that we remain mindful that sport and recreation is one component in the overall lifestyle. It interweaves with other components, for example, health, fitness, transport, education and access, etc, but it should be considered with them and not in isolation. Emphasis on people, rather than activities, regardless of what service the Government continues to provide to the community, is a major role of any Government.

As I said earlier, I have been involved in highly structured sporting activities. The Government recognises that for many people unstructured activities, for example, use of walking trails, are more appealing. I am aware that the Department of Recreation and Sport develops walking trails for people of all ages and abilities. This pastime is a major interest for people not wishing to be involved in structured activities. Of course, the more structured possibilities are available through bushwalking clubs. There is also planning of open space for recreation use. The department helps other departments, local councils and other agencies with land and water management responsibilities to understand and plan realistically in catering for the demands of people seeking to undertake recreational activities in natural surroundings.

I would now like to turn to the development of recreation, sport and fitness facilities at the community level. This is an important factor in encouraging increasing participation by the community in both structured and unstructured activities. Ready access to facilities is a determining factor for many people in participation.

The Bannan Government has supported and will continue to strongly support the development of local facilities. For instance, \$750 000 had been allocated in the 1985-86 financial year for this purpose, and I hope that this amount will be increased in future years. The Government also provides financial and other assistance to recreation, sporting and fitness bodies on the basis of need. This is done through local government and State organisations, where appropriate, or through individual organisations.

The use of community recreational sporting facilities should also be encouraged on the principle that existing school facilities should be used by the whole community. Indeed, this approach is well practised in my electorate. The Bannon Government has committed itself to implementing a major sport education program this year aimed at—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.3 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 13 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 12 August 1986

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PETROCHEMICAL PLANT

1. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What stage have negotiations reached regarding the possibility of a petrochemical plant for South Australia, who now are the interested parties and when can a decision be made?

2. How much money has been spent on site studies, administration, minor equipment and sundries to date since inception of the original proposals?

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

1. Negotiations are progressing with the ASAHI Chemical Industry Company. However, the current state of the world markets for petrochemical products and the availability of natural gas and ethane need resolution before plant studies can proceed.

2. When the project was first considered, officers in a number of Departments (Mines and Energy; Trade and Industry; Environment; Health; Marine and Harbors; Housing Trust; ETSA etc.) carried out work associated with it as part of their normal duties. It is not possible to accurately define the costs associated with this work.

In 1979 two small project teams were established to co-ordinate the various aspects of State Government involvement (e.g. preparation of environmental guidelines, urban planning, negotiating agreements, etc.). One of the project teams was to take care of the urban planning tasks and the other to coordinate the provisions of infrastructure and the

inputs of various Government departments. The team members were seconded from the Departments of Trade and Industry, Environment, Mines and Energy, and Urban and Regional Affairs and reported to the Redcliff Steering Committee (later the Petrochemical Steering Committee) established at the same time. The costs incurred by these teams on salaries and operating expenses were as follows:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Financial years 1 July 1980 to 28 February 1986. | \$ |
| Administration expenses | 52 780 |
| Studies site | 48 516 |
| Redcliff Urban Studies | 64 135 |
| Salaries | 483 009 |
| Total | \$648 440 |

In 1974-75, 2 895 hectares of land were acquired at Redcliff by the Government to provide a plant site, a buffer zone and an area for ancillary industrial development. Total cost of this land to the State was \$296 000.

FORMER MEMBERS

2. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Which former members of Parliament are currently members of statutory authorities, boards or committees of the Government, or in paid positions advising or assisting such bodies and:

- when were they appointed;
- what is their term of appointment;
- what is the remuneration paid annually or per meeting;
- what out of pocket expenses, mileage, travel allowances or other expenses are paid; and
- are any required to travel interstate or overseas and, if so, at whose expense and what allowances are paid?

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

| Name | Committee | Term | Term of Appointment | Fee | Expenses/Allowance |
|----------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| G.R. Broomhill | Electricity Trust of S.A. Environment Protection Council | 3 yrs 4 yrs | 19.9.85-19.9.88 25.10.84-24.10.88 | \$8 567 per annum \$103 per session | No. None to date, but would be paid travel and accommodation expenses at Public Service rates as appropriate when incurred. |
| J.A. Carnie | Citrus Board of S.A. | 3 yrs | 14.2.85-13.2.88 | \$5 515 per annum | Actual costs of accommodation and travel are paid by the Board. |
| E. Connelly | Electricity Trust of S.A. Arid Areas Water Resources Advisory Committee | 3 yrs 3 yrs | 20.10.83-19.10.86 11.2.86-5.2.89 | \$8 567 per annum \$46 per session | No. Any out of pocket travelling or other expenses are met at the standard Public Service rates. |
| J.D. Corcoran | Racecourses Development Board Playford Memorial Trust Greyhound Racing Control Board | 3 yrs 4 yrs 3 yrs | 17.2.86-16.2.89 26.9.83-25.9.87 1.2.86-31.1.89 | Nil Nil \$4 720 per annum plus \$900 allowance | No. No. No. |
| R.A. Geddes | Inst. Assoc. of S.A. (Standing Committee) | 2 yrs | 2.9.85-3.9.87 | \$46 per session | No. |
| D.H. Laidlaw | Playford Memorial Trust | 4 yrs | 1.10.85-1.10.89 | Nil | No |
| W.F. Nankivell | Board of Directors of the State Bank of S.A. | 3 yrs | 1.7.86-1.7.89 | \$8 567 per annum | No. |
| J.W. Olson | Institutes Assoc. of S.A. | 2 yrs | 17.2.85-16.2.87 | \$46 per session | None to date, but would be paid travel and accommodation expenses at Public Service rates as appropriate when incurred. |

| Name | Committee | Term | Term of Appointment | Fee | Expenses/Allowance |
|--------------|---|-------|---------------------|-------------------|---|
| D.W. Simmons | Board of Directors of the State Bank of S.A. Libraries Board of S.A. | 4 yrs | 1.7.84-30.6.88 | \$8 567 per annum | No. |
| | | 4 yrs | 17.2.85-17.2.89 | \$1 044 per annum | None to date, but would be paid travel and accommodation expenses at Public Service rates as appropriate when incurred. |
| | Correctional Services Advisory Council | 3 yrs | 20.9.85-19.9.88 | \$87 per session | Travel and accommodation expenses are paid at Public Service rates as appropriate when incurred. |
| G.T. Virgo | West Beach Trust | 5 yrs | 29.2.84-28.2.89 | \$3 386 per annum | None to date, but would be paid travel and accommodation expenses at Public Service rates as appropriate when incurred. |
| | Electricity Trust of S.A. | 3 yrs | 4.2.84-3.2.87 | \$8 567 per annum | No. |
| G.R. Langley | Sports Advisory Council | 2 yrs | 1.8.84-31.7.86 | Nil | No. |

CREDIT CARDS

3. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Are senior public servants issued with credit cards to facilitate payment of expense accounts and, if so, which classifications are involved, how many credit cards have been issued in each of the past three years and what is the total cost of establishment and service fees paid?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

Credit cards have been issued to facilitate the payment of expense accounts incurred by senior public servants in some departments.

The classifications for which cards have been issued include:

GE-2, GE-3, CO-6, AO-1, AO-2, AO-3, AO-4, AO-5, SO-4, EO-1, EO-2, EO-3, EO-4, EO-5, EO-6.

Number of Cards Involved:

1983—21

1984—30

1985—35

Cost of Establishment and Service Fees:

| | Establishment \$ | Service Fees \$ |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1983 | 150.00 | 670.00 |
| 1984 | 145.00 | 810.00 |
| 1985 | — | 1 230.00 |

The honourable member may be interested to compare these statistics with the previous three years when the number of cards involved was:

1979—7

1980—14

1981—13

1982—14

Cost of Establishment and Service Fees:

| | Establishment \$ | Service Fees \$ |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1979 | — | 210.00 |
| 1980 | 85.00 | 420.00 |
| 1981 | 60.00 | 440.00 |
| 1982 | 150.00 | 490.00 |

HACKNEY BUS DEPOT

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

1. What is the estimated cost of demolishing the old Hackney Bus Depot?

2. What was the cost of the purchase of the STA site previously owned by United Motors Holdings at Richmond?

3. What was the Valuer-General's valuation of the property as at 30 June 1983, 1984 and 1985?

4. What was the reason for any variation between the valuation and the purchase price?

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

1. An overall cost estimate for demolition of the depot has not been prepared since there are no short-term plans to carry out this work and the costs are likely to be small in relation to the overall cost of relocating the depot. To date, approximately \$83 000 has been expended on partial demolition of the depot to make way for the new Tropical Conservatory as a Bicentennial project.

2. The purchase price was \$6.6 million.

3. As at 30 June 1985 the Valuer-General's valuation of the property was \$6.5 million with a proviso that, if the site was compulsorily acquired, other heads of compensation, such as disturbance, could eventually increase the cost of purchase to \$7 million. A previous valuation, made in 1981 for rating and taxing purposes, of \$2.619 million applied at 30 June 1983 and 1984 but cannot be regarded as market value at the dates indicated since the original valuation had not been updated.

4. The negotiated purchase costs are considered to be reasonable in the light of the Valuer-General's advice cited above.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

8. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism:

1. What was the cost of premiums of workers compensation for each department and agency under the Minister's control in the years ended 30 June 1984 and 1985, respectively, and by whom is the insurance cover held?

2. How many workers compensation claims were made by employees of each department and agency in the years ended 30 June 1984 and 1985, respectively; how many have been settled; and for what total amount for each department or agency?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I refer the honourable member to the response previously given to this question on 25 March 1986 on page 1135 of *Hansard*.

TERMINATION PAYMENT

9. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: Did Mr M. Duigan receive any payment in lieu of notice when he terminated his service as ministerial adviser following his election as the Member for Adelaide and, if so, what was the amount of the payment?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Duigan did not receive payment in lieu of notice when he terminated his services as a ministerial officer. He did receive a payment in lieu of his pro rata leave entitlements.

ETSA CHARGES

11. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. What is the ETSA policy on charging deposits for small businesses, particularly ones just commencing operations?

2. Will ETSA accept a bank guarantee in lieu of a cash deposit and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. A security deposit is required from a person who, on entering a new business, has not previously established a good record of payment or who has conducted a past business with a history of late payments.

2. A bank guarantee from a recognised banking institution is accepted for amounts of \$500 and over.

DEBTS REPAYMENT ACT

13. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: When will the Debts Repayment Act 1978 be proclaimed and what is the reason for the delay?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows: There are two major reasons for the delay in proclaiming the Debts Repayment Act, 1978. They are:

- (i) the Commonwealth Parliamentary Counsel has nearly completed a draft of the Commonwealth Government's proposed Bill for a Debts Repayment Act, 1986 which will cover the areas dealt with by the 1978 State Act and more (i.e. including repayments for less than 100 cents in the dollar, and moratorium periods). The Commonwealth Bill will, shortly, be released for public comment.

Clearly, if the Commonwealth Bill becomes law any operative State Act will become inoperative to the extent of any inconsistency, especially if the Commonwealth law is intended to 'cover the field' of insolvency law.

As well, the Attorney-General has been conferring with his Commonwealth colleague to see what plans the Federal Government has regarding financing debt-counselling persons and authorities were the Federal Act to be implemented.

- (ii) a number of State Departments (Community Welfare, Public and Consumer Affairs, Treasury and Personnel and Industrial Relations)

have been asked by the Government to consider and report on the cost, staffing and other implications of fully implementing the 1978 Debts Acts package (i.e. including the Enforcement of Judgments Act and Sheriffs Act). The Government expects that report to be available within the next few months.

ETSA: DEBTORS LETTERS

15. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Did the Premier or any other person arrange for letters to ETSA consumers and land tax debtors prior to 7 December 1985 and, if so, why, how many persons were written to in each instance, at what cost and at whose cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The sending of letters to all land tax debtors followed the practice set by Premier Tonkin in directly advising taxpayers of the impact of major changes to land tax legislation. In relation to electricity consumers, the ETSA Board decided that it would be appropriate to include a letter jointly signed by the Chairman and the Premier to inform all ETSA consumers of significant cuts in electricity tariffs. All land tax debtors were written to, the postage envelopes and stationary cost of \$34 000 being borne by the Government. In the case of the ETSA letter, it was posted with regular accounts to all ETSA consumers.

BUILDING SOCIETY LETTERS

16. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Did the Premier request that a letter be forwarded to all building society housing loan borrowers prior to 7 December 1985 and, if so, why, at what cost, who paid the postage and who paid the cost of production and printing of the letter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A letter from the Premier to all building society housing loan borrowers was sent to counter the confusing statements made by members of the Opposition about the Government's assistance to borrowers. The letters were posted with the building society's accounts.

PREMIER'S TRIP

49. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Did the Government pay for the Premier's flight to and from Melbourne on 3 June, and his overnight accommodation, to watch the football match between Hawthorn and North Adelaide and, if so, what was the total cost?

2. Was the Premier accompanied by any member of his staff on this trip and, if so, who and at what cost for fares and accommodation and who paid that cost?

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

1. No.

2. The Premier's Executive Assistant flew to Melbourne with the Premier on 3 June to attend a series of meetings with senior officials of the Victorian Government. The Premier was unaccompanied on his return trip from Melbourne. The Executive Assistant's fares and accommodation were paid for on the normal basis—economy class airfare plus overnight accommodation.

DAILY PAID WORKERS

50. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Further to Question on Notice No. 161 of the past session, how

many daily paid workers were employed by the departments and statutory authorities under each Minister's control, what were their classifications and where they employed in the city or country in relation to each of the years ending 30 June 1984 to 1986?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The number of daily/weekly paid workers employed in Government departments under each Minister's control in relation to each of the years

ending June 1984 to 1986 is shown in Appendix 1. As explained in the reply to Question on Notice No. 161 of the past session, to produce this information for statutory authorities and the further details requested as to their classifications and location would require considerable work by the agencies and departments, the expense of which is not considered to be justified.

Daily/Weekly Paid Employees in Departments from June 1984 to June 1986*

| Minister | Department | June 1984 | | June 1985 | | June 1986 | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | F.T.E. | Persons | F.T.E. | Persons | F.T.E. | Persons |
| Premier, Treasurer, Minister for the Arts | Premier and Cabinet | 1.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 2 | 2.0 | 2 |
| | Public Service Board | | | | | | |
| | Treasury | 42.0 | 42 | 45.0 | 45 | 58.0 | 58 |
| Deputy Premier, Minister for Environment and Planning, Chief Secretary, Minister of Emergency Services, Minister of Water Resources | Arts | | | | | | |
| | Environment and Planning | 205.0 | 207 | 213.5 | 234 | 190.0 | 190 |
| | Auditor-General | | | | | | |
| | Police | 77.1 | 78 | 77.0 | 77 | 77.5 | 78 |
| | E. & W.S. | 3 228.0 | 3 228 | 3 218.0 | 3 218 | 3 183.0 | 3 200 |
| Attorney-General, Minister of Consumer Affairs and Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Minister of Corporate Affairs | Attorney-General | | | | | | |
| | Courts | | | | | | |
| | Public and Consumer Affairs .. | 8.0 | 8 | 11.0 | 11 | 10.0 | 10 |
| | Corporate Affairs | 4.0 | 4 | 4.0 | 4 | 3.0 | 3 |
| | Electoral | 23.5 | 24 | 27.5 | 28 | 25.4 | 26 |
| Minister of Lands, Minister of Forests and Minister of Repatriation, Minister of Marine | Lands | 1 303.6 | 1 380 | 1 223.2 | 1 227 | 1 199.4 | 1 206 |
| | Woods and Forests | 531.0 | 528 | 513.0 | 513 | 502.1 | 512 |
| | Marine and Harbors | | | | | | |
| Minister of Health, Minister of Community Welfare | Community Welfare | 174.9 | 180 | 57.4 | 73 | 53.6 | 63 |
| Minister of State Development, Minister of Employment and Further Education, Minister for Technology | State Development | | | | | | |
| | Technical and Further Education | 0.6 | 1 | 0.6 | 2 | 0.7 | 1 |
| | Ministry of Technology | 433.7 | 442 | 442.8 | 445 | 437.3 | 460 |
| Minister of Transport | Transport | 57.8 | 58 | 5.8 | 6 | 2.0 | 2 |
| | Highways | 1 719.0 | 1 719 | 1 776.0 | 1 776 | 1 672.0 | 1 672 |
| | Services and Supply | 128.6 | 129 | 199.7 | 204 | 217.7 | 220 |
| Minister of Mines and Energy | Mines and Energy | 116.5 | 120 | 116.0 | 119 | 118.4 | 122 |
| Minister of Education and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Minister of Children's Services | Education | 457.7 | 972 | 469.4 | 1 061 | 474.4 | 920 |
| Minister of Housing and Construction, Minister of Public Works | Housing and Construction | 1 285.0 | 1 285 | 1 280.0 | 1 280 | 1 201.0 | 1 201 |
| Minister of Labour, Minister of Correctional Services, Minister Assisting the Treasurer | Labour | 4.7 | 5 | 3.4 | 4 | 1.7 | 2 |
| | Correctional Services | 6.5 | 7 | 9.3 | 10 | 14.3 | 15 |
| Minister of Tourism, Minister of Local Government, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts | Tourism | 2.0 | 2 | 2.0 | 2 | 2.0 | 2 |
| | Local Government | 78.0 | 78 | 71.0 | 71 | 72.0 | 72 |
| Minister of Recreation and Sport, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries | Agriculture | 235.5 | 317 | 255.7 | 332 | 206.1 | 308 |
| | Fisheries | 1.0 | 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 4.5 | 5 |
| | Recreation and Sport | 6.0 | 6 | 2.0 | 2 | 5.0 | 5 |
| | Total | 10 130.7 | 10 822 | 10 026.3 | 10 747 | 9 733.1 | 10 355 |

* These figure are affected by transfers of functions between Departments and Statutory Authorities, and the reclassification of positions between Weekly Paid and Public Service categories.

EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

79. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Premier: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Premier's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- which agencies were used;
- how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- on what duties were such staff employed;
- at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

80. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Deputy Premier's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- which agencies were used;
- how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- on what duties were such staff employed;
- at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

81. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

82. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

83. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

84. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

85. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

86. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the

services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

87. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

88. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agent for the payment of commission?

89. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

90. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;
- (c) on what duties were staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

91. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism: Have any departments or statutory authorities under the Minister's control used the services of an employment agency in obtaining temporary clerical staff during 1985-86 and if so:

- (a) which agencies were used;
- (b) how many temporary staff have been employed through this means;

- (c) on what duties were such staff employed;
- (d) at what hourly rate were such staff employed; and
- (e) what is the arrangement between the Government and each agency for the payment of commission?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The time and effort required to provide the information sought in questions 79-91 is not considered warranted. Should the honourable member have any specific questions, I will arrange for responses to be provided.

PAYROLL TAX

93. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many employers were registered under the provisions of the Payroll Tax Act 1971 as at 30 June 1985 and 1986?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The number of employers registered under the provisions of the Payroll Tax Act 1971 were: at 30 June 1985, 5 351; at 30 June 1986, 5 096.

DISABILITY ADVISER

102. **Mr S.J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: With respect to the bulletin released by the Disability Adviser on modifications to Ford Falcons to allow transport of the disabled:

- (a) how many such vehicles will operate;
- (b) how will the call-up system operate;
- (c) will such taxi-cabs be available for other fares;
- (d) will disabled passengers be charged standard taxi-fares, be subsidised by Government or subject to a surcharge; and
- (e) if Government subsidy is involved in the modification or fare structure, what will be the method of finance?

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

- (a) Ten;
- (b) Phone bookings, or radio call;
- (c) Yes;
- (d) The fares will be subsidised by the Government;
- (e) An annual budget.