HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 25 February 1987

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

UNCLAIMED GOODS BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: VERMINPROOF FENCE

A petition signed by 78 residents of Belair praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the erection of a verminproof fence along the State Transport Authority boundary on Sheoak Road was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: POKER MACHINES

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any measures to legalise the use of poker machines in South Australia was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any measures to legalise prostitution in South Australia was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

SCHOOL CAMPS

In reply to **Mr M.J. EVANS** (4 November).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: A wide range of campsites is available for students of all ages throughout South Australia and they provide for the outdoor education curriculum needs of particular schools. Teachers are encouraged to visit campsites before using them and if this is not possible to gain as much information as possible prior to taking the camp. This often means making contact with other schools who have used the site. The Camping Association of South Australia is the organisation responsible for maintaining a register, monitoring standards of accommodation, and publicising information about available sites. Dissatisfaction with any campsite should be conveyed to this organisation and any complaints received by the Education Department are passed on, accordingly.

All campsites must comply with regulations of the Departments of Housing and Construction and Health. The Health Department, in particular, may carry out spot checks to determine levels of cleanliness and the adequacy of ablutions. It should be noted that the Department of Housing and Construction has requested advice from the Education Department in the past when new campsites have been approved. The Camping Association has been working with the South Australian Health Commission toward a process of accreditation for campsites but sites older than six years do not have to comply.

The Outdoor Education Project Officer of the Education Department provides an advisory service to schools on all matters related to school camps but is not in a position to overtly indicate its support of any particular campsite in preference to another. However, an assurance is given that all complaints and concerns brought to the notice of the Education Department will be taken up with the Camping Association and the campsite managers directly if necessary. In particular the outdoor education project Officer will advise schools if requested about campsites with a 'poor record' in providing basic minimum standards of accommodation and support for school activities.

The Education Department has clearly defined safety guidelines regarding school camps and excursions, and recommends an involvement of teachers in 'Leadership for School Camping' courses. In all cases where schools embark on programs in the outdoors, 'informed consent' must be given by parents for students participation. In all camping programs the safety and wellbeing of students is paramount. However, the duty of care vested in teachers must always be considered within the context of the program being offered. The right of schools to be more adventurous in their camping programs will inevitably lead to the use of a variety of sites and facilities. The Education Department will continue through its outdoor education project and area officers to approve and monitor camps and excursions to ensure that minimum standards of safety and health are maintained.

DRUGS IN SCHOOLS

In reply to **Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE** (18 November).

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member has sought an undertaking that the guidelines for principals relating to the discovery of drugs be reviewed. I have asked the Director-General of Education to prepare a memorandum to school principals clarifying their responsibilities in this regard. The Education Department and the Drug and Alcohol Services Council are cooperating to provide school communities with information on the use and abuse of drugs which will assist schools in their drug eduction programs.

QUESTION TIME

BUSHFIRE COMPENSATION

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier intervene in the handling of compensation claims by victims of the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfires to ensure that victims are given more humane treatment and that the impact on future electricity bills is limited? I have minutes of a deputation to the Attorney-General and the Minister of Mines and Energy on 23 December last year at which representatives of bushfire

victims sought more Government action to settle their claims. During this meeting, the Attorney-General revealed that he had not even sighted the Supreme Court judgment given in July 1985 in a test case to resolve ETSA's liability for fires in the McLaren Flat, Kuitpo, Meadows and Hope Forest areas on which about 80 claims are currently outstanding. But more astonishingly, the Minister of Mines and Energy admitted to the meeting that a major cause of the delays and the lower offers made by the trust was—and I quote—'a stalling tactic engineered by ETSA under instructions from their three insurers'.

While the notes also record that the two Ministers were 'disgusted' that the so-called interim offers to alleviate hardship were only $10 000, it appears the Government is doing nothing to resolve these outstanding claims, even though it has the power to give directions to the Electricity Trust. These lengthy delays are causing considerable anxiety to the people involved, who have had to take out large loans at very high interest rates to re-establish their properties so that they can put the traumas of Ash Wednesday behind them and get on with their lives. Further, because I understand that the trust has agreed to pay 11 per cent interest on any amounts awarded from one year after the fires and all claims arising from Ash Wednesday could total more than $400 million, these delays also have serious implications for all South Australians as regards the impact on their electricity bills, as the trust has not so far made any provision in its financial accounts for such liability.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I understand that the question asked was whether the Premier would intervene. I think it is public knowledge that I have already intervened on an earlier occasion.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It is not true to say that nothing at all has happened. I asked ETSA to examine a method of making interim payments without prejudice, irrespective of the outcome. As members of the House would know, I cited the kind of procedure that applies in relation to motor vehicle accidents and third party awards. Subsequently, ETSA had discussions with a number of claimants and amounts were made available. Some people accepted those amounts.

Mr Lewis: They were conditional, though.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Every amount must be conditional before a matter is finally resolved.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I suggest that the honourable member not intervene in this matter, because the Government (and, in this case, it seems even the Opposition) are quite concerned for the victims. I am as genuine as the Leader of the Opposition, but all members understand that in this case a claim is made and there has to be an assessment of the claim. In this case we have insurers as well as ETSA involved.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Stalling tactics.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I listened to the Leader's explanation very carefully and he used the words 'I quote'. Apparently, the only record kept of our meeting was one which I assume was kept (because the Leader said that he was quoting) by somebody who has now gone to him. I certainly did not keep any record of the occasion, because I treated it in good faith as, in effect, a deputation. The Hon. Mr Wotton and I had the same concerns that he had. I undertook to speak further with ETSA and I have done so.

The difficulties that are involved have not changed. If people are dissatisfied with the procedure and pace of the matter, they are entitled to go to the courts, but everybody in South Australia as well as every member in this House should know that the difficulty that is being put forward is a real one. People who have suffered losses have gone to assessors who in turn prepare the case and say, 'This is the amount of loss for which you can lodge a claim.' Naturally, insurers are involved and ETSA, too, will assess the same claim.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: How is it that claims—

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I think that members of the Opposition are showing a lack of legal background by some of their comments. In Victoria liability was accepted from the beginning by the utility in that State, but that has not been the situation in South Australia. There was one test case. I refer also to the misleading statement made by the Leader of the Opposition when he said that ETSA was paying only about 11 per cent interest. That is the interest which was specified in the court order handed down in the first test case. I think the claimant concerned in that case was someone by the name of Dunn. The Government cannot place itself in the middle of this.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You can tell them to hurry up; you are in charge of ETSA!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the floor and no-one else.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I well remember the Deputy Leader, at the time when we had the Bill before the House, trying to get assurances that I would not interfere in the day-to-day running of ETSA if that power were granted. Now I am being asked to do just that. When will we get some consistency in this matter?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I have acted in this matter and I think that members of the Opposition do themselves little credit by acting in this rabble-like way when discussing such a serious matter. I have sympathy for the claimants. I do not think that the Opposition will put to the House that every amount claimed will be accurate to the nth degree and that that is the amount that should be awarded. Members opposite well know that that does not occur in the field of human endeavour. ETSA is not seeking to avoid its liability. There have been test cases, I have intervened, and, as I have already informed the House, further consideration of this difficult area is currently in progress.

TOURISM

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism in this House, tell the House the status of South Australia's tourism promotion under the present Minister of Tourism? In this House last night the Opposition spokesperson on tourism made an extraordinary personal attack on the Minister of Tourism and suggested that the tourism industry in South Australia is languishing. It has been put to me that such attacks could have a detrimental effect on the promotion of South Australia, both interstate and overseas.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As the Minister of Tourism who followed the member for Coles and preceded the present Minister, I believe I am in a position to respond to some of the accusations made in what was an extraordinary contribution to the parliamentary debates last night. I happened to be the Minister in the House at the time and, quite frankly, I could not believe what I was hearing, knowing what the member for Coles did as Minister of Tourism and also knowing how she acted when I was the Minister. The House should understand that the tourism industry is a sensitive industry that responds to a lot of public opinion. When you have a shadow Minister who, for no other reason than pure vindictiveness—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will not use the words 'jealousy', 'pettiness' or 'cattiness' which have been used, because that is not my style. The Government's activity within the tourist industry has maintained a very high level, higher than it has for a number of years. I have previously given the member for Coles credit for that. The present Minister is not only carrying on those policies and programs but she has extended them, and is continuing to do so. The Government's contribution to tourism in South Australia has been quite notable, and I want to mention in a moment what I believe should be the industry's response to all the work and finance that the Government is putting into the industry.

I should think that members opposite will support what I am saying, because they have a very strong belief that the private enterprise system should be able to look after itself without Government involvement and that people should be able to stand on their own feet. I will get to that in a moment.

One of the other points the honourable member made (and here I use terminology I said I would not use), which I thought was fairly petty, was that the current Minister of Tourism is a page 3 cover girl. When I was Minister of Tourism I did everything I could to be regarded as a page 3 cover person and, no matter what I tried, I was nowhere near as successful as the present Minister nor, might I say, as successful as the previous Minister.

I can recall one day in Rundle Mall (and it was not the day the Leader of the Opposition took part in that much publicised wheelbarrow race) when, wearing a crash-helmet, I pushed an 18 gallon keg down Rundle Mall, because the tourist industry wanted me to do it. I recall very well another occasion when I was attending the annual Caravan and Camping Fair here in Adelaide when the photographer asked whether I would like to be photographed in a one person tent. I was accompanied at the time by the present shadow Minister of Tourism—and she was in that tent in a flash. Then she challenged me to get in there with her! Photographs were taken of us looking out of the tent, both with strained smiles on our faces. That photograph did nothing for my marriage, but it did a hell of a lot of good for her image!

I just draw to the attention of the House some other page 3 efforts of the honourable member. Back in January 1982 she was photographed (this was on page 3 of the *Advertiser* no doubt) throwing a tuna fish down Rundle Mall. She did not like what she had to do—and if members do not believe me I am prepared to show them the photograph—and it was certainly with a great deal of distaste that she was photographed doing that, but she did it because the industry wanted her to have a high profile and to be photographed doing it.

On another occasion, in January 1982 (this was a good photographic period for her), the honourable member appeared in the *Murray Pioneer*. There she was in a rather compromising pose, I might say, with the local member—the member for Chaffey—treading some grapes, with arms around each other and wearing a T-shirt (wet, no doubt). The photograph I had was a bit fuzzy, but knowing the honourable member as I do I have no doubt that it was a wet T-shirt. The collective arms were strategically placed, so I am not too sure about that. However, she did this because she was supporting tourism.

Again, in August 1982 there was a quite remarkable photograph of the member for Coles, in a funny hat, with the caption '"South Australia saved from sin", says Jenny', taking pride that, as Minister of Tourism, she was able to help defeat the casino vote in the House. This was the Minister of Tourism flaunting how successful she had been in helping the tourism industry in South Australia by defeating one of the greatest things that has happened to tourism in our State, namely, the establishment of the casino. Although I suspect that the honourable member has not been back since the night she accompanied us all to the opening—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: She was not there that night: at least she has some principles. However, the honourable member opposed the casino, although I point out that her colleagues who also opposed the Bill attended that night just to see how correct they might have been. They were wrong, of course.

A photograph of the Minister of Tourism that appeared on page 3 I believe is the best photograph that I have ever seen in the press in Australia of a tourist Minister promoting tourism. It was a very brave performance to be seen in such close proximity to what I think was a carpet snake from Bowman Park, in the Leader's electorate, I guess at a facility—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: One of his constituents, I guess. The Liberal Party would like to have animals and snakes voting: members of the Liberal Party have always had acreage and property voting over the years, so I guess they would like to have animals voting for them. But that was a great photograph—and it was done by the Minister to assist in promoting tourism in South Australia.

One other example I can recall (and the honourable member would remember this one, photograph and all) was when she launched the Yorke Peninsula tourism plan, and cuddled a koala bear. We all remember the experience of the Federal Minister for Tourism when he cuddled a koala bear, and the honourable member and I both know that unfortunately she had the same sort of experience. But she put up with it. I will not comment on the statement that the koala might have made—that is for the koala to answer for! But she did that because she believed that it was in the interests of tourism, and that tourism Ministers are required to do that. In fairness, I think the honourable member did a lot of good for tourism in South Australia, and I have never denigrated her performance. However, I am surprised that since she is no longer the Minister she has adopted a very vindictive attitude, one that I believe is contrary to the best interests of tourism in South Australia.

I said on a number of occasions when I was Minister of Tourism—and I am prepared to say it whenever the platform is given to me to make these statements—that the tourism industry in South Australia cannot rely on the Government, and should not rely on it, to determine its success or otherwise. The Government has a role to play and is fulfilling that role. If the tourism industry in South Australia has not enough confidence in its own entrepreneurial flair, to be able to get out in the market place and sell the product that we have in South Australia, that is a problem for the tourist industry to answer for. The Government has done, is doing and will continue to do what it is expected to do in promoting South Australia's base. It is up to private entrepreneurs in the tourism industry to make sure that we have a successful tourist perception here and that tourists come into the State.

I believe that that is happening, and the remarks by people like the shadow Minister will not deter that. I think that the bottom line is that she should be out urging the private sector and her friends in the tourism industry to start play-

ing their part, and not relying upon the Government to do their job for them.

COAL GASIFICATION TESTS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy confirm that coal gasification tests, on which the South Australian Government has spent almost $3 million, have been a fizzer? In April 1985 the Premier announced that the Government would undertake, with a West German consortium, a feasibility study into the gasification of the Bowmans coal deposit. In making the announcement, the Premier said that the study was of enormous technological significance and would attract world wide interest. The Premier was even more bullish in his 1985 election policy speech, saying in a reference to the tests:

> We are talking about petrochemical power generation and fuel production developments worth well over one billion dollars.

What the Government did not reveal at the time was that the tests were undertaken against the advice of the Electricity Trust. I have now been reliably informed that the latest information from Germany, where 1 000 tonnes of coal was sent for testing, indicates that the project has been a complete fizzer.

There are too many contaminants in the gas produced, rendering it unsuitable for commercial use. As a result, the plant used for the testing is being dismantled, and the West German consortium does not intend to proceed any further with the project. I am also told that there is a great heap of South Australian coal there with which they do not know what to do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The last remark of the honourable Deputy Leader was out of order, as it amounted to debate and comment. In addition, I would caution him that it may be acceptable to use words such as 'unsuccessful' but, when he uses a word such as 'fizzer', it is clearly comment.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: No, I cannot confirm that the tests were a fizzer. I can confirm that the Premier was 100 per cent right in the remarks that he made on the occasion quoted: that the potential in respect of future gas supplied to South Australia from that source (above ground gasification of the Bowmans coal) will be vindicated in the future. So, there is the answer to the honourable member. And he is a former Minister in this area! I am surprised at his rather denigratory attitude to something which could affect the future of every South Australian.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I certainly do know; the honourable member could have come and asked me, and I would have given him the information that I will give the House, instead of getting the furphy that he has now got. I can say quite clearly that the preliminary two day test was performed satisfactorily but, for a combination of mechanical and physical reasons, it was not possible to perform the planned 10 day extended time test. A number of shorter tests were run instead. This resulted in approximately 400 tonnes of coal remaining unused in Germany, which coal is available for further test work. It does not sound to me like someone is giving up there at all.

The honourable member was rather scathing about the possibilities, apparently, of some of the technical results of the tests, and I stress that all that is known at this stage is that it is preliminary, anyway. As I said, I am quite surprised at the attitude of the honourable member in this area. One of his colleagues, the member for Goyder, asked me to specifically assist him when he went on an overseas journey last year so that he was able to visit this very site, where he was given every assistance from UDHE and other principals concerned to increase his understanding and learning about this procedure which has a possible future use in South Australia.

I take it that the Deputy Leader would say that this is a fizzer—the fact that the fluidised bed gasifier can be operated effectively with Bowmans coal at the temperatures required for adequate gasification with no significant risk of major problems due to ash agglomeration. That is a fizzer, is it? That is confirmation that the fluidised bed, which is the coming technology, is already here and that the very large resource of coal at Bowmans can be gasified and used in this technological mode. I would not call that a fizzer.

A relatively good carbon conversion of around 90 per cent is achievable, producing satisfactory gas quality. So much for the scathing remarks from the Deputy Leader! I am sure that the procedure will work, and my understanding on a preliminary basis only—supplied by a departmental officer who attended the tests—indicates that some of the difficulties met (and there are always difficulties in pilot testing and pilot running) related to a function of the test bed, not the procedures, the sample of coal, or whatever. Clearly, now that we are in the assessment phase, we should properly assess the results of the tests and not shoot off our mouths, as the Deputy Leader has done as a result of some furphy, and then see where we are.

ETSA METERS

Mr DUIGAN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House whether the Electricity Trust of South Australia is currently requiring new home owners to install a new type of electricity switchboard to enable the trust to more easily cut off power if electricity bills are not paid and whether this new switchboard costs $1 200, that is, $1 000 more than a conventional switchboard? Further, will the Minister advise the House whether ETSA officers are forcing people to buy these new switchboards, as claimed by the member for Davenport, and can the Minister say which metering system is currently used by the South Australian Housing Trust?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for providing an opportunity for me to put the record straight in this very important area. Many people may have been misled by information, provided by a member, which is entirely erroneous and, apart from that, absolutely inaccurate. The trust has advised me that the proposed changes apply only to multi-tenanted domestic dwellings and not to single private dwellings. The allegation made was that every new home owner, in addition to finding funds for land, and so on, would have to pay well over $1 000 in order to comply with an ETSA requirement relating to metering.

This change is being proposed because the trust is required frequently to disconnect power in multi-tenanted dwellings when tenancies change. In a conventional detached dwelling power can be disconnected from the service fuse. This cannot be done in multi-tenanted buildings because all the tenants would lose power. Members would understand that a single service fuse arrangement applies. In these cases, trust employees must physically remove live wires from an individual tenant's meter, a practice which is, for obvious reasons, better avoided, if possible, on safety grounds. To overcome this difficulty, the trust proposes installing plug-in meters which are in common use in most other States. With this kind of meter disconnection is simply achieved by unplugging the meter.

The additional cost of this arrangement is less than $15 and not the enormous and totally misleading figure mentioned previously—the cost of the plug, in effect. The other change being proposed concurrently for multi-tenanted buildings is improvement in the standard of meter boxes, because those currently in use have proved unsatisfactory in a number of respects, including the fact that they have a relatively short service life.

It also includes the failure of hinges on the box door, the loosening of terminals when electricians move the hinged switchboard panel inside the box, and so on. ETSA proposes an improved box incorporating thicker steel and replacement of the hinged panel with a fixed arrangement. True, the indicated cost of the new type of box is much higher than ETSA expected but, even taking that into account, the costs referred to by the honourable member are much too high. The trust estimates that, if it proceeded on the basis of the indicative costs, it would mean an increase of about $100 a unit in the case of a 4-unit block of dwellings.

However, the trust believes that this additional cost is too high and is currently discussing with switchboard manufacturers methods by which these costs can be reduced. In this context, I am talking about the box, not the metering itself. I am advised by the trust that it has made clear to electrical contractors that the new requirements will not apply to any building which is under construction or for which plans have been completed. In any event, in respect of new and unplanned multi-tenanted dwellings, they will not apply before 1 July.

FIREFIGHTING COMMUNICATIONS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier immediately investigate what appears to be a complete breakdown in communication between the Electricity Trust and the Country Fire Services over procedures to be adopted in dealing with any repeat of Ash Wednesday conditions? I have in my possession a copy of a letter written by a senior CFS officer which indicates a serious dispute between the CFS and the trust over ETSA's plans to cut off power in the event of a recurrence of Ash Wednesday conditions.

The letter makes it clear that there has been little communication between the CFS and ETSA over the trust's plans, that the CFS does not support those plans and that, in the event of a power cut off, the CFS may not have sufficient time to advise all brigades affected. This last point raises the possibility that some firefighters could be exposed to grave risk because of this lack of communication. The Opposition has previously asked questions about widespread public concern and confusion about ETSA's plans. In answering a question on 4 December last year, the Minister of Mines and Energy said:

> ETSA, local government and all other areas of representation that members would expect to be involved are involved.

However, the letter I have shows clearly that this has not occurred. I have a copy of the letter which I will give to the Minister.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for raising this important matter. I do not believe that the situation is as he has put it, but I accept his offer to make the letter available to me, and I shall institute immediate inquiries.

ROAD ACCIDENT STATISTICS

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Transport provide the House with an analysis of circumstances surrounding road deaths and accidents in South Australia, using such statistical indicators as age of driver, alcohol consumption, location, estimated speed, mechanical defects, density of motor vehicles per road distance, accident rate per thousand vehicles, and any other factors that he considers to be relevant? Many, if not all, members are perturbed about the fluctuation in the rate of road accidents, and an analysis such as I propose would be a good starting point for members to bring themselves up to date and to ensure that such decisions as need to be made are made on the basis of factual information.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will certainly consider carefully the honourable member's suggestion, which on the face of it is a good one indeed. At present, the Minister having responsibility for road safety is not required to bring to Parliament a report on road accident statistics, and I believe that the point made by the honourable member that members have a deep concern about safety on our roads is valid. If information were more readily available, the debate could be more relevant and people would be better informed, and I believe that that can be achieved. I do not know whether the honourable member is suggesting that we bring down one report each year or, if possible, more than one, and I will look at that aspect.

At the moment there is a small problem which, hopefully, as a result of improvement in technology, we may be able to overcome, and that is that it takes about five months for all the appropriate road casualty accident data from police information to reach the Road Safety Division. That is just one example; there are others. At the moment this information is computerised, and we are seeking to improve our computerisation performance so that we can have the information within about two months. That would then make the information that we could give to Parliament much more relevant.

When we talk about road accidents, of course the critical factor with which the community is concerned is fatalities. When one compares fatalities in a week in one year with the same week in another year, the figures vary greatly and one cannot obtain a direct comparison. Even if that were possible, tragic as it is, really it is not the best comparison that can be made. We ought to focus on casualty accidents, because they relate to the number of accidents in which an injury has occurred.

I think it is useful for members to understand that, whereas last year our fatalities increased from the year before, on the latest information that I have (and that is to the end of September), there has been a significant reduction in the number of casualty accidents. Statistical data can be used in a number of ways, but I think that in road safety it should not be used in any other way than trying to project the correct picture. I will look at the honourable member's suggestion, because I think it has merit. We ought to be able to do what he has suggested, and I think that I can give an undertaking that that information should be available to Parliament at least once a year (possibly more often), because the statistical information that the honourable member has categorised is data that is available within the records that are kept at the Road Safety Division.

TRAIN SERVICES

Mr INGERSON: Has the Minister of Transport received any recommendations from the STA to close uneconomic services and, if so, what are those recommendations? The Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen has called for the resignation of the Chairman of the STA, Mr

Rump, following the revelation that the authority wants to close the Bridgewater to Belair train service.

In his response, the Minister has revealed that the Government has required the STA to nominate some savings to curb the authority's deficit, which has escalated by 60 per cent to almost $100 million since 1982. A full statement from the Minister on what exactly the Government has in mind, and what recommendations it may already be considering, might help to avert a threatened stoppage of all metropolitan—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's last remark was clearly debate, and I withdraw leave for the explanation.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: For the benefit of the honourable member who asked the question, at 12 o'clock I had a meeting with the Secretary of the AFULE and the Secretary of the ARU. They expressed, in fairly blunt terms, their attitudes to one of the recommendations which the STA Chairman will make to the Government and which he announced last night. The Chairman of the STA was asked a direct question, and I think, in all fairness, he was entitled to answer it truthfully: that is, that the STA will make a recommendation to the Government in relation to the Bridgewater to Belair train service.

It is then a matter for the Government to consider that recommendation and to make a final decision. Members should appreciate that we live in very difficult economic times. Yesterday we were told that I think in May there will be a mini budget. The Federal Treasurer has advised the States that there will be a reduction in the funds made available to the State Governments to maintain their present level of services.

Irrespective of that, because we are in the budgetary processes, I have asked the STA to provide for me a whole range of potential savings within the STA so that, when we look at additional services, we can fund them out of savings within the authority. I would have thought this would have met with the agreement of members opposite. It is early days yet. I do not have the submission from the STA but when we receive that submission I will consider it very carefully and I guess I will involve my colleagues in some budgetary decisions in relation to the STA. Once we know the direction that the Government may wish to take, then of course I will talk to the unions involved so that they have an idea of what the Government is going to do in relation to STA services.

I would like to emphasise to the members for Heysen and Fisher the economy efforts that are taking place. I feel it is indicative of the general attitude of members opposite who, on the one hand, ask for smaller government and reduction in Government expenditure and yet, on the other hand, submit notices of motion involving increased expenditure in STA areas.

Whatever service we provide in the STA, it is not going to pay, and will require a subsidy. We acknowledge and accept that. However, as a Government we are anxious to run an efficient and economic service which provides the best possible service for the commuters of Adelaide at the best possible price to the taxpayer. I am surprised that, because we are trying to do that, we are the subject of criticism from members opposite who profess a philosophy of smaller government and lower taxes. You cannot have it both ways. If our resources are going to be reduced by whatever action and in whatever area, it is going to have an impact on the Government's capacity to provide services.

So, the only sensible thing we can do—and we will do in cooperation with the management of the STA and workers, through their unions—is sit down and talk about the future of the STA. If there are savings to be made, we will make them, and, if there are new services that can be paid for out of those savings, we will look at that also. When we have the submission before us, I will not tell the honourable member, because it will be on the front page of the press in an effort to agitate and inflame industrial disputation when there are no grounds for doing so.

SPECIAL PURPOSE HOUSING

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction indicate to the House the steps which have been taken by the Housing Trust to provide special purpose housing for people with disabilities? In particular, will the Minister explain the steps taken by his department in cooperation with the Friends of the Disabled to establish special purpose housing at Mitchell Park?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I think it is fair to say that over the past 20 years the trust, in a fairly large way, has been providing community services which often have not been recognised by the community except by those people who are receiving help from the South Australian Housing Trust and also with regard to the Government, which sometimes has deceived the South Australian Housing Trust in providing public housing.

In my own area of Elizabeth the Housing Trust in the early days not only provided houses and community facilities such as churches but picked up the needs of community organisations at that time and in lots of cases provided houses. Things have certainly changed since those days because the list of people seeking public accommodation is growing—a matter that concerns this Government and the Housing Trust. Despite that, in the area of neighbourhood houses the trust has still given up some of its stock to those organisations because it sees that it has a role not only in providing public housing but also providing those people in public housing with facilities where they can meet and discuss their problems.

With regard to the disabled, the Government has carried out a deinstitutionalisation program where the Housing Trust, in conjunction with the Health Commission and the Department for Community Welfare, will provide housing for disabled people throughout the State. The Friends of the Disabled is a very good example of a concerned group that has worked in partnership with the South Australian Housing Trust for the benefit of the disabled in that community. I understand that the group was formed in 1981 and received funding in 1984 from the Department of Community Services to establish a pilot project to help residents with disabilities in the Mitchell Park area.

This was of particular benefit to the trust, which has a residential development in the area specifically built for people with disabilities. I further add that, where the trust has provided housing for people with disabilities, it is rather good to note that those people who live in surrounding areas cannot identify the houses that have been provided for people with disabilities and that any alterations have been done in such a way as not to highlight the fact that people with disabilities are living there.

Also, to help the Friends of the Disabled with their valuable community work, the trust allows the organisation to administer its operations on a rent free basis from a small community building located in the development. The organisation, with a group of dedicated volunteers, is continuing to provide its service from this building, to the delight of

residents and the trust. The Friends of the Disabled and the Housing Trust have worked together for the benefit of the disabled, and there are many organisations working similarly with the trust. I think that we should all be reminded from time to time of the unselfish and dedicated people in both the voluntary organisations and the trust who serve the community so well.

MEASLES IMMUNISATION STICKER

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Is the Minister of Education aware of concern in the education and medical fields over the Government's issue to schoolchildren of a measles immunisation sticker bearing the words 'I ain't afraid of no spots', and does he believe that material issued to the community by the Government should be grammatically correct?

As custodian of the education of the State's children, the Minister would be aware of the vast sum of taxpayers' money that is channelled annually into ensuring, among other things, that young people are taught basic skills such as correct spelling and grammar. He would also be aware of the importance of literacy in the wider community, which was recently described by a senior lecturer as (and I quote) 'being able to put your own words in reasonable format and being able to spell'. While the medical profession and the education community strongly support the current measles immunisation campaign as does the Liberal Party, there is some alarm over the stickers being distributed in conjunction with that campaign.

The sticker contains the words 'measles immunised' in the centre. Around the edges, run the words 'I ain't afraid of no spots', and running in the opposite direction the statement, 'I have been.' I would ask the Minister to clarify whether 'I ain't afraid of no spots' means one or more of the following: I am not afraid of no spots; I am afraid of spots; I am not afraid of spots; or, I am so confused I don't know what I'm afraid of.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question from the member for Coles should be heard in silence.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not need the assistance of the member for Mount Gambier, who is very close to being in contempt of the Chair.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister might also like to shed some light on the meaning of the statement 'I have been' on the sticker, which is currently being interpreted by concerned parents, teachers and doctors as 'I have been presented with a Government issued sticker that teaches me all about poor grammar, unclear meaning and lamentable layout.'

The SPEAKER: Order! That last remark was clearly comment. Leave is withdrawn. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to raise the awareness of the community (and, certainly, obviously of some honourable members) of the importance of the campaign being conducted around this country with respect to the very high incidence of measles in our community and the need for an immunisation program. It might be of interest to members to know that it is estimated that up to 5 000 cases of measles are seen by the health system annually in South Australia, 40 per cent of them occurring in children of school age. In fact, one measles patient in 15 develops a potentially serious complication, and one in 5 000 dies.

This is a very serious issue indeed, and it is very important that we are able to conduct a campaign which will be effective. This is not the first time that the Opposition has decided to attack this campaign. The shadow spokesperson on education roundly criticised the distribution, through the *Advertiser* newspaper and through schools, of a calendar which was paid for, in the main, from two sources: one, the Commonwealth Government education campaign on the need for immunisation against measles, and the other from the *Advertiser* newspaper itself as a community service. I think that is an excellent example of cooperation between Government and business to provide essential information to the community.

Some 425 000 copies of that calendar were in that way distributed. Hopefully, it is in every household in the State where there are children who are likely to contract measles, and who will be given that information to make sure that does not occur in that family. In fact, the Opposition erroneously said that State funds were used, which were not, in that campaign, although some State Education Department staff and staff from some other departments were involved in the preparation of information. That was criticised by the Opposition, and now we have this incredibly nitpicking, negative attack on a very serious attempt to provide important information to the community in a form that is attractive. I just want to tell members what products have been made available through the health authorities to assist schools and families in this area. First, there is a poster which is titled 'Young, innocent and deadly'. Then there is a brochure headed 'If you think measles and mumps are harmless childhood diseases, think again'. There is the brochure 'Immunise now—Protect against disease,' which includes the recommended immunisation schedule, and then there is the sticker, which is meant to attract attention. 'I ain't afraid of no spots—I have been measles immunised'.

I think it can well be argued that that is, in fact, an educational aid in English expression in itself. Obviously, it will raise that precise concern the honourable member has expressed, but to attack this very important campaign which is being conducted throughout this country on that basis is a very destructive path for the Opposition to tread, and does them no credit at all.

GEPPS CROSS SPORTING FACILITIES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House as to the present attitude of local residents towards the provision of proposed sporting facilities at the Gepps Cross Samcor paddocks? Further, can the Minister outline to the House what steps now need to be taken to implement the proposal? There has been considerable comment in the media, and in this Parliament last week, alleging that residents were unhappy with the proposals. However, media reports of a public meeting held last week to explain the concept indicated that, in fact, the concept plan was acceptable to residents. There appears to have been some confusion about this issue, and I ask the Minister to clarify the position.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to respond to the honourable member's question, and, in particular, to bring to the attention of the House the success we have had in putting this proposal before the local residents, and what the proposal as it stands will mean for sport in this State. I think that it is one of the most significant steps taken by any Government to provide sporting facilities in South Australia. Residents of the immediate area attended a meeting that was convened by the Enfield council last week.

The meeting was extremely successful, and the proposal was accepted unanimously by residents. After explanations were given by officers of my department and Enfield council, the residents unanimously indicated their support for the proposal for a sports park to be developed there. It is interesting to note that the member's question refers to an attack last week by the Opposition in relation to this matter. It seems that they are again adopting through the shadow Minister a knocking approach to these facilities that we are attempting to establish.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member now responds, because he is feeling sensitive about it, and because he knows that he is endeavouring to undermine a legitimate attempt by this Government to establish an important facility for the community in this State. It is significant that we should, for the first time, have under the control of the Minister of Recreation and Sport a significant parcel of land which will be developed for both local recreation and State sporting facilities.

The shadow Minister attended the meeting along with the member for Eyre. It was hard to understand why the member for Eyre attended, given that it was nothing to do with agriculture and that it was a long way from Eyre. However, he was there. The meeting was very successful, and it was not too long before the shadow Minister and the member for Eyre realised that the residents were very supportive of the proposal and that their attempts to undermine the Government's attempts to institute this significant sporting facility would not be successful, so they sneaked off with their tails dragging, not to be seen again.

I think that it is worth noting that they did not last too long. I am disappointed that the shadow Minister has not come out in support of me and the Government in its attempts to establish this facility. He has not done that: he has not given any indication of his or the Opposition's support for this facility, which I think is significant. This is a quite sad reflection on the Opposition.

Moreover, I was privileged today to announce jointly with the Federal Minister for Sport (Hon. John Brown) that cycling will be relocated in Adelaide as part of the Australian Institute of Sport program and that we will now see not only cricket but also cycling located here as part of the Australian Institute of Sport decentralisation program. I think that that will be significant, from the point of view not only of cyclists in South Australia but also of cycling generally in Australia, because it is now under the Australian Institute of Sport banner. That will fit into the program.

The honourable member asked about the next steps. All these proposals will have to run the full consultation gauntlet with local residents and go through the whole planning process before the respective authorities, including the local council, the Planning Commission and, of course, the Government in the final analysis, approve them. In addition, planning for the hockey stadium is reaching the final stage. I hope to take that matter before Cabinet shortly. That will then proceed through the process of consultation with residents. We will see in the Samcor sports park a facility for future generations of South Australians to enjoy.

I am delighted to reflect on the Bannon Government's process of consultation. I am sure that the residents of both Pooraka and the Save the Paddock area will be delighted. With the support of their local member (Hon. Terry McRae) they have achieved what they set out to achieve many years ago: they will see that land preserved for their use and for the use of the community of South Australia. I think that this identifies the achievements of this Government and the way in which it has attempted to consult and involve people in the community in achieving what will be a significant—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Opposition cannot bring itself to support this project: it has to knock it. We are seeing this knocking because they cannot see achievement, or recognise it—they find that difficult to do. The member for Bragg should enter the world foot shooting competition, although he would probably end up needing a dentist to get his foot out of his mouth. I believe that this Government's achievement with this sports park is very significant for sports in this State.

ASER PROJECT

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Premier say what is the latest estimate of the cost of the ASER project?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is capable of asking his question without assistance from the honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The annual report of the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust, which was tabled yesterday by the Premier and which would be of interest to members opposite, shows that the trust now expects to invest $100 million in the ASER project compared to the estimate of $58.5 million when the Premier announced this project in 1983. In this regard, I point out that the estimate of $58 million was expressed in terms of 1986 values. The trust's equity investment has more than doubled to $34 million, while it will make loans of $66 million—$22.5 million more than the original estimate. These latest figures suggest that the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and Kumagai Gumi now expect that the project will cost at least $240 million—a blow-out of more than $100 million. A major reason for this, which is also referred to in the trust's report, has been the industrial trouble that has delayed the completion of the convention centre and the hotel.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member asks what is the state of the ASER project. I refer him to the answer on this matter that was given by my colleague the Attorney-General earlier this week in another place to, I think, the Hon. Mr Davis. I have also answered a number of questions on this issue. It is extraordinary that this question should be asked by the member for Mitcham, the leader of the 'dries' on that side and the man who is after Steele Hall and wants him out of the Parliament. I can understand the repugnance of the honourable member to this project, because there has been some Government involvement in it.

The figures quoted by the honourable member refer to a project that has since been modified substantially and in all respects upgraded and increased in size and scope. If what he implies is meant as criticism of the SASFIT investment in that project, he should remember that SASFIT is an investor in the casino, the project that the shadow Minister of Tourism fought to the bitter end to save us from sins, and it is doing very well on that investment. As I understand it, it has no concerns about the return of its investment in ASER, which will be of massive financial benefit to this State.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 6)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 18 (clause 3)—Leave out 'by notice published in the *Gazette*' and insert 'by regulation'.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 21 and 22 (clause 3)—Leave out subsection (2).

No. 3. Page 2, lines 32 to 34 (clause 3)—Leave out subparagraph (ii) and insert new subparagraph as follows:

'(ii) where the registered owner is a body corporate—

(A) that no officer or employee of the registered owner was driving the vehicle at the time;

or

(B) although an officer or employee of the registered owner was, according to information in the possession of the registered owner, driving at the time—that the registered owner has furnished to the Commissioner of Police, by statutory declaration made by an officer of the registered owner, the name of the officer or employee.'

No. 4. Page 3, line 8 (clause 3)—Leave out 'in form approved by the Minister' and insert 'in the prescribed form'.

No. 5. Page 3, lines 20 and 21 (clause 3)—Leave out 'as the Minister thinks fit' and insert 'as is prescribed'.

No. 6. Page 3, lines 25 and 26 (clause 3)—Leave out 'in a form approved by the Minister' and insert 'in the prescribed form'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Government accepts all the amendments that have been made by the Legislative Council. With your concurrence, Mr Chairman, I shall address amendments Nos 1 to 6 *in toto*. Amendments Nos 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 relate to the Government's ability to proclaim changes in the regulations, especially those relating to red light cameras and whether such changes should be made by regulation. I did not hold strongly to either view, and I said so previously when this matter was debated in this place. I considered that making changes by regulation would increase the work load of Cabinet and of Parliament, but the Legislative Council has determined that changes should be made by regulation and, as those amendments will not detract from the effectiveness of the Bill, I see no problem in accepting them. Even though the amendments will result in more regulation that might have been avoided, they represent the decision of Parliament.

The other amendment provides for an additional defence where the registered owner is a body corporate and that body possesses information that an officer or employee was driving its vehicle at the time of a prescribed offence and furnishes to the Commissioner of Police a statutory declaration naming the officer or employee. The changes to that provision would provide an additional defence. This amendment has been discussed with the police and they have no objection to it. The Government was, and it still is, of the view that the provision in the original Bill would have been sufficient, but the additional defence that has been provided by this amendment is acceptable to it.

The other matters that were raised during the debate in this place by the member for Bragg (the shadow spokesman on transport) concerning the power of the regulation that was provided in the Bill had been answered satisfactorily, as were the other matters that he raised through his colleagues in another place. I urge members to accept the Legislative Council's amendments.

Mr INGERSON: The Opposition supports in principle the Legislative Council's amendments and it supports the Government in this area. Opposition members thank the Minister for accepting these amendments, which provide that any changes in the regulations must be referred back to Parliament. It is essential that we do not keep on handing out the opportunity to Executive Government to make such decisions, because they should be debated by Parliament. I therefore thank the Minister for accepting that.

Concerning amendment No. 3, the change that has been made in transferring the liability to the driver and the requirement that the driver's name should be stated by declaration in the case of a corporation employee is indeed acceptable.

I am concerned that, having made that decision to accept a change to ensure that a driver is liable in relation to a corporation, the same situation occurs with the owner of any business that is not a corporation. If it is a corporation and one does not want to be involved, the driver must be identified but, where a corporation is not involved, individuals merely have to say that they were not driving the vehicle; no-one has to be identified. Any employees of a corporate body can have liability passed to them because it is their responsibility, but if they are working for an individual or partnership that will not occur. I think that the Minister ought to look at that aspect, because any person who works for a corporation is now more liable than an individual.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: One of the reasons why demerit points are not a part of this legislation is the difficulty of being able to determine in some instances exactly who was driving a vehicle. If the owner of the vehicle is not prepared to identify the driver, the owner will pay the appropriate fine. The alternative is for the owner of the vehicle to identify the driver. I think that 99 times out of 100 the owner of the vehicle will know who the driver of the vehicle was. If the owner does not know who the driver was, it is because an unauthorised driver was in the vehicle or because the vehicle had been stolen. In those circumstances, the police would take action.

As I said earlier, I do not believe that this extra defence that has been provided for corporations necessarily changes the role of the police in identifying or enforcing the legislation. It provides an additional defence, but that is all. The situation will remain that an owner who receives a notification under this legislation has the option of accepting the penalty as the owner of the vehicle and paying the fine, or identifying the driver to the police. That helps to make the operation of red light cameras more effective. Because it does that and because of the difficulty on some occasions of identifying the driver, if the owner does not want to identify the driver, then we do not impose demerit points for those alleged offences.

Mr S.J. BAKER: New section 79b (2) provides:

Where a vehicle appears from evidence obtained through the operation of a photographic detection device to have been involved in the commission of a prescribed offence, the registered owner of the vehicle is guilty of an offence against this section unless it is proved—

My understanding of the legislation is that, if a private individual says, 'Look, it was my wife, daughter or cousin who was driving that car', that absolves them from all liability.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Bill does not say that. I have read it three or four times, and I have also read the amendments made by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Minister to contain himself and to wait until the member for Mitcham has finished.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have read the Bill several times and I cannot see where it says that the driver of that vehicle is guilty of an offence. It mentions the registered owner. Perhaps that has been sorted out in the other place, but on my reading of the legislation it says 'the registered owner'. The registered owner is then relieved of liability if they can provide a statutory declaration. It does not say that the

person who has been named on that form is guilty of an offence.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: We are not creating a new offence: the offence of running red lights at intersections already exists. In this legislation we do not have to spell out what the offence is, because it is already prescribed in the Act. In this Bill we spell out the actions of the police following the committing of an offence, so we do not have to go back and rewrite the offence that is already mentioned.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It may well have been sorted out in another place. I contend that a sub-offence is created as a result of the red light cameras. They are used as a device for detecting offenders. Because the new section specifies a particular individual or particular body (the registered owner) as the guilty person, that offsets the other parts of the legislation whereby it is an offence to go against a red light. That is my interpretation. I thank the Minister for his comments on this matter. It may well be that I am completely wrong and that it goes back to the original offence.

Mr LEWIS: Once the registered owner is absolved of any guilt through the due processes prescribed in new section 79b (2), there is no means by which it is possible, even if the offender is identified, to prosecute.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Accepting the generosity of the Minister's comments, I contend that, whilst it is an offence *per se* in the Act, this Bill does not specify that it may be detected and prosecuted in this fashion. The Bill does not enable the prosecution of the other identified party. I, like the member for Mitcham, believe that the lawyers will laugh all the way to the bank and, as a result of this loophole, Government and Parliament will be left with egg on their faces. Although I am not a lawyer, I think that is in fact what will happen once the legislation is proclaimed. I am not happy with the amendment. It rectifies a real anomaly in the original Bill, wherein employees were off the hook and they simply left the boss to pay. The employers not only incur the cost of a fine, but also, because they provide a fringe benefit by so doing, they would have to pay tax on payment of the fine. This amendment goes further than the original Bill, but in my view it does not go far enough. However, I do not intend to move a further amendment. I will leave it for time and the courts to demonstrate the truth or otherwise to those people who believe that the law is to be adequate.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am interested in the comments that the honourable member made at this late stage of debate on the matter. This whole area was raised (very responsibly) by his colleague the member for Bragg. I undertook to check the comments he made as a result of advice that he had received from eminent legal sources. I had Crown Law check on those comments and the Bill then went to another place. The Hon. Mr Griffin participated in the debate. No-one would suggest that he does not have at least a working knowledge of the law. He believes that the concerns expressed by the honourable member are adequately catered for, and I believe his colleagues would agree with that.

This matter has not gone through the Parliament without a considerable amount of checking of the legality. The matter was once again raised by the honourable member's colleague, who felt that it was important for Parliament to be able to state exactly what it wanted to do and not leave it to the courts to perhaps interpret the legislation as providing for something else. It was with that chastening advice from his colleague that we thoroughly investigated the concerns of members opposite. I am happy in the knowledge that there is no legitimate concern left in the Bill in the nature of those expressed by the honourable member. Of course, he will have to satisfy himself either by again reading the Bill and tying it in with the existing Act or, as he said, waiting to see how the courts interpret it. I am confident the courts will interpret the will of the Parliament.

Motion carried.

UNCLAIMED GOODS BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the disposal of unclaimed goods, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to overcome defects in the present common law of this State regarding the situation where a person may knowingly have or come into possession of the goods of another but is compelled by extraneous circumstances to retain possession longer than he or she desires. Thus, for example, if A hands goods over to B for safekeeping and A subsequently fails or refuses to reclaim or collect those goods, B is (with very few exceptions) presently without a lawful remedy.

If, therefore the goods in question become nothing more than of nuisance value to B and B purports to dispose of them or sell them to another person, B could well find himself or herself liable at law to A for the tort of conversion. As Professor Fleming has said in his text on the Law of Torts:

> Conversion may be defined as an intentional exercise of control over a chattel which so seriously interferes with the right of another to control it that the inter-meddler may justly be required to pay its full value. Of overriding importance is the fact that ordinarily the measure of damages for conversion is the full value of the chattel so that the action, in effect, forces an involuntary purchase on the converter; it permits the plaintiff to say to him: 'You have bought yourself something'.

The reason for this unsatisfactory state of affairs is summed up by Palmer in his text on 'Bailment', where he says:

> There is at common law no general right to dispose of goods which a bailor has refused, or is unable, to collect. In *Sachs v Miklos* [1948] 2 K.B. 23, at 37 Lord Goddard C.J. suggested that the bailee might place the bailor in a position of having impliedly consented to a sale, by writing to him and warning him that this will take place unless the goods are collected within a specified time. But this raises difficulties, not the least in that silence in response to an offer cannot generally be taken to connote consent.

To overcome these types of problems, England first passed its Disposal of Uncollected Goods Act 1952. All States of Australia, except South Australia, have separate legislation on the topic in similar if not identical terms to those of the English Act. New South Wales passed its Act in 1966, Western Australia in 1970, Victoria in 1961, Queensland in 1967 and Tasmania in 1968. Palmer has observed:

> At present, most of the State legislation in this field is rather more abstruse and complicated than seems appropriate, in view of the likely frequency of the problem and the likely value of the goods involved . . .

It was with such criticisms in mind that this measure has been drafted. The Government believes it represents a healthy simplification of the law on this topic without unwarranted sacrifice of the relevant interests that are at stake.

In summary, this Bill spells out the criteria by which goods are to be regarded as unclaimed for its purposes. Thus, if the goods are valued below $100 and the expenses attached to their maintenance and sale exceed that figure, the bailee is entitled to dispose of them as he or she sees fit. If the goods are valued between $100 and $500 the bailee has one of two ways to deal with them: either the bailee can sell them by public auction or pursuant to a court

authorised sale. If the value of the goods exceeds $500, then a court authorised sale is the only means by which the bailee is entitled to proceed. In any case, proper notice must be given of the bailee's intentions and adequate and appropriate publicity must be given to those intentions.

The court which is called upon to authorise sale or disposal is to be determined according to the value of the goods: that value attaches jurisdiction to the appropriate court according to the ordinary jurisdictional limits. In turn the bailor can have the court proceedings stopped and reclaim the goods: but in order to do so must pay to the bailee the legitimate expenses and other charges incurred by the latter. Any dispute about those expenses and charges is to be resolved by the court. If the sale proceeds, any purchaser will obtain good title to the goods, free from the interests of third parties of which a purchaser has no knowledge. Any surplus from the sale proceeds (that is, after deducting the moneys to which the bailee is lawfully entitled) is to be paid to the Treasurer. Any person, who is able to establish a claim to a legitimate interest in the goods, can expect recoupment of the share of his or her interest from the Treasurer.

The following features of this Bill should also be noted. It will have retrospective operation—that is it will apply to relevant situations that have arisen before the Act comes into operation. The Bill will also not affect any other specific legislation that deals with related questions. In this regard, honourable members are referred to the relevant provisions of the Unordered Goods and Services Act 1972, the Pawnbrokers Act 1888, s. 79a of the Residential Tenancies Act 1978 and s. 41 of the Workmen's Liens Act 1893.

Nor is the Bill intended to affect or in any other way derogate from the existing rights and remedies of a bailor with respect to any unlawful loss or damage sustained by him or her. Therefore, if a relevant bailee does not avail himself or herself of the provisions of the Act or indeed comply with them he or she can expect to be held legally accountable under the ordinary principles applicable to such cases (for example by the tort of conversion itself to which reference has already been made).

The Commissioner of Police will also be required to be notified in the event of a public auction of the goods or of a court-authorisation being sought for their sale. This procedure will enable the police to check whether the goods in issue are or have been the subject of criminal behaviour (for example, stolen, criminally damaged, etc.). If they are so subject then the ordinary powers of police investigation will take over and the property can be seized or otherwise taken into the possession or custody of a member of the Police Force in furtherance of an official inquiry. Subsequently, those goods would (if they remain unclaimed) be able to be dealt with pursuant to Part XIII of the regulations made under the Police Regulation Act 1951 *(Government Gazette* 23 December 1981 pp. 2497-2499).

The Bill has been the subject of scrutiny and comment by the Judiciary, the Law Society, the Legal Services Commission, the police and others. It represents a reform of the law that is long overdue. And it does so in a style that is, in the Government's view, of great clarity and simplicity which will make it readily accessible and comprehensible to the general public as well as their legal advisers. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 defines expressions that are used in the measure. Of significance are the following:

'bailee'—a person in possession of goods belonging to another;

'bailor'—the owner of such goods;

'the court'—is defined in such a manner as to reflect the jurisdictional limits of the local court. Thus the local court of limited jurisdiction deals with goods whose value falls within its jurisdictional limit, and so on.

Subclause (2) provides that the measure applies to all goods in a bailee's possession, even those that come into his possession before the measure commenced.

Clause 4 binds the Crown.

Clause 5 deals with unclaimed goods. Under subclause (1), goods are unclaimed goods—

(a) if the bailee received them under an agreement providing for the bailor to collect them at a certain time and the bailor has failed to do so;

(b) if the bailee has them under an agreement providing for him to deliver them to the bailor, and the bailee, after making reasonable attempts to so deliver, has been unable to do so;

or

(c) if there is no agreement governing the collection or delivery of the goods but the bailee has requested the bailor to collect them and the bailor has refused to do so or failed to do so within 28 days. Such a request must state the times at which the goods are available, the address, a description of the goods and may be made by post addressed to the bailor's last known address or, if the whereabouts is unknown, by notice in the prescribed form in a newspaper.

Such a request shall not be regarded as valid unless it allows the bailor a reasonable opportunity to collect the goods.

Clause 6 provides that a bailee may, after the expiration of three months from the date on which the goods became unclaimed goods—

(a) sell the goods;

or

(b) if the value of the goods is insufficient to cover the cost of sale, otherwise dispose of the goods.

The sale or disposal may be authorised by the court, and if the value of the goods exceeds $500, the goods must not be disposed of without authorisation. Where authorisation is sought—

(a) notice must be given to the Commissioner of Police;

(b) appropriate notice must be given to the bailor and any other person who in the opinion of the court may be interested in the goods.

The court may give any directions it thinks appropriate in relation to the sale or disposal of the goods.

Where goods valued between $100 and $500 are to be sold without authorisation—

(a) they must be sold by public auction;

(b) notice in the prescribed form of the proposed sale must be given to the Commissioner of Police and the bailor.

The notice may be given by post and, if the whereabouts of the bailor is unknown, by advertisement in a newspaper.

Clause 7 provides that, where a bailee has commenced proceedings under the measure but has not yet disposed of the goods and the bailor claims them, the bailee may not proceed with the disposal and must give them to the bailor.

However, before handing the goods over, the bailee may request the bailor to pay—

(a) the costs incurred in proceedings under the pressure;

(b) the costs of storage and maintenance after the date when the goods were to be collected;

(c) the amount to any lien in favour of the bailee.

If these amounts are not paid within 28 days of the rendering of an account, the bailee may proceed with the sale or disposal. The bailor may apply to the court for a review of the account and in that event the sale or disposal may not occur until the completion of the review, and the court may vary or affirm the account.

Clause 8 deals with the proceeds of sale. The bailee may retain the reasonable costs of sale and proceeding under the measure, the recoverable costs of storage and maintenance; the amount of any lien he had over the goods. The balance will be paid by the Treasurer. The Treasurer may pay that balance to any person who he is satisfied had, prior to the sale, an interest in the goods.

Clause 9 provides that a purchaser of goods sold under the measure acquires good title to the goods, free of any mortgage, lien or charge in favour of the bailee and any other mortgage or charge of which the purchaser was unaware.

Clause 10 provides that the measure does not affect the bailee's right to deal with the goods in accordance with any other Act.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Whilst I find it strange that this Bill should be introduced in this place, I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: When I am in the Chair, I do not intend to accept that sort of behaviour in future. If the honourable member does that sort of thing again, I will name him.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, can you clarify in what way I was out of order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes: I asked the honourable member to resume his seat and either adjourn the debate or indicate what he was doing. The honourable member continued to raise his voice and talk over the top of me. I do not have the slightest intention of accepting that behaviour. If it happens again I can assure the honourable member that I will not hesitate to name him.

Mr S.J. BAKER: By way of clarification: when you asked me to clarify the matter, I said that I wished to adjourn the debate. I did not think that you had actually asked my direction until I had finished my opening remarks on the adjournment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is the last time that I am going to converse across the Chamber with the honourable member. The honourable member should have responded to the Chair when the Chair first asked him to do so. It is not a case of continuing on with debate and then clarifying a point, and, obviously, from his answer, the honourable member heard my question, and showed great ignorance not only to myself but the rest of the members in the Chamber in continuing on whilst I was raising that query. Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

LIFTS AND CRANES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lifts and Cranes Act 1985. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Bill

The Lifts and Cranes Act 1985 provides statutory requirements to be observed for the safe design, use and operation of lifts and cranes. The Act repeals the existing Lifts and Cranes Act 1960 but has not been brought into operation due partly to difficulties in the preparation of regulations and partly to developments that have arisen since the Act was assented to in May 1985.

One of the regulatory matters that haa required an amendment to the Act is the intended introduction of a certification system for persons known in the building industry as 'dogmen'. These persons sling and direct the movement of loads handled by a crane and it has been agreed by the parties concerned that such persons should be required to undergo a formal training and examination procedure that establishes a minimum standard of competence for the safety aspects of a dogman's activities.

The Act's provisions for the regular inspection of lifts are based on annual inspections by government inspectors but because of the long standing difficulty in meeting the demand for inspectors' time under the current annual inspection requirements, provision was made in the Act to extend the inspection period by an additional twelve months. The Chief Inspector has the power to approve this arrangement subject to the owner submitting an expert report that the lift is in good repair and may be safely operated for the period specified.

The Lift Manufacturers Association of Australia (LMAA) has expressed the view that due to the ever increasing numbers of new installations, compliance with the inspection provisions of the Act will not be possible unless a significant increase is made in the number of lift inspectors. Also, because of the significant improvements that have occurred in reliability and in-built fail safe characteristics of the modern lift, increased intervals between formal inspections would not reduce safety.

The Chief Inspector has recommended that, as the maintenance of lifts in South Australia is already carried out competently on a regular basis by companies which are all members of LMAA, the Act's certificate of inspection provision (section 13) be removed and the frequency of inspections of lifts for safety purposes become a matter for prescription as is the case for cranes and hoists. Under section 9 of the Act an inspector may make an inspection of a lift, crane or hoist at any time and give directions to prevent the risk of injury as well as prohibit its operation until those directions have been complied with. Audit inspections by government inspectors would verify the efficacy of inspections carried out by the lift companies in accordance with the Act.

The use of performance or quality standards and codes of practice published by the Standards Association of Australia (SAA) as a means of establishing safety requirements for compliance purposes has had wide acceptance for many years. The Act authorises SAA standards to be called up in regulations to provide detailed requirements for lift and crane design, use, etc. In such cases the standards become

legally enforceable. However, a new approach to the use of codes of practice has been incorporated in the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986. In brief, the new approach is to utilise codes of practice for the purpose of providing practical guidance to employers, employees and others relating to occupational health and safety matters, for example, a code of practice may provide options or alternative methods of achieving a desired standard of safety for a particular situation.

These codes of practice will not be legal requirements in themselves (unless they are referred to in regulations) but may be used as evidence in legal proceedings. Where the requirements of a code have not been met, the burden of proof would shift to the accused to show that an equally safe practice has been used. It is considered appropriate that the same relationship is achieved between general offences under the Lifts and Cranes Act and compliance with codes of practice as is adopted under the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986.

The amendments proposed in this Bill will enable the Act to be operated as intended when it was introduced, that is, to provide effective and flexible requirements for the safe use of lifts and cranes applicable to the present industrial environment.

The provisions of this Bill have been fully discussed with industry representatives and approved by the Industrial Relations Advisory Council.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends section 4 of the Act by adding a definition of an 'approved code of practice'.

Clause 4 repeals section 12 of the Act and substitutes a new section making it an offence—

(a) if a proper standard of care is not exercised in the operation of a crane, hoist or lift;

(b) if a crane, hoist or lift is operated while in an unsafe condition;

or

(c) if the operator of a crane, hoist or lift is not adequately trained in its safe operation subclause (2) provides that a person failing to exercise a proper standard of care in erecting, constructing, modifying or maintaining a crane, hoist or lift is guilty of an offence.

Subclause (3) provides that where a defendant is proved to have failed to comply with a relevant provision of an approved code of practice the defendant will be taken to have failed to exercise the standard of care required by section 12.

Clause 5 repeals section 13 of the Act.

Clause 6 amends section 14 of the Act by including 'lifts' so that the manner and frequency of inspection of lifts can be prescribed by regulation.

Clause 7 amends section 16 of the Act to provide that a person shall not operate a crane or perform work of a kind prescribed by regulation unless the person holds an appropriate certificate of competency or provisional certificate of competency.

Subclause (1a) makes it an offence for a person to cause or permit another person to act in contravention of subclause (1).

Clause 8 inserts a new section in the Act which makes provision for the approval of codes of practice by the Minister.

Clause 9 amends the regulation making power to permit regulations to be made relating to the safety of the public and to permit the exercise of a discretion by the Director or Chief Inspector in relation to matters specified by regulation.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. D.J. Hopgood:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

(Continued from 24 February. Page 3095.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to raise a couple of matters and, first, I refer to the responsibility of councils to clear roadsides of vegetation and other debris, which constitute a bushfire hazard. I raised this topic with the member for Newland some time ago, and she was good enough to raise the matter of roadside vegetation on Anstey's Hill with the council responsible for that area, the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully. However, the council declined to do anything about the matter, in clear contra distinction of the efforts of the Gumeracha council, which takes over responsibility for the roadside from the top of Anstey's Hill.

I shall recite to the House some of the problems experienced by Hills dwellers (many of whom I represent) with attitudes such as this. One of the real problems during a bushfire is being able to move from one place to another. First, firefighters have to be able to move along roads to get to the seat of a fire. The other important aspect is that people who have houses in the Hills are often advised to go home—because the best way to protect property is to be there. A resident at home can often save his property, if reasonable precautions have been taken. In 99 per cent of cases properties can be saved. But if owners are not there they cannot do that.

The fire hazard on Anstey's Hill is becoming more acute as time goes by. The Department of Environment and Planning has insisted on quarry owners planting highly inflammable natives to screen a quarry in the area. I think it is stupid and that the benefit of screening the quarry is far outweighed by the hazard produced in relation to a bushfire. Anyone living in the district would agree wholeheartedly with that point of view. However, these highly flammable wattles and eucalypts have been planted on the quarry property. I understand that the other side of the road is under the control of the Tea Tree Gully council. In this area we have the spectacle of large pine trees that were killed during the Ash Wednesday fire still standing there. This is not only most unsightly but it will provide further fuel for another fire. All the eucalypts that were burnt have of course regrown and many others have shot or germinated, so a most unfortunate situation is developing in relation to this matter.

After the member for Newland had tried to get something done, she informed me that she had not been successful, and I thanked her for trying. I happened to see socially the district engineer and I spoke to him about this matter. He said that the problem was with the environmentalists. I spoke to the honourable member about regrowth near the E&WS filtration plant, and farther up to the top of the hill there is an enormous amount of regrowth, including these large pine trees which were burnt on Ash Wednesday but which are still standing there.

I speak from personal experience, because on Ash Wednesday I was at an official function in the city and it

was not until 2.30 p.m. that I knew about the fires. At the bottom of Anstey's Hill I was told that I could not go up because it was not safe, that the hill was on fire. They meant that both sides of the road were on fire, trees had fallen over the road, and it was impassable. So, I, with a number of other local residents who work in the city, had to stay at the bottom of the hill twiddling our thumbs, not having the faintest idea of what was happening. When I got home of course everything had been burnt, except, fortunately, my home. The CFS saved that.

This vegetation is an enormous hazard and it is getting worse. In a couple of years time it will be worse than it was on Ash Wednesday. It is time that councils like Tea Tree Gully woke up to their responsibilities. The Gumeracha council responded quite quickly and was on the job with front-end loaders and chain saws. All the dead pine trees adjacent to the road in the area where I live were cleared. The Highways Department did its bit for a year or two, but now it has got the stitch. The Highways Department had people up there with brush cutters clearing the sides of the road, but they have given that away now that the immediate horror of Ash Wednesday has passed.

I am appalled by the lack of effort by some Government departments and the lack of understanding by some Government departments—and the Department for Environment and Planning and the E&WS Department are two that I would name. The Woods and Forests Department is making an attempt. That department, chronically short of staff is making an attempt to come to grips with at least some of the reserve land under its care. But nothing has been done to clear the unsightly dead trees that were burnt on Ash Wednesday or indeed to get rid of some of the regrowth.

So, I raise this matter in the House. Two members of this place have been singularly unsuccessful in their approaches to the Tea Tree Gully council. In due course I shall send copies of these remarks to the Mayor, whom I know, and to other councils. I thank the honourable member for trying. As I have said, I mentioned the matter to the engineer. Notwithstanding his response I do not think any environmentalists would enjoy seeing the dead pine trees still standing. But I certainly believe that the ability to travel on those roads at times of bushfire and at least to save property is a far higher priority than screening quarries with highly flammable eucalypts and wattles.

The other matter I want to raise (totally divorced from what I have been talking about) is to read into the record a letter from the Association of Professional Engineers. I have been asked to raise the matter, so I do. They are concerned about the appointment of their members to what they believe are positions they should occupy. The letter, sent by the association to the Premier, states:

Dear Mr Premier,

Further to our respective correspondence regarding the revitalisation of the manufacturing industry within South Australia, we advise that we have had an opportunity of an in-depth discussion with Mr John Cambridge of the Department of State Development and the association will be shortly confirming our offer of practical assistance in this Government initiative. We now draw to your attention another aspect of technological leadership in the State that is of concern to this association and of the utmost importance to the future industrial development and prosperity of South Australia.

We are sure that your Government agrees that the future technological capability of the State is dependent upon sound infrastructure of industries and services such as water, transport, energy and the like. The effectiveness and efficiency of these technological functions, which provide the life blood of the State, depends upon the sound leadership of professional engineers employed in Government departments and instrumentalities. South Australia has been well served by a body of highly qualified and dedicated engineers, who have assisted to create the water systems, highways and electricity systems, etc. in which the State has cause for pride. The engineers of South Australia also take pride in these achievements.

The confirmed effectiveness of Government engineering services and functions is dependent in absolute terms upon retention of able, enthusiastic and dedicated leadership in engineering technology. South Australia has had the benefit up to now of having outstanding engineers in the leadership of its engineering infrastructure enterprises. Such people have been known internationally and throughout Australia for their achievements and for the leadership of their profession. Among those professionals still serving the State, but by no means exclusive, are Messrs Don Alexander, Keith Lewis, Michael Knight and Leon Sykes.

Now we see a tendency to lose sight of the need for technological leadership of the engineering based Government enterprises and to throw open executive management positions to non-engineers. While we can understand the ambitions and aspirations of non-engineers for appointment to top positions in these vital bodies, we are alarmed at the consequences of such apppointments. While it may be true that an accountant or an economist or a lawyer can understand the pure administrative functions involved in the senior management levels of engineering based organisations, such people can never provide the technological leadership needed for their effective performance. Our concern naturally is for the welfare of our profession and its members, but we are also concerned for the welfare of South Australia. Therefore, we urge you to consider deeply the question of maintaining the technological leadership of South Australian public enterprises by a confirmed recognition of the roles of professional engineers at executive level. Accordingly we put the following matters to you in the context of the promulgation of the new Government Management and Employment Act:

1. We request that no positions at senior officer level in government services, traditionally filled by engineers, be filled by non-engineers.

2. We request that an examination of all such positions be reviewed by a mechanism that can be accepted by the profession as objective, so that all positions involving the leadership of engineering functions, can be designated as requiring recognised engineering qualifications.

3. We request that a review be made of the engineering classification structure, including positions in the senior officer levels, be carried out by a joint committee of the Government and the association.

We put it to you that these actions are just as vital to the future technological leadership and economic wellbeing of South Australia as are other welcome initiatives of your Government. We would appreciate the opportunity to amplify these matters with you and seek to have officers of the association meet with you in that objective.

Yours faithfully, R. H. Overall, Industrial Officer.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): The first matter I wish to raise is very short. I put on notice to the Minister of Lands question No.246, which asks:

Has the Government committee announced by the Deputy Premier on 1 May 1985 and headed by the former Director of Fisheries (Mr A. M. Olsen), which was to report by the end of the year, completed its study of the sensory perception of fish and, if so, when will the report be tabled and, if the report is not to be tabled, will the Minister inform the House whether any persons are able to indicate whether fish do or do not feel pain?

I was not able to ask whether the fish made any comment, because that would have been deleted. The answer was as follows:

The report has not been finalised because of difficulties obtaining information from overseas.

That is all I wish to say, except that it is a joke that we have a committee sitting (some members of which have probably gone overseas—I do not know), to ascertain whether or not fish feel pain. God knows how much that is costing us! If ever there has been a joke, this is one!

I want to refer briefly to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science annual report for 1984-85 which was made available as late as 24 February 1986 in our library. The report states:

It is pleasing to note that the real growth in private patient work has continued despite the lower number of private patients in recognised hospitals during the year. It should also be noted

that this growth in work has been accomplished within what has been essentially a standstill budget over the last two years, and with staff numbers being kept constant in that two year period. Further analysis also suggests that, apart from an increase in volume of work, there has been an increase in the complexity of the mix of pathology test undertaken at the institute.

The council of the institute particularly appreciates the response of staff to the challenges to improve productivity and to maintain competitiveness during a period of economic constraint. The council is also pleased to note that the reputation of the institute for providing high quality independent professional services by its pathologists to medical practitioners has been respected by the medical profession. This has occurred during a period when the country doctors dispute caused a deterioration of relationships between the medical profession and the Government.

During the year, the institute completed funding arrangements for public hospital work with the South Australian Health Commission of a similar nature to those arrived at for private practice funding. The council feels that significant improvements to these funding arrangements could still occur. The institute has maintained, with respect to the grant for private patient services, that recognition for an increase in the volume and mix of work should be given to the institute, as would have occurred under the medical benefit schedule payments system. The Commonwealth Department has so far declined to automatically pass on these adjustments, but rather has insisted on difficult and complex negotiations. During this financial year the Commonwealth has at least funded some of the increases in private patient services, whereas there has been no funding of increases in work from the public sector. It is hoped that further review of funding arrangements in the forthcoming financial year may improve the current arrangements. Once again the institute has achieved a balanced budget for the financial year.

It is a credit that the institute has balanced its budget; that it has worked on virtually the same budget for two years; that it is not going for more staff—but it is not to the credit of the Health Commission (or the Federal body, but more to the Health Commission) that they have not paid the money they owe the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. That is the truth of the matter. The report does not put it in those words, but it is indicated to us as Parliamentarians that the institute has been done out of its dough, and we really have to get the Minister to answer that. I am sure someone will pick it up and take it up in the other place.

While on Government attitudes I want to refer to an article in the local paper which came out today. That is the Messenger Press for the Hills area, and I refer to an article headlined 'Bulging at the Seams!' It refers to the Upper Sturt Primary School, a school which I attended (not the present one, but the old one down the road), as did my father and grandfather. The new school is in about the same state as the one my grandfather attended must have been, because the report states:

> Upper Sturt Primary School is 'bulging at the seams' and wants the Education Department to answer its call for new buildings. School council Chairman Barry Latter said student enrolments had tripled over the past 10 years and the school's facilities were extremely strained.
>
> 'There's a limit on how much you can cut back, and personally I believe we're over and above it', Mr Latter said. 'We're cutting back on the education of our kids and they're suffering because of it. The population of the area has leapt in the past few years and now the school is bulging at the seams.'
>
> Last year the school sent a list of 26 complaints to the Education Department. These included:
>
> - a lack of toilet facilities, there are three cubicles between 90 children . . .

What a disgrace! The article continues:

- no sheltered area for children on wet days.

We all know how many wet days they have in that part of the State. The article continues:

- overcrowding and inadequate amount of facilities per child, and
- poor design of school equipment leading to safety hazards.

Perhaps somebody wants to laugh about that, too. The article continues:

> Mr Latter also said some of the school's equipment was outdated and run down. 'The furniture is just about matchsticks and glue—bits of junk. Some of it we've made ourselves,' he said.
>
> Principal Bob Chapman said the department had confirmed it had received the submission but he had not heard when the school would be upgraded.
>
> He said the school, which consists of one permanent building and four transportable classrooms, was built in 1967 to house 40 students.

I do not wish to continue with further comments. The department says that it cannot give a date when this school will be upgraded to a reasonable standard for these children. I know that it is tucked away in the bush a bit and that people might think they can ignore it because it involves a small population. However, the truth is that that school, and the community—particularly the children, the ones about whom we are supposed to be concerned—are being neglected by the present Government.

I will refer now to our 'friends' in the Federal Parliament, Mr Hawke and Mr Keating. The Independent Grocers in this State operate two cooperatives and have to pay sales tax, as do the big chain operators. However, the big chains pay their sales tax at a point before the goods enter their warehouses. The small operators, who are hoping to survive, must pay their tax as the goods leave the cooperative warehouse, so they are paying sales tax on the cost of storage and handling in and out of store. That amounts in this State alone to over $2 million extra tax that they must pay, yet they are expected to compete against the big operators. They wrote to the Prime Minister, and to the Treasurer, explaining this position about 12 months ago and saying how unfair it was. They wrote in the following terms:

> The existing tax is not a sales tax but is a wholesale tax levelled at the last wholesale point.

The Treasurer acknowledged the inequity and quite rightly stated that the solution was to shift the taxing point, thereby treating all parties equally. However, the Government refuses to do that. Keating and Hawke admit that they are ripping off the small operators and supporting the big ones, the multinationals (or nationals in some cases) to the detriment of the small operator who has to join a cooperative to compete and in the hope of surviving against the big operators. Yet those people are forced to pay $2 million a year more in tax. Members must bear in mind that they employ about 15 000 people, turn over $1.2 billion a year and control approximately 56 per cent of the market. The other 40 per cent goes to the multinationals in profit.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I will use this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House the difficulties that are being experienced by investors in this State, particularly in real estate. During the introduction of the last State budget, the Premier, in his role as Treasurer, said that the State would hopefully receive $45.4 million from land tax compared with $38.2 million in 1985-86. During the Budget Estimates the Premier advised that the number of taxpayers with property holdings in excess of $200 001 in 1985-86 was 2 672 and in 1986-87 would probably be 3 956—a 50 per cent increase.

Let us go back, because this is important and is where the crunch comes. During the 1985 State election campaign, the Premier sent a letter to taxpayers headed 'Notice to taxpayers from the Premier of South Australia', as follows:

> At this time each year accounts for land tax are usually forwarded to taxpayers. However, you may be one of 76 000 people who have benefited fully from the tax concessions the Government announced in August 1985. These concessions will significantly reduce the number of people who are liable to pay land tax. Principally, all those persons whose total land holdings are

valued at less than $40 000 will no longer have to pay land tax. This will mean that 76 000 South Australians will be exempt from paying the tax.

Those who are still subject to land tax will receive some relief from the tax by the introduction of the new tax scale. However, because of rising land values others will pay more tax than in 1984-85 but less than they would have under the old scale. Billing of land tax will commence in early November 1985 and continue until mid-January 1986.

We know that that letter was used for pre-election gimmickry purposes. It used a property valuation figure of $40 000 knowing that property values had increased and were to increase again and that within 12 months most of that would be picked up. We have found that in the past 12 months small businesses and small investors (so necessary to provide rental accommodation for retail organisations, both commercial and industrial) have experienced huge increases in property values and hence large increases in their land tax.

On the other hand, those who have been providing rental accommodation to assist those who need affordable housing have also been hard hit. Let us look at some examples of the incentivation introduced by the Bannon Labor Government. A commercial property in Port Adelaide was charged land tax of $253 in 1985-86. The proposed tax for 1986-87, is $2 027, or $39 a week, a 700 per cent increase. That land tax was reduced to $462, or an increase of nearly 87 per cent when I challenged the Valuer-General's valuation on behalf of the person involved.

A commercial property in Seaton was charged land tax of $293 in 1985-86 and the proposed tax for 1986-87 is $450, a 54 per cent increase. That amount was reduced by $150 owing to an error in the notional value. Errors do occur, and we were able to assist that person. A commercial property in Carrington Street, City, was charged land tax in 1985-86 of $1 220, and the proposed land tax for 1986-87 was $3 017, a 147 per cent increase, or a total of about $58 a week. That land tax has to be paid by the person leasing the commercial premises.

A small property in the central business district of the city, was charged land tax in 1985-86 of $495 and the proposed tax for 1986-87 is $1 920, a 288 per cent increase or about $37 a week. Another small commercial property in Gouger Street was charged land tax in 1985-86 of $3 510 and the proposed land tax for 1986-87 is $6 040, a 72 per cent increase or $116 a week. A commercial premises in Norwood attracted a land tax in 1985-86 of $1 048 and proposed land tax for 1986-87 of $1 462, a 40 per cent increase or $28 a week.

In the central business district of the city the land tax on a small commercial premises was $3 905 in 1985-86, and the proposed amount for 1986-87 is $4 612, an increase of 18 per cent or $88.70 a week. The $88 per week land tax paid by the persons leasing those premises must come from somewhere, as it must in the other examples that I will give. A commercial premises in Marion had a land tax in 1985-86 of $11 595 and a proposed tax in 1986-87 of $14 604, an increase of 26 per cent, or a total of $280 a week.

In the eastern suburbs, land tax on a commercial property was $16 500 in 1986-87 ($317.30 a week) compared to $13 840 in the previous financial year. In the south-western suburbs, a commercial property that attracted $18 874 in land tax during 1985-86 suffered an increase of 15 per cent to $21 683 ($417 a week) in 1986-87. In 1985-86, land tax on a commercial property near where I live in the western suburbs was $24 606 ($473 a week), whereas in 1986-87 it had increased to $30 747 ($591 a week)—a 25 per cent increase.

No business can expect to increase its turnover or its profitability by 25 per cent just to cover an increase in land tax, let alone any other taxes or charges, increases in the cost of living or wages costs that may be incurred. The need to meet a land tax impost of $591 a week means one of two things for a small business: either one or two of the staff must lose employment or one or two other people are not given an employment opportunity. This type of tax is killing the incentive for anyone to establish a business in South Australia.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What's the answer?

Mr BECKER: The honourable member knows the answer: lean, mean and efficient Government.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Oh!

Mr BECKER: There is no point in the honourable member's saying 'Oh!', because over the years the Public Accounts Committee, which identifies areas where there is waste and poor management in Government departments, was extremely critical of the financial management of a department of which the honourable member, as Minister, was in charge.

I now turn to the rental markets, which covers houses and flats. In 1984-85, the land tax on a private house and granny flat at Brighton was $680; in 1985-86, $1 398; and in 1986-87, $2 095—an increase of $1 415 over 2½ years. The land tax on that residential property with a granny flat this year is $40.28 a week. That is absolute madness: after all, it is only a residential property with a granny flat. The land tax on an average five-room house at Unley this year is $14 a week, and on a block of flats in the same district it is $10 a week for each unit. I have always believed and have often said that property valuation is nothing more than an educated guess, and I have proved over the time when I have objected to property values that errors have occurred.

As shadow Minister of Housing and Construction, I am trying to obtain affordable accommodation for people who need it. The following are further examples of land tax on suburban properties. In 1985-86, the land tax on a house at Kilburn was $30 a week or $1 067 a year. The land tax on a house at Norwood is $28 a week or $1 462 a year. The land tax on a house at Auldana was $28 a week or $1 446 a year. On a block of four flats at West Beach in my district, the land tax is $800.00.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During the past three years in Australia, and in South Australia in particular, we have witnessed the greatest period of industrial peace for more than 35 years. The figures released on Friday, 6 February 1987 in respect of the number of industrial disputes that are occurring in Australia reveal that for the third year in a row the number has declined. Indeed, the record in South Australia is so good that it is hard to find another area in the Western world where the figures can be compared because they are so good. South Australia has a record that is better than Japan, better than West Germany, and better than any of the manufacturing countries of the OECD that are often used as comparisons with our own economy.

Despite this period of industrial peace, 1986 saw the emergence of a right wing group known as the H. R. Nicholls Society. Members of this organisation applauded, supported and, I believe, found money to support the disputes that occurred in Mudginberri, the Dollar Sweets dispute and the South-East Queensland Electrical Board dispute. A feature of these disputes was the use of common law, where writs were taken out against the unions involved and the union members for damages.

Another feature of all disputes has been the dismissal of unionists and union officials and lock-outs by the closing down of factories that have occurred. All these tactics have been applauded by the H. R. Nicholls Society and, indeed, by members of the Liberal Party in this House. I think the member for Victoria in his most recent speech in the House indicated that there ought to be more Mudginberris in Australia. Because of the interference of this society in the industrial relations scene in Australia, the recent dispute at Robe River has been unnecessarily prolonged and, in fact, is still on the go.

The Chairman of the Peko Company (Mr Copeman) indicated on television that he was certainly in favour of the methods proposed by the H. R. Nicholls Society. Many observers from business and unions say that the twists and turns that have kept the battle simmering in this dispute point to a longer-term political objective being involved. I do not necessarily agree with the work practices that have been occurring in this industry, and I believe that they should be on the table for debate, the same as work practices should be on the table for debate in any negotiation that occurs around the collective bargaining table. It is clear that the way that this dispute has been handled has not been in the best interest of the company concerned, the shareholders, the workers or indeed Australia.

The blame for it all must be laid at the bullheaded tactics of the company following the principles of the H. R. Nicholls Society. In a final analysis the company came to the bargaining table and Mr Copeman was prepared to agree to a peace package which included recognition of the Industrial Commission, consultation with workers on any further change, and guarantee that all workers in the strike would have their jobs to go back to with a clean slate. All unresolved work practices were to be resolved by the Industrial Commission. However, the offer for peace by the company had come too late and the workers on the job had decided that they had enough and this dispute has continued.

Although there has been a large cost to the workers involved, the cost to the company has been far greater. The company itself has claimed that the strike has cost almost $500 a minute and has kept Japanese ships idle off the north-west coast, causing untold expense. More importantly, the immediate financial pressure is the danger that Robe River could lose its share of the Japanese market. The Japanese companies, which have been the receivers of the raw material from Australia, have been totally unimpressed by the way in which the company handles its industrial relations, and indeed sent a telex report to the company exhorting the Australians to establish a dispute settling mechanism, including the use of arbitration, stating that the second Robe River dispute had caused financial losses in Japan and could lead to a reallocation of the Australian market share.

The Robe River dispute was set up and has been maintained by the right wing of the H. R. Nicholls Society and its supporters in the Liberal Party as being a litmus test for change. It included all the same conditions as the other disputes at Mudginberri, Dollar Sweets and the South-East Queensland Electricity Board. We saw a full scale challenge to the system, the legal system against the unions, lock-outs and dismissals, etc., but what was not understood by the right wing was that the previous disputes did not involve investment from shareholders. It was the small employers who were able to use the legal system, not in the correct way, in my view, to protect themselves. All of them had no shareholders and had nothing to lose.

In the Peko-Wallsend situation, the shareholders are very concerned and they have been watching the battle with a growing concern. The shareholders contain institutions; for example, 20 per cent of Peko-Wallsend is owned by the CML. The General Manager of the CML has stated, 'If the company has a big win, I don't see how they are going to maintain satisfactory working relationships with their employees. I don't see that as being beneficial at all. I want to see a resolution which is amicable.'

What is not realised by members of the H. R. Nicholls Society and their Liberal supporters is that a common law writ is not as big a threat against a worker as they might imagine. Many workers have not got a great deal of money and it does not matter to them whether or not they receive a writ. Once all the money they possess has been taken away from them, the threat itself diminishes. The company is mounting a hatred that will not be forgotten for another 20 years. Those people who know the history of industrial relations in Australia will know that the strikes that were originally perpetrated by various companies in the industrial field during the depression years, especially the large strike of 1929 in Broken Hill, set up problems for the company which took it 20 years to overcome. No amount of legal might will eventually overcome the problems of a miner when he has a score to settle with the company, and he may be prepared to wait many years to do so.

All this illustrates the stupidity of the tactics that have been advocated by the H. R. Nicholls Society and its Liberal supporters. I refer to the words of the Chief Executive of the BHP Iron Ore (Mr Gordon Freeman) when talking about this dispute. He stated:

> In Robe River today there is misery, fear, intimidation and frustration. All the factors go to make a bitter quarrel and, even after quarrels are mended, a legacy of mistrust that is not conducive to quality of life and reasonable working conditions. Gentlemen, there must be a better way.

It is my own view that the majority of employers in Australia are not so silly as to follow the tactics advocated by the H. R. Nicholls Society and Liberal members in this House.

Despite the claims that have been made of victory for the right wing during the Mudginberri, Dollar Sweets and South-East Queensland Electricity Board disputes, the vast majority of Australian employers have not followed the course advocated by the far right and members of the Liberal Party. There have been no sudden waves of employers seeking to use the same tactics as occured during those disputes. It is to the very great credit of the majority of employers in Australia that they can see that following these tactics would be both unproductive and unprofitable.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The previous Liberal Government established a committee to review the classification of non-acceptable shack sites in South Australia. As far as I am concerned, that committee did an excellent job. Up until that point, the problem and future of unacceptable shack sites had been a nightmare to all previous Governments. The committee examined the complete array of shacks right across South Australia, and it made detailed recommendations in its report in 1983. However, since that time, the implementation of those recommendations has dragged on and, in some instances, there has been complete bungling on the part of the Government.

I refer to the history of one case in the Riverland involving Mr and Mrs McFarlane at Barmera. In 1985 Mrs McFarlane approached the department in relation to her shack site at Barmera which was classified under the report as an acceptable site. On 28 August 1985, in response to a letter that she wrote to the Department of Lands, she received a reply regarding freeholding section 638, Cobdogla irrigation area, miscellaneous lease 16097, which indicated that

her shack had been reclassified as an acceptable shack site and that in due course she would receive a freehold title to that property. On 10 February 1986 Mrs McFarlane received a letter from the Department of Lands which stated:

Following the Government's review of the classification of non-acceptable shack sites, it was decided that those sites which were held by the lessee as at 5 November 1979 may retain their shack for the remainder of their life time plus the life time of a surviving spouse. A new lease to reflect life tenure will be issued on expiry of the current lease.

That then immediately put her shack back into the non-acceptable classification with a terminating tenure. On behalf of Mr and Mrs McFarlane, I raised the matter with the Department of Lands and, 17 days later, on 27 February 1986, the department again wrote to the people concerned and stated:

The letter was sent by mistake as your shack area has been reclassified as acceptable following the shack site review. On expiry of your current lease on 31 December 1986 a new acceptable lease for a period of 20 years will be issued and it is expected that freehold offer would be made approximately six to 12 months later.

Once again, the people concerned were quite happy. However, some six months from that date, on 17 September 1986, a further letter was received from the department which once again clouded the issue. The letter stated what would happen, instead of a new acceptable lease being issued for a period of 20 years prior to the issuing of freehold title, as follows:

The new lease will be a life tenure lease and will remain current until such time as either the offer of freehold title or an acceptable 20 year lease is accepted by you.

So, once again there was a change. The statements made by the department made it uncertain as to whether or not, if these people accepted a life tenure lease, in reality they would ever get the freehold title. Recently, on 10 February 1987, they received a letter from the department which stated:

I refer to your Miscellaneous Lease OM 16097 over section 638 hundred of Cobdogla I.A. which expired on 31 December 1986. On the recommendation of the Land Board, the Minister of Lands has approved that you now be offered a life tenure lease for holiday accommodation purposes over section 638 commencing 1 January 1987 at a rental of $153 per annum payable yearly in advance and subject to revaluation every five years.

The letter further stated:

Failure to meet the above requirements would lead to you having no formal tenure over the land which could result in removal of the shack.

Members can appreciate these people's concern about the situation. They intend to retire to this property and to further develop it. The sequence of events and the final letter that they have now received places them back in the position that they were in before the shack site committee commenced its review in 1981.

I call on the Minister of Lands to give an assurance that Mr and Mrs McFarlane will receive a freehold title over their shack site as recommended by the classification committee and as confirmed by the Department of Lands on 28 August 1985. I ask that this matter be finally cleared up. I hope that the Minister of Lands will take note of what I have said. I will make the letters from the department available to him, and I trust that the matter will be resolved once and for all.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I want to take the opportunity to refer again to the vine-pull system which has been implemented in South Australia and to point out the invidious position in which the Government has placed the future livelihood of a large number of people. On 23 September 1986, I took the opportunity of speaking in two grievance debates on the one day (*Hansard* pp 1106-7 and 1079-80) to draw attention to the problems which existed. Subsequently the Minister and officers of his department entered into dialogue with me and acknowledged some of the difficulties that existed, and they indicated that the department was seeking additional funds from the Commonwealth to resolve the problems.

I was given a very clear understanding that everybody who had lodged an application before the given date, regardless of his means, would be given proper consideration. Let me just explain that: we had a position where applications were called from the grapegrowers generally to pull vines. The first 300-odd growers who made application—practically without exception—received the financial assistance sought: there was no consideration of means or viability, they were given the funds. Then, beyond a particular number of applications, it was decided overnight to change the rules and, even though persons had lodged applications within the rules obtaining at the time, only those who passed a means test would continue to be considered and would be likely eventually to receive funds.

A number of those persons had lodged applications through the system at the same time as, or even before, some of the first applications were lodged prior to the decision to introduce a means test. Others made statutory declarations that they had been advised by officers of the appropriate Government department—more particularly the Department of Agriculture—to take specific action in relation to the management of their vineyards on the basis that, if the vines were to be pulled out, it was not wise to prune them because of the additional cost involved which would not be recouped; and that in the period leading up to the time when the vines would be pulled, if they had the time they should pull out the posts and take out the wires on which the vines were trained. They would then be that much closer to being able to complete the vine-pull. A number of people who had that type of assurance did just that.

The growers concerned were subsequently told that funds were not available and that they were not going to be considered for assistance, because they were considered to have other means and they did not receive 50 per cent of their total income from vines. Therefore, people who had fulfilled the directions they had received from officers of the department, who were acting on the knowledge that was available at the time, suddenly found themselves behind the proverbial eight ball. It was too late to prune, because pruning when the leaf bud is at an advanced stage will cause bleeding and interfere with the viability of the vine and the likelihood of a crop. Further, some vines are only of value if they are trained to wires and, if the wires have been pulled out, the vine is no longer viable and it is not possible to undertake the appropriate management of those vines.

Many people find themselves in a very difficult financial position, having made arrangements with their banks based on the information they had obtained from local newspapers and from departmental officers. Growers have been able to indicate information which was available in various documents circulated by the Department of Agriculture at the time and bank managers advanced them funds or undertook to carry them for a period of time until those funds became available. Many growers still do not know what their future will be other than having received a letter from the department suggesting that they abandon all hope. I will read from a typical letter dated 6 August 1986, as follows:

I am replying to your letter of 4 July 1986, which explained that you have applied for the vine-pull assistance and that the current policies for administering the scheme have caused you financial problems. I apologise for the delay in replying to your letter. The nature of your comments has made it necessary for

me to investigate the matter with those departmental officers mentioned in your letter, and this has taken some time.

I can accept that situation. The letter continues:

All officers involved with the vine-pull scheme were informed in March 1986 that the number of applications for vine-pull assistance was much larger than expected and that extra funds were to be requested from the State and Commonwealth Governments. Staff were told not to inspect any more applicants' properties until funding arrangements had been finalised and that applicants should be informed of the situation.

The letter did not say that staff were told not to discuss the issue with people who were involved in their departmental offices: it merely said that they were not to go out and undertake inspections. The letter continues:

All staff have indicated that assurances for payment for vine-pull assistance were not given to any applicants whose properties had not been inspected by the end of March 1986.

I sincerely question the validity of that statement. It is an easy statement to make in hindsight but, from the advice and information that I have had from growers who were present (with witnesses) and from comments I have received from departmental officers, I do not believe that that statement is based on fact. I believe that a very clear statement was made by people in the Department of Agriculture indicating the line of investigation being undertaken by the Government and that the likely end result would be a favourable one. That is the same likely result as that indicated to me by the Minister in the vicinity of this House after my previous comments in September last year. The letter goes on to say:

As your application was not made until 29 April 1986, I feel that any financial commitment made by you which depended on the successful outcome of your vine-pull application was made at your own risk.

I comment on that because there were continuing statements from the Minister and his officers, as well as the Federal Minister (Mr Kerin), that the scheme was still viable, that it was being considered for a further injection of funds, and that growers would be assisted at the earliest possible moment. That has not come about. Finally, the letter states:

The need for a change of policy regarding eligibility for assistance is regretted, but with such a large number of applications the potential expenditure outstripped budget arrangements made to fund the vine-pull scheme by both the Commonwealth and State Governments.

That may be a statement of fact, but I return to my point that people were invited by this State Government—and indeed by the Federal Government—to make application for the purpose of vine-pull on a series of criteria which did not preclude them from making the application on the basis that they might not get 50 per cent of their income from that source.

It was made on the basis not that they would be graded out because they lodged an application early in the application period or late in the application period. They were invited to make an application on the basis that they would be considered on a par with everyone else who had made an application. The Government has created two classes of citizen in South Australia. Many in the first category did not really need financial assistance but, notwithstanding, have benefited and the other large group involves people who took time to put in an application but who are now grossly disadvantaged.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): The education budget in this State accounts for some $750 million per annum, yet country school-children are still suffering considerable lack of equal opportunity compared with their city counterparts. The plain fact is that the basic education needs of children of those of us who live in the country is the last thing that enters the mind of these bureaucratic clones, jostling for positions of power, in air-conditioned offices in Adelaide. This is in addition to having a Minister who has no interest in exercising his managerial function and who allows his department to lurch from disaster to disaster. The morale generally of both staff and parents has never been worse. This has been shown up recently in the deteriorating enrolments in Government schools.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. Members of the House may not like what the speaker is saying, but it is his or her right to say it, and therefore I think every speaker in this House should have the protection of the Chair and I ask that he be heard in silence. The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you Mr Deputy Speaker. I will provide to the House some figures to back up what I am saying. In South Australia, enrolments in Government schools fell this year by some 1.9 per cent, to 192 000. The figure for non-Government schools rose by 3 per cent, to 52 800. Australia wide, in the 10 year period from 1976 to 1986, Government schools enrolments fell by some 5 per cent, while enrolments for non-Government schools rose by 27 per cent. It is significant that the fall in Government school enrolments in this State is double the national average. Of course, we, the disadvantaged in the country, do not have the same access to non-Government education as our city counterparts do, and even if we did have that access many of us could not afford to take advantage of it.

I think country people have the right to ask for a basic education for their children. One should rightfully expect one's children not to be disadvantaged, but until we can convince the Minister and the department of this I do not think we will see a lessening of the resentment felt towards the Minister and the department by people who live outside the metropolitan area. We realise that cuts in education have to be made but, unfortunately, the cuts are always made at the coal face and not at the pit head. I shall give the House some crazy examples, which have cost the taxpayer dearly and which have cost country people dearly.

Regionalisation—being the latest catchword—was recently introduced in the Education Department. The Education Department office at Mount Gambier was shifted to Murray Bridge. All that did was to make it harder for the majority of parents in the South-East to contact the Director. We were told that this regionalisation—and rationalisation—would save the taxpayer $1.5 million, but so far it has cost $5 million to $6 million, and so schools in the outer metropolitan area and in the country have been asked to cut their programs. I think it is a scandalous waste of taxpayers' money. Regionalisation is a catchcry of this Government. It has not worked in the health field, for example. It will not do one thing in relation to children receiving a better education in country areas.

In 1986, the Jubilee 150 year, the Education Department was involved in a youth music festival, budgeted to cost $260 000, although final expenditure to date, we are told, is in excess of $1 million. I know that many schools in my electorate would much rather have had music teachers available, either shared or individually allotted to a school, than for the State to lose that amount of money on a function that none of them had the opportunity to see or attend.

This year the education budget was cut by $10 million, and some 230 teaching positions were lost. This of course was mainly due to falling enrolments in the metropolitan area. But we have 10 Directors of Education who each

receive between $50 000 and $70 000 per annum. On top of that, it has been found necessary to appoint a public relations officer, at a salary of $35 000, to help sell education and the Education Department to the community. Some examples of positions that have been abolished include the Chief Speech Pathologist, the Chief Social Worker, and the Chief Guidance Officer. Surely, these are warped priorities. Country schools desperately need more resources in special education. They do not need more resources for public relations.

Many members will have noted from reports in the newspapers that the program for the South Australian Primary Schools Amateur Sports Association (SAPSASA) was to be cut. If ever a program was beneficial to country children it was this competition. In many cases it is the only chance for country children to mix with their city counterparts, and in many cases it is their only chance to play in a superior competition which must improve their skills. We have been told to beware in 1987 because it has already been mooted that this program is to face severe cuts. All this will do will be to further disadvantage those children who live in country areas.

Last year the Correspondence School, in preparing new school assessed subjects, had to spend an estimated $65 000 to print, publish, prepare and distribute texts of course material. By December last year, $26 000 had been spent and the whole program had come to a halt. It took a lot of effort and questions in this House, as well as questions to the Minister in committees, to put before him the farcical situation that we were in, that there was a scenario that when the school term started this year those courses would not be printed. The people affected were, of course, about 200 students who live in country areas and who go to area schools that do not teach year 12. Although those courses have been printed, the money is still not forthcoming from the Education Department to pay for them.

I want to refer to one other matter that is a great disappointment to us in the country, and I refer to the postponing of the building of a TAFE college at Millicent. We have been fighting for this facility in the town for 10 years and in each of the last four years we have been promised that it would be built. Last year a date of commencement was even set, and that was to be 15 January 1987. That was confirmed in a letter that I have from the Minister of Housing and Construction.

Alas, a cheap political decision has been made. Because of the delay in the starting date, some four years ago, the inflation in the cost of building that TAFE college has now risen from below $2 million to above $2 million, and one of the excuses used is that it now has to go to the Public Works Standing Committee. Yesterday we heard the Minister of Employment and Further Education announce that $700 000—$700 000, I might add, which he said has just gone through Cabinet very quickly—is to be spent on a hotel for a few barmen—

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: And a creche for children, I will admit. That was a snap decision. For 10 years the people in the Millicent township have been neglected, and for the last four years the college has been promised. Potential TAFE students in the district are being further disadvantaged because, I guess, the political mileage in it is nowhere as great as in purchasing a hotel for training in the hotel trade. I think it is a very cheap political exercise by the Minister, and I think it just shows how much he thumbs his nose at country people in general.

Education in this State is in a shambles; country people are disadvantaged, and unless we can get a basic education for our country students we will fall further and further behind. In this coming 12 months we will attempt to get deputation after deputation to the Minister, to see whether we can get through to him the fact that we are disadvantaged, we should get an equal go, and it should be recognised that distance does mean that it is more difficult to get our children into school. I would go on at length with the problems we have with school buses, but time will not permit. I can assure those opposite that we will be grieving on that at the first opportunity.

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

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): This afternoon I wish to raise a matter which has caused me and a number of other people throughout the community a good deal of concern. I certainly would ask for everyone to take this matter most seriously. On 1 May last year I was approached by a young gentleman who informed me that he and five of his friends had been sold a package of insurance policies by an agent representing a leading insurance company. The insurance package was known as a 'Bahama package' and consisted of five different schemes rolled into one, apparently on the initiative of the commission agent concerned.

According to the young man, the purchasers of the Bahama package, which cost $130 a month, were promised yearly bonuses and a major pay-out every five years until retirement, at which point a large pay-out was promised. In addition, the agent offered to sell the young people concerned a 'disability income insurance scheme' which would pay $1 000 per month on the production of a doctor's certificate. The cost of this package was to be $35 a month and the agent said that each consumer 'could pay two premiums and then put in a claim'. She also said that she knew a 'helpful doctor' who would assist people to lodge claims against the company.

Following some inquiries, one of the clients was able to establish that money had not been paid directly to the company but had been paid into a provisional account. The agent concerned had also managed to ensure that any correspondence from the company to the clients was sent to her own address and not delivered to the clients. Further inquiries revealed that she had changed employment details on the various application forms to exaggerate the earning capacity of the clients in order to make the policies acceptable to the company. The agent also sold house insurance to one of the young people concerned, and later changed the value on the cover note from $30 000 to $15 000 for the house contents.

She also misinformed the client concerning the expiry date of the cover note, and arranged for the company to send the 'customer copy' of the cover note to her and not to the client concerned, so that the discrepancy was not discovered until the cover note had expired. When one client tried to claim on this so-called Bahama package the insurance company concerned refused to pay up on the grounds, quite reasonably, that details on the proposal had been falsified and that the company would not have accepted the policy had the true details been known.

There is at least some suggestion, I must concede, that the client was aware of an attempt to defraud both himself and the insurance company, because he had wittingly left blank several sections of the proposal form. These were presumably filled in by the agent at a later date. Several days later, a second client of the same commission agent came to see me with a similar story. He had also purchased a Bahama package under similar circumstances and had been to see the insurance company concerned.

On 23 June last year a third client came to see me with a similar story. She had paid $6 000 to the commission agent and had been told that the agent had sold $65 000 worth of Bahama packages up to that point in time. In each case the clients were aware of their omissions in not ensuring that the application forms had been fully and accurately completed and, in the event, each client was prepared to accept some of the liability. The insurance company concerned negotiated with each client separately and, as I understand it, was prepared to refund all the premiums paid and to make good any interest forgone on the money paid as premiums.

The company made it clear to each of the clients that it was under no legal obligation to refund their premiums as a result of the irregularities arising from the incomplete proposal forms. The company made it clear that it took this action solely as a means of avoiding unfavourable publicity concerning the clearly dishonest tactics which had been employed by the agent. It is not a coincidence that the six young people who purchased the Bahama package and others from the commission agent, like the agent herself, were members of Adelaide's gay community. All of them told me that they had made approaches to the commission agent and that they had been warned off by threats of violence directed against them.

It appears that the agent had a companion, a female police officer, who was not averse to enforcing silence by violent means. The commission agent's 'minder' also threatened to ensure that the clients would be subjected to harassment by the Drug Squad if they did not drop their claims against the agent and the company. The most odious aspect of the whole affair is that the commission agent was able to use the traditional code of silence observed by the gay community to exploit fellow members of that community and that, when threatened with exposure, she was prepared to threaten violence against people to whom violence is largely an anathema.

Despite my best efforts to obtain affidavits or statutory declarations concerning the behaviour of the commission agent, I was unable to persuade any of the young people concerned to make any formal declaration concerning the agent. Happily, I am told that the company quickly dispensed with the services of the agent on learning of her activities, and I am led to believe that the agent made immediate plans to leave for overseas following her dismissal.

The only fact that I have been able to ascertain about the whole affair with any certainty is the name of the agent. If the appropriate authorities wish to follow this up, I am quite prepared to make that available. I would be most distressed to think that a sequence of events such as these could be repeated, using the reputable name of the insurance company concerned (or, indeed, any other company) as a cover. It appears clear that the insurance industry as a whole, and the company in particular, will need to look very carefully at prospective agents before allowing them to sell on commission, and I would hope that this lesson has been well learned by that company.

It appears to me, as an outsider to the industry, that the industry will need to look at a number of things. It will need to look at screening its commission agents more regularly and thoroughly to ensure that bogus schemes of this nature are not cooked up by the more enterprising members of the fraternity. It seems to me that the insurance industry will also need to introduce operating procedures which do not allow commission agents to act as intermediaries between a company and the clients; in particular, it should not allow its agents to hold money, and it most certainly should not allow its agents to handle correspondence and act as a forwarding address for the clients' mail.

It seems that this situation that I have described places the agent in a position of inordinate power over both the company and the clients. It enables the agent to hold the company and the clients to ransom, and facilitates corruption of the kind I have described. I would certainly hope that the insurance industry in this city—and, indeed, in Australia—takes remedial measures in the shortest possible time to ensure that that particular rip-off is not perpetrated again on insurance buyers and members of the general public.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I will raise three subjects during this grievance debate. The first relates to stamp duty paid on the sale of motor vehicles. As honourable members know, when one buys a motor vehicle one pays stamp duty on it. As that vehicle depreciates over the years, its value drops to the extent that, when it is traded in, one gets a certain amount for it. One then buys a new vehicle and the amount of the trade-in is taken off its price and stamp duty is assessed. The unfair thing about this whole formula that is used by the stamp tax office is illustrated by the example that I will now give.

A constituent of mine purchased a Mitsubishi Sigma which had been advertised on the lot at $9 990. The dealer offered him $2 000 for the vehicle that he traded in. It must be borne in mind that the vehicle that he traded had had that full stamp duty paid on it when purchased. The $2 000 trade-in was deducted from the $9 990 cost of the new vehicle, so he paid out $7 990 and was happy with the deal. A long time later he received an account from the State Taxation Office for a further $80, on the basis that the purchase price was $9 990. I make the point that the State Taxation Office is double dipping. It had already collected tax on the original price of the first vehicle, which had slowly depreciated. However, when the man bought the new vehicle, which was reduced by the $2 000 trade-in value, he was charged stamp duty not on the amount of $7 990 that he paid out but on the advertised price of $9 990—a clear case of double dipping which is wrong and immoral.

I call on the Government to reverse this policy decision, which is purely a revenue raising measure. I am quite sure that the Treasurer is aware of this anomaly which exists with this tax and exploits and uses it as another way of raising tax revenue. It is wrong, and I call on the Government to ensure that this anomaly is corrected in the next budget so that the public know when they buy a vehicle that the actual amount that they sign their cheque for is the amount that the State Taxation Office will use for the purposes of charging stamp duty.

I turn now to the establishment fee that is imposed if registrations expire before they are renewed. I have heard arguments from the department about the need to charge a $10 establishment fee on expired registrations when they are renewed. This is tied to the cost to the department in relation to the computer and staff work involved in reregistering a vehicle on which registration has expired. I believe that a new system could be devised to avoid this establishment fee.

There are retired people in the community who have caravans and boats that they use for less than six months of the year. I refer, for example, to a boat trailer. It is seldom that such a trailer would be used other than during the months of November and December or between March and April. Thereafter, the trailer goes into the shed and is not used for some time. At present, if a member of the public wants to register such a vehicle he is forced to register

it for 12 months because, if he lets the registration lapse, he must pay a $10 establishment fee when the vehicle is reregistered. I propose that the Government consider, particularly in relation to retired people who use their caravans only occasionally and do not have the capacity to pay a 12-month registration fee, a three-year seasonal disc which can be used for boats and caravans. Therefore, if a vehicle is used only occasionally that three-year, or five-year, seasonal disc will allow those involved to use that trailer or caravan at certain times of the year.

The Government cannot tell me that someone in the department could not sit down and work out some sort of costing to allow people to have a seasonal disc that will allow a boat or caravan owner to use that vehicle for only six months of the year. That person would pay an amount to cover registration for the next three or five years and would know that the vehicle was covered for use during certain times of the year and that, if they used it outside those times that were recorded on the computer, they would incur the wrath of the law. However, if they stick to the dates on the disc, once every three or five years they would take out a new registration, obtain a seasonal disc and would then be able to use their vehicle according to the dates shown on that registration disc.

The next matter that I raise relates to the policy of the Department of Tourism regarding contacting flat owners around the State to handle bookings on their behalf. As honourable members know, many blocks of flats and holiday units are scattered throughout the metropolitan area and along the beaches which rely on business channelled to them by private booking agents or by the Government Travel Centre. Evidence has been presented to me that on many occasions the Government Travel Centre does not canvass all the travel industry when channelling bookings. Indeed, I have an example of an operation in the western suburbs close to Glenelg which has been in business for seven or eight years, during which time it has not had any bookings channelled to it from the South Australian Travel Centre.

It is my intention to write to the Director of the Travel Centre asking why this company has not received any bookings from the centre. I have been assured that it has not heard from the Travel Centre for three years. How the owners of a block of units on the beachfront who had not been approached by the Travel Centre for three years could then be offered bookings, I do not know. One wonders whether the Travel Centre is channelling bookings to certain sections of the accommodation industry and not being free-ranging, as it has a responsibility to be.

I turn now to a matter that I raised during Question Time last week regarding cuts in overtime for members of the E&WS Department who have been instructed not to commence work after 3 p.m. if they cannot complete it by 4.30 p.m. This means that emergency work will not be done and that residents and ratepayers in the suburbs, if there is a break in a service after 3 p.m., will be without water until the following morning. I call on the Minister who promised me an early reply to my question last week to expedite that reply so that the public knows where it stands on this matter of emergency resupply of water to properties after hours.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Last evening in this House I referred to my concern about the time being taken by Ministers to reply to correspondence. I did not then have the opportunity to be specific or to indicate the actual time taken to reply to some pieces of correspondence, so I shall refer to a couple of them now. One of them, which is referred to in today's edition of the Hills *Messenger*, relates to the Upper Sturt Primary School, which is in my district. I have made several representations on behalf of this school concerning much needed upgrading.

Indeed, I have made representations to the Minister of Education concerning three schools: Upper Sturt Primary School, Heathfield Primary School, and Mylor Primary School. I am happy to say that it seems that we are getting somewhere as regards the Mylor school and that, as a result of a visit to the school by the Minister and suggestions that he has made, certain work required may be carried out under the minor works plan. However, in regard to the other two schools, I took the opportunity last year to write to the Minister. Indeed, I first wrote to him about problems at the Upper Sturt school in October. On a visit to the school, I was given a copy of the submission that had been sent to the department, and I took the opportunity to inspect the conditions, about which there is much concern and many of which are referred to on the front page of the Hills *Messenger*.

The situation is disturbing. It seems incredible that on a matter of such concern, which has now been highlighted through the media, the responsible Minister should not have replied. I have sent the Minister a further letter asking why I have not received a reply and why we are not being told what stage the upgrading of the school has reached. I have also visited senior departmental officers and discussed the matter with them. It is a great pity that the Chairman of the school council and the principal must go to such lengths and approach the media in an attempt to have something done.

I hope that, as a result of this request to the Minister yet again through the Parliament, and as a result of the points made through the media today, some action will be taken. Members opposite will probably refer to the shortage of funds for such activities but, when they consider some of the work that is being carried out in other areas of the State and the unacceptable conditions under which students attend and teachers teach at a school such as Upper Sturt, I am sure that all members would support action being taken.

This involves not just the Upper Sturt Primary School; the Heathfield Primary School is in a similar predicament. Again, I had the opportunity last year of visiting the school. On receiving correspondence from the Chairman of the school council, I forwarded it, along with my own letter seeking support, to the Minister of Education. Again, that correspondence went last year and, other than an acknowledgment, no information has come back as to the present stage of the negotiations or arrangements that may be made to effect an improvement or upgrading of that school.

Both schools, which are fairly close to each other, are in areas of high rainfall and both require new classrooms or at least a major upgrading of the existing classrooms, along with many other improvements that I have listed previously in this House. I only refer to this matter again today in the hope that the Minister will recognise its urgency and do something about it, and at least reply to the letters that were forwarded to him a long time ago. Another matter on which there has been a lack of response concerns the Crafers Tennis Club.

Mr Tyler: Funds may be short.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is all very well for the Government to bleat about the lack of funds, and I certainly understand that. However, if members had a chance to read the letter that I wrote to the Premier back in the early part of November, they would recognise that attempts have been made since 1969 to have something done about this club and its need for facilities. In fact, this matter goes back to when the South-Eastern Freeway was first started and went

right through the centre of Crafers township. At that time tennis courts were located there for the use of the community. Now one remains, but the others were removed as a result of the redevelopment of the town.

No compensation has been received by the town or the community to enable these facilities to be provided again. I listed in great detail all the approaches that had been made and provided a detailed list of the various aspects of the negotiations that had been conducted over a long period of time, indeed since 1969, in an attempt to have this problem solved. Again, other than an acknowledgment, I have not received a reply from the Premier or from any other Minister which would suggest that this matter is being dealt with. So, I again bring it to the notice of the House and express my grave concern that once more we have an example of correspondence just not being replied to.

In this House yesterday I gave notice that I would move a motion regarding the lack of service provided on the Bridgewater to Belair railway line and, since then, we have learnt that the State Transport Authority is to recommend to the Minister, if it has not done so already, that that line be closed. I would oppose such a move strongly indeed. I do not intend to speak on that subject at this stage, because I shall have the opportunity to do so in the House in a couple of weeks time when I move my motion. However, if action is taken to close that line between now and when I have that opportunity, enormous concern will be expressed by those who use it and who support its retention and upgrading.

If the Minister spent more time having the service upgraded and encouraging people to use it, there would be less need even to consider the possibility of closing the line. I certainly do not support the intention of the STA in putting that proposition to the Minister, and I hope that he is strong enough, and that indeed the Government is strong enough, to reject that proposition and retain the service for commuters and tourists to enjoy.

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I know that there has been some concern about the future of the film industry in Australia. In its recent annual report the Australian Film Commission painted a rather bleak future and prophesied a reduction in investment. It pointed out also that, in 1984-85, 24 mini-series were produced but in 1985-86 that number was reduced to five. Also, it pointed out that the number of telemovies was reduced from 20 to 12 during the same period. Nevertheless, as noted in the annual report, there has been an increase in feature films from 31 in 1985 to 36 in 1986.

It is well known that in 1980 the then Federal Government amended section 10BA of the Income Tax Assessment Act and effectively made film investment a taxation haven. Initially, an investor would receive a 150 per cent deduction on his investment and tax was waived on the first 50 per cent of the film's return to investors. There is no doubt that that was a substantial incentive to the film industry in Australia as well as to the people who invested in it. The 150 per cent tax deduction and the waiving of tax on the first 50 per cent of the film's return was reduced to 133 per cent and 33 per cent respectively, and in September 1985 it was reduced to 120 per cent and 20 per cent respectively of the film's return.

The changes that took place as a consequence of the September 1985 budget mean that, after July 1987, when one takes into account the reduction in the marginal tax rate, the cost of each $100 invested by an investor will be $40 and a 60 per cent return will be needed to cover that cost, because only the first 20 per cent can be received tax free. In the past a film generally has had only about a 10 to 20 per cent return. Before September 1985, for each $100 invested the net cost was about $18.87 to the investor and that $18.87 was below the 33 per cent which was then applicable before September 1985, and was tax exempt.

It is in this setting that the Australian Film Commission predicted a rather bleak future for the film industry in Australia; in other words, if there is to be any blame, it laid the blame at the reduction in Federal Government tax incentives. I recall that, when the reduction from 150 per cent to 133 per cent took place, people in the film industry prophesied a catastrophic time, but that did not result. I think that I can confidently predict that, with the reduction to 120 per cent, it will not occur. There is no doubt that there is some substance in the suggestion that there may be some reduction in investment in the film industry as a consequence of a reduction in tax incentives, but the tax incentives really amount to a very significant public subsidy for the film industry and progressively, like any other industry in Australia, the film industry eventually needs to reach a stage of self-sufficiency. Despite all the rather bleak forecasts in the Australian Film Commission's annual report, the fact is that the film industry is here to stay; it will continue to be viable, and it will continue to produce films of a very high quality.

Mr Lewis: You need another one like *Alligator Al.*

Mr GROOM: I do not know what types of film the honourable member produces in his electorate, but the fact is that films of a very high quality will continue to be produced, notwithstanding some downturn in overall investments. Large amounts of money do not have to be spent to produce good films.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: *Crocodile Dundee* is a film which cost a lot of money to make and in its first 14 weeks it grossed about $25 million. The film *Malcolm*, which was a very low budget film produced at a cost of $1 million, has been extraordinarily successful, so the overall grosses in terms of investment are not the determinant. South Australia needs to produce high quality films and these can be done on a relatively low budget. I dare say that the industry, because it is producing very high quality films, will be able to structurally adjust to the alteration in tax deductions.

Financial institutions, including leading banks, have moved strongly to secure a position in the film industry and the extent of that confidence is reflected in their preparedness to enter into underwriting agreements to guarantee that the money invested will be secure, because in earlier times a film would not return more than 10 or 20 per cent. Investors now have a greater amount of security. Usually, they now insist on a pre-sales agreement; that is, before they invest, the film must have pre-sales agreements of up to 70 per cent of its budget. Once a film producer has a pre-sales agreement, which might be from the ABC for television or it might be from J.C. Williamson's for overseas distribution, the investor is guaranteed of getting his money back, and various public companies, particularly in the Eastern States, issue a prospectus for investor finance. If $3 million or more is to be invested in a film, a prospectus must be issued by the public company, but if the investment is less than $3 million, a much more simplified prospectus, called an offer document, is required.

There are then various underwriting agreements. The insurance industry steps in to guarantee any shortfall in investors' funds. Because not all film budget costs are tax deductible, usually there is a requirement for a non-deductible loan agreement; in other words, Governments step in.

That might involve the Australian Film Commission or it might involve the South Australian Government (I know that the latter has done this) and, through these non-deductible loan agreements, there are Government grants for the film industry. The investors know that they have a pre-sales agreement and the first amounts of money received from pre-sales are then repaid to the investors and the balance may be made up by video cassettes or other overseas sales.

Also, the insurance industry steps in and provides a completion guarantee insurance; in other words, if there is some shortfall in funds and the producer cannot raise sufficient money, the insurance industry underwriter steps in. The involvement of Australia's major financial institutions reflects the confidence in this industry. One has only to look at the success of the South Australian Film Corporation in this regard, and I am sure that the member for Albert Park is well aware of this. I know that in his electorate he strongly supports the South Australian Film Corporation which has produced films of exceptionally high quality.

Some objections have been raised to the continuation of tax concessions in the industry, but at present, in my view, the investment by way of tax concessions will continue to be the most appropriate form of film industry fund raising. The Australian Film Commission is involved in lobbying to remove the dependence on private investors by establishing a film bank with money guaranteed by Government bonds. That bank would then lend funds to producers. I do not think that that is the best solution, because the Australian Film Commission will exercise a great degree of control over the industry and it may lead to an ultimate exclusion of the initiatives and entrepreneurial skills needed in the film industry. The fact is that, if the Australian Film Commission controls the whole distribution process, I think there may be a gradual aggregation of bureaucratic control which might be to the long-term detriment of the film industry. Certainly, in the immediate and foreseeable future tax concessions will continue to be the most appropriate form of funding.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): There are a number of matters to which I wish to draw attention in this debate. However, because of the peculiar changes that have been made to the way in which members can bring their grievances before the House, I cannot do that in any particular sense. I note that there is one Bill on the Notice Paper which will further truncate the opportunity that members have to air their grievances in relation to the effect of Government policies in their electorates.

I will therefore address the matter generally and draw attention to the parlous state of the economy, particularly the small business sector in the rural community, if indeed not the entire economy. The remarks I wish to make are relevant to small businesses everywhere, both in the metropolitan area as well as rural areas.

There is now a heavy burden of regulation and cost on small businesses to the extent that their viability is fast disappearing, if it has not already disappeared. Many small businesses, particularly farmers, are living on increased borrowings against fictional values determined by banks and other lending institutions at a time when land prices hit an all time high in October 1984. There is no question that those prices followed through into 1985 but right now they are in a trough and I suspect that, if forced sales were to be made by the mortgagees around rural South Australia, we would find that land values have not just fallen by 20, 35 or 40 per cent, as cited by valuers at present, but that they have fallen through the floor. I know of a number of instances where farmers have attempted to voluntarily liquidate their holdings to pay out their debts and find another means of deriving a better income (even the dole) and there has been no bid or offer on the property for sale, whether it be offered by auction or private sale. The simple fact is that nobody wants these properties.

The most significant reason for this is the Federal Government's dishonest float of the Australian dollar using the interest rates paid to corporate investors and lenders from outside Australia to the Federal Government to attract funds to meet the balance of payments deficit that is arising, or involving other corporate borrowers who are meeting their internal debts through takeovers. However, the most significant and important contributing factor associated with these high interest rates is State and Federal Government borrowings and borrowings from other Government instrumentalities, including local government, which the Labor Party, both State and Federal, has been foolishly encouraging recently.

Therefore, the cost of borrowing money is the main reason for the destruction of the viability of existing industries and the reason why there is a profound reluctance on the part of any entrepreneur to go into business. It is not only the cost of borrowing money to finance the venture but also the cost of up-front Government charges which are unavoidable. You have to have the money in hand to pay those charges to get permits, licences and plans approved by the myriad of Government departments and instrumentalities that require the submission of plans before they will agree to issue those permits and licences. How foolish and stupid! If we are really trying to reduce unemployment, what we must do is ensure that entrepreneurs are given the incentive, opportunity and encouragement to go into business ventures which will generate one, two, three or more jobs in the short term and probably more in the long term, because once you establish confidence in the minds of those entrepreneurs other people will follow suit.

Therefore, there needs to be a complete turnaround in Government policy at both State and Federal levels to defer the application of those charges and other stiff imposts and give faster approval to businesses where they fit into the general broad guidelines which ought to be drawn up by Government instrumentalities, each in consultation with the other, to enable these businesses to get going. After they have been in operation for 12 months or until they are so profitable as to be a saleable business in the hands of the developer, the entrepreneurial interests can then pay the stamp duty.

Moreover, we need to look at the cost of compulsory award wages which must be paid from the capital that has been set aside to get the business under way. Obviously, to apply award wages in these circumstances is ridiculous. There are plenty of unemployed people who would welcome the opportunity of not only working for a retainer but also for a share of the profits, but are forbidden from doing so by the excessive regulations of this quaint industrial relations system we have in the labour market in this country. It is not permissible for entrepreneurs to obtain labour at a negotiated price or to make a certain arrangement with the unemployed person, who has nothing but his labour to sell, in an effort to develop that business.

In addition, there are the rules and regulations that are required—not just the cost of obtaining them but the trouble that one has to go to. It can take up to 4½ years to get a project approved by Government departments before even a peg can be put in the ground for the layout of a building.

I have personal first-hand knowledge of a case where that has occurred. It took one small business venture in tourism from 1981 until 1986 (nearly five years) to get all approval needed. I think it is not only regrettable but also ludicrous when I hear members of the Government in this House and in Canberra saying that they are doing everything possible to help small business.

Damn it! What they need to do is to give these people a go. Get off their backs! If you need to collect taxes and charges from such operations, do it after the business is established—do not require small businesses to find the capital up front to finance social welfare problems and other Mickey Mouse schemes implemented to win votes in marginal electorates. Lay off, or you will always have a welfare problem in this country the like of which we will be unable to address because it will degenerate into a crime wave. I am making that point now, because it is certainly going to happen with the current generation of people leaving education institutions, from secondary through to tertiary. It has already got its genesis there. I can see it coming.

I want to draw particular attention to the terrible way in which the State and Federal Governments (but particularly the State Government) have approached farmers. At present, valuations on farms put rates and taxes way above the real valuation of the land and the capacity of the farmer or rural business to meet those costs. They need to be revalued, and downwards, fast, so that people presently experiencing difficulties do not go broke just meeting those costs on capital which bear no relationship whatsoever to the productive income that it is possible to obtain at current world prices for their commodities.

This House must remember that farmers are price takers, not price makers. It is the world market that fixes the prices for the commodities that they sell. More importantly, the Department of Agriculture's Rural Assistance Branch needs to remember that it is not possible to simply say that if you are viable you do not need help, but if you are not viable then we will not help you anyway because you will go broke in any case. How stupid! Then the Government comes along with this inane proposition that it will give welfare handouts if the farmer goes broke. They put the ambulance at the bottom of the cliff but not the safety barricade at the top. How stupid!

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): The member for Murray-Mallee has referred to some rural issues that have been building up over recent years. I want to refer further to this matter and, more particularly, continue the remarks that I made last week about the crisis situation that is occurring at Port Neill. Although those comments were given considerable publicity, it is regrettable that that publicity did not occur some 12 months or even two years ago, when the crisis was starting to develop. However, the issue had only a little publicity at that time, and I am now finding pockets of farming communities, families and whole districts similarly affected.

Tonight I have to arrange a phone linkup in an endeavour to assist one group to prepare a submission to the Federal Government task force that is to tour Eyre Peninsula. Regrettably, a golden opportunity has been missed by the sitting Federal member for Grey: with good intent he intends to bring the rural task force to Eyre Peninsula with the idea of seeing some of the things that are going on. It will visit the fish factories, the councils and a number of other places but, regrettably, the task force will not spend very much time in talking to the people who are really affected, those who, given a reasonable opportunity, would be the backbone of getting this country on its feet again.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member can be jocular about probably the most serious issue that has confronted this State. It is certainly the most serious issue that has confronted it since I have been in politics. Many of my senior colleagues in the area that I represent who lived through the depression years say that we are getting to a similar situation. For all intents and purposes, we are facing, in many areas, a depression similar to that of the late 1930s. That is a situation that bothers me. I was not old enough to understand the implications of the Great Depression, but I hope that I am wise enough to seek the advice of those people who lived through that, to enable me to relate it to the circumstances that are developing at this time.

I believe that during the Great Depression where there were forced sales of land it was organised in the general community that when the auctioneer put up the land for bidding only one person would bid, and that person would bid with the idea of getting the original landholder back on the land. No-one else dare bid, even if they had money, or so on, to enable them to bid. I hope that we never see such dramatic and drastic circumstances again. However, I am told that we are getting dangerously close to that situation.

The number of forced sales occurring at present is not due to bad farming practices or because a bad decision was made in regard to grain *versus* stock or goats instead of sheep, or anything like that, but for the very reason of increased interest rates, which have been bolstered out of all proportion by a Government for its own selfish reasons. It has embarked on a social welfare program that it cannot now finance. The only way it can finance that is by bringing in money from overseas, and the only way it can get any overseas money into this country is to offer attractive interest rates, more attractive than those applicable in other parts of the world, thus providing an incentive for the money to flood in.

I did not see all the news service last night but I understand that the Prime Minister said words to the effect that the party was over, that we must tighten the belt, and that we have to make a $2 billion cut. Regrettably, that decision was not made two years ago. Had that occurred, we would be well on the road to recovery now instead of being in the present dire straits.

Mr Klunder interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member opposite talks about more assistance. I do not think anyone—

Mr Klunder interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I am going to ask the Government to sit down and work out ways and means to get productivity back in the community and to get interest rates down, to enable those people who are willing to get off their backsides and work, in many cases for nothing, and thus to promote a more favourable world balance of trade.

Mr Klunder: A couple of days ago you said that the State Government was not responsible for interest rates.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Interjections across the Chamber are out of order.

Mr BLACKER: The member for Todd said that a couple of days ago I said that the State Government was not responsible for interest rates: I did imply that the interest rate problem basically was Federal, but I also said that the Government has done nothing to convince its Federal Labor colleagues to do something about the matter. Government members have certainly not gone to the media and said, 'Look, we are trying to impress upon the Federal Treasurer or the Prime Minister that something must be done about

the matter.' The backbone of the South Australian economy is still rural.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I would like to know who the honourable member thinks my mates are, because I certainly do not have that sort of funding. I do not think the crisis situation that has arisen is anything to be jocular about. I have referred to problems associated with Port Neill, but other centres are experiencing trouble also, and I refer to Murdinga, Lock, Streaky Bay, Cleve, Kimba, and so on. I could go on and on—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: Whilst the honourable member says that other districts are involved, too, it may be that when the districts of other members are hit very hard those members will stand in this Chamber and make the same sort of speeches on behalf of people that they represent, as members who represent the rural areas are trying to do. It hits the rural areas first, and it will hit the metropolitan area next, perhaps next year, along the line.

Members interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: Members opposite seem to be carrying on, but I am pleased that they are starting to respond to the problem. Until the present time no real concern has been expressed. Apart from the financial side, another issue concerns the social implications to the community. I shall refer to one small example. The TAFE college at Port Lincoln is running a number of schemes across Eyre Peninsula, but in particular it is running a NOW (New Opportunities for Women) program. My constituent who has been responsible for organising the NOW program in the Cleve area placed advertisements in the paper seeking women wanting to undertake a NOW program course. I believe that the course takes 14 or 15 applicants: 45 applicants applied. In almost every instance the trauma that those women were facing in having to condition themselves to helping their menfolk get over the social and community welfare implications is something far beyond—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member says that it is not just in my district. I am pleased to hear members say that, not because I want that sort of pain inflicted on any community, but that because there must be a Government response to this.

Ms Lenehan: We want interest rates down, too.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Flinders is not making it any easier by responding.

Mr BLACKER: I do apologise if I became too heavily involved in the cross chatter. However, I do believe that I am starting to get the message across to some of my colleagues in this House that crisis situations are developing in the community. In trying to project to the future one asks, 'What is our future?' I do not know what it is. I know that many people will be forced off their farms. One chap who telephoned me last Sunday said that between his home and the railway siding, which is his main place of business and which is nine or 10 miles away, there were nine vacant homes. People have just gone. This is starting to hit the community. As I have said, the more senior people in my electorate tell me that this is building up to a depression type era. I had hoped that I would never see it in my lifetime, but it looks as though I will.

Mr S.G. Evans: What happens if we have a drought?

Mr BLACKER: I think that that would be a really telling point. If we get a drought, its severity will determine how many millions of dollars will not go into public circulation. Not only the farmers and machinery manufacturers and all the service agencies will be affected; it will virtually wipe out country towns. I know a reasonable sized country store that normally employs 11 or 12 people which is now down to three people—two of those part-time. That is the sort of crisis we are facing. Until such time as the Government can be seen to come to grips with that, can be seen to be imploring their Federal colleagues that there is a need to do it, get in there and lobby, and lobby very hard and be seen to be lobbying very hard, the situation cannot improve.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It has been pleasing to hear a few speakers from this side talk about the real issue confronting the State, namely, the rural crisis. The Government, at both State and at Federal levels, seems to be choosing to ignore the rural crisis. It seems to think that the country can get along without the rural sector, and its policies have shown that very clearly over the past two or three years. We can look at the fringe benefits tax as a classic case where the small person has been hit for six by a Government which supposedly represents the small people—hit for six from the point of view that so many workers received fringe benefits from their employers. The Government said, 'That is not on: someone's going to have to pay tax on those, and if the workers aren't paying it, we'll get the employers to pay the tax.' So, what has happened in most cases? The employers have said, 'Well, I'm sorry, but we're not going to be paying tax on fringe benefits to workers—they'll go.' And we are seeing the effects of that type of thing spread across the economy more and more.

We saw the effects of the fringe benefits tax on the motor car industry, I remember the debates in this House, when some of us screamed across at the Bannon Government to appeal to Canberra, and no action occurred for week after week. Finally, in a moment of weakness I suppose, we could say, the Premier took some small conciliatory action to Canberra to say, 'Look: our motor car industry will be ruined.'

I remember several debates here where figures were put forward by Mitsubishi and General Motors, and we were pooh-poohed by members on that side of the House, who said, 'Rubbish! It's scare tactics. It won't hit the motor car industry like that.' What is happening at present? The motor car industry is on its knees, and one only has to speak to any car dealer or any worker in General Motors-Holden's or Mitsubishi to find out how the car industry is—and it is disgraceful!

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: As the member for Davenport says, there are hardly any left, unfortunately. The member for Hartley comes out with, 'Tell us your policy, what are you going to do?' This Government has had four years to do things. The Federal Government has had nearly four years. In fact, I think it would be about four years, and they say, 'What would you do?' They cannot do anything: they are useless. They should not be in their positions. We know why the State Government is in its position: because of the untruthful tactics it employed at the last State election to get in. They knocked privatisation, but the minute they were in they said, 'We are going to privatise a few things now: STA for a start: Housing Trust as a second thing, to some extent, and now Amdel.' Untruths: despicable! If we had a proper system in this country they would be thrown out and people would have another chance and another election. In fact, they should not be given the chance, because the election is simply a hoodwink from this crowd, and that is praising them. Back to the issue—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Yes, I was halfway through what the policy is. The Federal Government has been going from side to

side, not knowing where to go. I remember the old days of consensus: now consensus is almost a dirty word. The Prime Minister came in and said, 'That will fix all our ills.' We can recall the times when the Prime Minister said that the summits were going to cure all ills, and what has happened since that time? We have gone from a position of relative strength down, down, down. How low can we go?

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Members opposite laugh at the economy: they laugh at the situation of this State, and they laugh at Australia. The time will come when they will not be laughing any more. In fact, the people of this State and this country are sick and tired of them. When our national debt has just gone up, up, up—it is screaming at everyone—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The member for Goyder will address his remarks to the Chair, and stop responding to interjections.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr MEIER: It is a pity that some of the Government members do not take notice of the Acting Speaker, but I am sure that they do not, perhaps, have sufficient intelligence, in some cases.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will return to the issue at hand.

Mr MEIER: The fringe benefits tax is such a negative tax and, as the latest edition of *Farmer and Stockowner* said:

> It seems the infamous FBT is here to stay—at least for the duration of the Labor Party's control of Federal Government.

My word! It will not be there a minute longer, once the Liberal Party gets into power in Canberra. But what else—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: We could talk about Joh and all that, too. Members opposite should look at the latest opinion polls and see the conservative forces are rallying behind the various people—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: You should have heard Prime Minister Hawke on radio this morning. He acknowledged that the 'Joh factor' had a significant bearing on the upsurge of conservative forces, so don't get carried away: you'll be—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will come to order. I have already asked him to address his remarks to the Chair. I will ask him to continue to do so, and not respond to interjections.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Besides the fringe benefits tax we have the capital gains tax, another iniquitous tax, which certainly takes away incentive, perhaps not so much from the ordinary worker whom the fringe benefits tax has hit so hard, but from the person who wants to establish a small business or get on and see if he or she can improve his or her position in life. This tax says, 'You try to be successful in this world, and we'll tax you out of existence.' That, again, is particularly affecting not only small businesses but the farmers who, of course, are small businesses.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: The farmers are not now being given any incentive to build up their properties, to try to establish themselves in a situation where they have taken their properties from, perhaps, being run down to being in a booming condition. What is the use of working hard and building it up when you will be taxed through the capital gains tax? And does the Hawke Government make any apology? No apology at all. They keep sticking it in. They want to ruin the rural economy, and I think that people have absolutely had enough. Going on from that, we could talk about interest rates, and interest rates are hitting every single person. What does Mr Kerin, the Minister for Primary Industry, say?

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Mr Acting Speaker, I will ignore the interjections.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I would ask the members of the Government back bench to listen to the member for Goyder in silence.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker—they could learn something. But if they keep up with the rabble, of course, they will lie in the dormant state in which they have been for so long. The Minister for Primary Industry indicated that an immediate reduction in interest rates would only lead to worsened conditions in the rural sector. He said this at the end of January of this year. That is the attitude of the Hawke Government: keep interest rates up; do not let them go down, it will ruin the economy.

Good grief! Does he not realise that this economy has thrived on low interest rates in previous years; that the interest rates are perhaps doing more than anything else? We have an inane Federal Minister with that sort of policy. No wonder this Government—Federal, of course, aided and abetted by the State Government—is not getting anywhere. No wonder we cannot solve our problems.

Mr Oswald: Before Whitlam it was 4 per cent.

Mr MEIER: Yes, it was 4 per cent before Whitlam, and what happened during Whitlam's time? The dollar should be allowed to drop to find its natural level. Many people to whom I have spoken in the business sector say that if it was let fall it would drop to about 55c; then we could start exporting, and it would slowly build up. However, the Reserve Bank refuses to let it fall that far, yet a forecast a month ago said that it is highly likely that it will drop to 55c, anyway. The Government is going around in a circle: it is a catch 22 situation and the sooner an election is held the better.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome this opportunity to debunk some of the inane statements that have been made by the Opposition. Obviously, they do not listen and are blinkered in their approach to what is happening in this country. Obviously, members opposite have been too damned lazy to read the statements which I made in this House last night and which were well researched. I will advise them of some of the statements. Most of the criticisms that have been made by the Opposition have been directed at the Government and at the working class in this country, but not once during the contributions made by members opposite since I came into this Chamber at about 10 past five have I heard mention of management: not once have they raised the subject of management in this country!

I will give the Opposition a lesson on what has taken place in this country. General Motors-Holden's had to be propped up last year with a grant of $500 million from the parent company in the United States; that is not small bickies, but big brass! Who is responsible? Is it the working class that slave their guts out on production lines with outmoded pieces of equipment? Indeed it is not! Is it industrial disputation that is causing the problem in this country? Indeed it is not, because industrial disputation is the lowest that it has been for many years.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I remind the mouth from across the way of the statement made in a *Four Corners* program in December of last year. I regret that one has to tone him down by making the sort of statement that I just made. I will read from the *Four Corners* transcript of last year because it is rather interesting. John Sprouster is General Manager of Nashua. I think most people in this place know that Nashua is one of the biggest companies in the world, and its aim is to catapult Australian management into the twentieth century. Sprouster has said that 85 per cent of all the problems in a business can be directed to senior management, yet not once, as I said previously, have we heard any contribution from members opposite relating to the need to review managerial decisions in this State or in this country—not once!

The article from which I quoted last night, and which I will repeat in part, for the edification of members opposite, stated that GMH's main problems can be sheeted straight home to management dumping a popular model like the Kingswood and backing a series of vehicles that people just did not want to buy. They made the wrong decision: they were responsible! Now they want to foist the problem back home on the working class, and on those people who work their butts off on the shop floor and in factories in and around this country.

It is about time there was a little bit of straight thinking on the part of members opposite. The trade union movement, as I have said repeatedly in this House, is not without faults. I know that, as I served in the trade union movement. However, the business people also have problems. Let it be known in places such as this Parliament that they are equally responsible for many of the problems that we have in this country.

I turn now to the subject of bankruptcies, about which the Opposition has said a great deal recently while blaming the Government of the day for them. Let us do a little research as to the reasons why we have bankruptcies in this country and where some of the major areas of bankruptcy are. The Opposition is keen to quote figures about bankruptcies in South Australia. I share the Opposition's concern about bankruptcies, because they are a disaster for people, many of whom have invested their life savings and have worked hard to build up a business but who, for a whole range of reasons, not all of which (as the Opposition would like us to believe) can be foisted on the Government of the day, have become bankrupt. I will give some of the reasons for bankruptcies.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: If after my contribution the member would like to come over here I will be happy to show him my well researched speech, but he will not deter me from what I am saying now. The causes of bankruptcy are as follows: lack of sufficient intial working capital; lack of business ability, accumen, training or experience resulting in such matters as underquoting and mistakes in estimating; lack of supervision and failure to assess potential in business or to detect misrepresentation; failure to keep proper books of account and costing records; economic conditions affecting industry, including competititon and price cutting; credit restrictions; falling prices; increases in charges and other overhead expenses; the high cost of repairs and maintenance of equipment; and changes in the character of business locations, many of which I would like to discuss. However, time does not permit me to do so.

I refer also to seasonal conditions including floods and droughts; excesive interest payments on hire-purchase and loan moneys and capital loan losses on repayments; inability to collect debts due to disputes, faulty work or bad debts; excessive drawings including failure to provide for taxation, either personal or wage tax deductions; gambling or speculation; personal reasons, including ill-health of self or dependants, domestic discord and other personal records; excessive use of credit facilities including pressure selling, losses and repossession. All these factors cause many of the bankruptcies that we have here in this country. Lack of sufficient capital is one of the reasons involved, as many of us on this side of the House are well aware.

Recognition should be given to this Government for setting up the South Australian Small Business Corporation. Members on both sides of this Chamber have sent prospective and existing business people to this body to try to assist them in running their business. I do not accept the views that have been put forward by Opposition members that all problems can be sheeted home to this Government. Of course they cannot be!

I return to the transcript of the 8 December 1986 *Four Corners* program, on which it was said that Australian managers could afford to be smug about their British counterparts were it not for their own poor performance. A highly respected Swiss survey of 28 countries rated Australia twenty-third on managerial talent, well behind countries like Turkey, India and Mexico. Management has a lot to answer for in this country. It makes decisions—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: You go back and look after your quarry—you will have your contribution later on. Management does have a lot to answer for in this country. I am sick and tired of people, like those silvertails opposite, who try to blame the workers of this country, who, given the opportunity, will work closely with management to try to increase productivity. They want to secure their jobs and to take money home to look after their wife and children, to educate them and to provide them with an opportunity later in their life. I do not accept the Opposition's decision.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): During Question Time this afternoon the Minister of Agriculture took it upon himself to rebuke the member for Bragg and me for attending a meeting last Thursday night which was held at the Enfield community complex. The Minister is so super-sensitive, is so naive and has so alienated every group with which he has become involved that he now wants to chastise the member for Bragg and me for having the audacity to attend a public meeting. It is interesting to note that the Mayor did not read out the Minister's apology for not attending, and the Minister would know why that was the case.

The Minister has not told the people of this State where the money will come from to pay for this exercise; nor has he stated the real timeframe. I do not mind being criticised, but I will not accept criticism from someone who has acted as irresponsibly as has the present Minister of Agriculture. During my time as a member of Parliament (and that is nearly 17 years), I have received briefings on a regular basis from a cross-section of Government departments, and I appreciate that. It is only under the administration of this Minister that a political officer has had to be sent along to ensure that the officers concerned do not let the cat out of the bag. The Minister is super-sensitive and I believe that he is damn naive and has been very foolish.

I suggest that, when the Minister administers a portfolio involving the rural industry, which is facing difficulties in this State and the nation, he should have better things to do with his time than act in such a juvenile and foolish fashion. He will be able to stand up proudly when he has

received the money from his Federal colleagues to construct the plan that was displayed.

Another reason for my attendance at that meeting was that I have the responsibility for agriculture in the Opposition. In relation to this matter we are dealing with the Samcor paddocks, with which agriculture has been involved for a long time. I was rather interested to know what one of these large sporting complexes was to be like, who was to fund it and the proposed timeframe for it. My constituents, and many other people in this State, are trying to obtain normal bread and butter things rather than huge sporting complexes which are very nice but, when such a difficult financial situation is being faced, I believe that it should be a matter of Government priorities. I will be interested to hear when the Minister can announce what money he has. His Federal colleagues now tell the States that they have borrowed too much money. Will the Treasurer allow the Minister to borrow more money because, if he does, he will mortgage the future of the people of this State.

When the nation is virtually on the verge of bankruptcy, it is appalling that we should have to tolerate such dismal exhibitions from the Government benches over the past few days. I know the sorts of hardships and difficulties that people face in the areas that I represent. There is high unemployment in the country. These industries have built this country and, with a little commonsense, a little help and a reasonable go, they will continue to provide an export income and a reasonable living for the people of this State.

In such circumstances I find it absolutely appalling that these so-called Labor whiz kids engage in political exercises when they are more interested in manipulating the media than putting anything constructive to Parliament. I do not know whether they realise that about 150 people on household support will have to walk off their farms. I do not know whether they appreciate the sort of financial burden that some banks and stock firms are holding, or whether they have any understanding of or appreciate the balance of trade in this country. If they did, they would not indulge in this nonsense. The best that they can offer is cheap political comment across the Chamber. The Minister of Agriculture has taken it upon himself to hand out a few brick bats, and he will get a few in return. During my time in Parliament I have never heard the Secretary or the Executive Officer of the United Farmers and Stockowners go to the media and attack a Minister as was the case with Mr Andrews a few weeks ago. Under a heading 'Mayes silly and naive, says UFS' the *Advertiser* of 22 January 1987 stated:

> The United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia General Secretary, Mr Grant Andrews, has accused the Minister of Agriculture, Mr Mayes, of being 'silly and naive'. It is the latest confrontation in a long-running war of words between Mr Mayes and the UFS . . .

It was the Minister's political officers who accused Mr Andrews of being a member of the New Right. Mr Andrews not only was very critical of the Minister but also had some very harsh words to say about the Minister's political officers. However, he had nothing but praise for the departmental officers.

The Minister should put his own house in order before he responds to Dorothy Dix questions in this House and has a go at the member for Bragg and me. If the Minister was at all bright he would be pleased that Opposition members are attempting to familiarise themselves with Government activity when a public meeting is called. I give the Minister notice that, whenever I think it is in my interest, or in the interest of the people of the State, I will attend public meetings in Adelaide or anywhere else in the State. I will not be told by the Minister or anyone else that I can or cannot attend those meetings. I think it is about time the Minister turned his attention to more productive exercises.

Some weeks ago I was involved in a public dispute with the Licensing Commissioner (Mr Secker). Again I refer to this matter, because in the local Ceduna paper, the *West Coast Sentinel* of 18 February, under the heading 'Liquor ban weeks away', it stated:

> A hearing date for the proposed ban of the sale of take-away alcohol to Yalata people from three Far West hotels could be two months away, according to the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, Andrew Secker.

Mr Secker said in a letter to the *West Coast Sentinel* of 21 January 1987:

> It is not correct, as you reported Mr Gunn as saying, that I 'proposed to stop the sale of take-away alcohol at Nullarbor, Nundroo and Penong Hotels'.

Mr Secker is the Licensing Commissioner, and he is the person who makes recommendations to the court. If that is not an attempt to prevent the sale of alcohol from those three premises, I do not know what is. Again I say to Mr Secker that, if he wants to adopt that course of action, it is a pity that he does not have to live in those areas and suffer the consequences. I guarantee that the local community in the suburb in which he lives in Adelaide would not accept those sorts of conditions or the results of that ban. It will result in a number of people from the west of Ceduna congregating in Ceduna and driving unroadworthy motor vehicles down the highway. He would not accept that. I call on the Minister to make representations to the Licensing Court, or to have someone appear to prevent this nonsense from taking place.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: On a point of order, I ask for a ruling on a matter which I know the honourable member has raised a number of times. He is reflecting upon a judicial officer, who is proceeding to make a determination with respect to a matter that is currently before the Licensing Court in this State. The comment made by the honourable member is highly prejudicial to the determination that will be made by that court, by that jurisdiction and by that judicial officer, who is going about his duties in accordance with the requirements laid down under the Licensing Act.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I rule on that point of order, I intend to take advice. The view of the Chair is (and I have mentioned this many times) that this House provides parliamentary privilege and, under parliamentary privilege, the member is allowed to raise the names of whomever he desires. However, I am not sure—and I am not in a position to know—whether this matter is before the courts and whether this is a judicial decision that is now before the courts but, if it is, then the matter would be *sub judice*. I ask the honourable member to think seriously before saying anything about a matter that may be *sub judice*. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: At this stage I do not know whether the matter is before the courts, but I know that it will be; I am fully aware of that. I make no apology because I feel most strongly, as do my constituents, that they have not had a fair go.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I begin by taking up some comments of the Minister of Recreation and Sport during Question Time today and, in particular, his comments about—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member assure the Chair that he is the lead speaker in this debate?

Mr INGERSON: Yes, I apologise, Sir; I am the lead speaker. I refer to statements by the Minister of Recreation and Sport in the House earlier today and correct him, as I often must do. On this occasion I will present a few facts. It is interesting to note that earlier today the Minister criticised me for attending a meeting. I decided to attend that meeting at the invitation of the Mayor of Enfield. The Minister was not present at the meeting, which he called to explain a situation that had arisen within the Enfield council.

The Minister said earlier today that it was an excellent meeting and I agree—it was an excellent meeting. I have not commented on that fact before now, because one does not need to state publicly that the conduct of a meeting has been excellent and the staff have done an excellent job. However, what I did—and the Minister did not put this to the House today—is point out that on the day after the meeting at Enfield I telephoned the Director of the Department of Recreation and Sport and asked him to pass on to his staff my thanks for their excellent presentation the previous night. I am always intrigued that this type of comment never comes before the House.

The Minister said that I left the meeting early. It is important that I inform the House that I arrived at the meeting at 7.30 p.m. and left at 9.30 p.m. following the major presentation and knowing full well that the meeting was very much in favour of the project. So there was no point whatsoever in my remaining. I think it is very important that I make these observations. An Opposition Party becomes involved in this sort of project because its job is to protect the rights of those who are not happy with what a Government may be doing. In this instance the meeting was almost unanimously in favour of the project. A couple of people who had publicly stated that they were concerned about the lack of consultation with the Minister in particular had received a briefing and as a result were quite satisfied with the proposal. Therefore, there was no reason for my Party to proceed with any concerns that we had about the project.

Having said that, I am quite staggered that the Minister is concerned that I as shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport have not come out and publicly supported this project. We need to place in perspective the Government's involvement in recreation and sport since 1982 and, since I have a little time tonight, I will do just that. The Government's first project since I have been involved in recreation and sport was the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, which was budgeted to cost $4.8 million and ended up costing $8.3 million. It was interesting to note earlier tonight the member for Albert Park's statement that members on this side had to recognise that management was a very important factor, that we continued to overlook this and all we did was talk about the unions, discussing their inadequacies and their inability to perform. How can a Government member say that we on this side need management expertise when the Government, which claims to have done an excellent job, budgeted for $4.8 million and the project came in at $8.3 million?

One can also look at the Gawler Three Day Event, which involved Government officers and had a $3 million budget overrun. I would have thought that there was a significant amount of Government involvement in that event. There is also the $1.3 million loss on our America's Cup entrant, *South Australia*. Let us put that in perspective. Over the past few days Mr Spurling has said that the yacht made a profit, and the Premier supported him. If one looks at the syndicate's balance sheet, one will see on the income side the sum of $1.4 million and alongside it the words 'Government grant'. If one takes that grant away from the income side and examines whether the books have been balanced, one will see that there was a loss of $1.3 million and the grant brought it up to a surplus.

I do not mind anyone playing with figures, but let us be honest. Let us put all the figures on the table, and then it will be clear that the yacht made a loss of $1.4 million. As a result of a Government grant, which initially was to be a loan, the syndicate has ended up with a surplus. If the Government is prepared to be honest and say that, that is acceptable.

Let us look at the exercise in relation to management. The Premier's then right-hand man, Mr Anderson, was involved as an adviser (I assume because of his expertise in management). We can also look at the Olympic Sports Field and at the $200 000 expenditure incurred because the wrong track was put down. A track was put down which was not wanted by anyone in the sporting or athletic bodies, yet the Government says that it has management expertise. We have been criticised for not having management expertise, but look at what the Government is doing!

The latest example is 5AA. We have been critical of 5AA, but the Minister has said, 'I don't have direct control over 5AA; I have control over the TAB'. Of course, the TAB wholly owns 5AA, and there is a possible loss there. We have all these examples—a $3.2 million overrun on the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, a $3 million loss on the Three Day Event; a $1.4 million loss on the yacht *South Australia*, a $200 000 loss on the Olympic Sports Field track, and a possible $4 million loss on 5AA. However, members opposite are prepared to say that we on this side need to know much more about management.

Let us go further and look at what has been promised but not achieved. At the Olympic Sports Field a new track has been promised at a cost of some $900 000, but where is it? At last a hockey stadium in the Samcor paddocks has been announced, costing in the order of $3 million. When it is in place at the end of this year we will happily support it. The small bore rifle organisation has also been promised $600 000; the weightlifting centre has been promised $300 000; and the Sports Institute has been promised $1 million. All those substantial promises add up to $5 million. Earlier this week we were told that the Federal Government will apply the screws in terms of funding. I accept that, so where will all this money come from? It has all been promised, but where will it come from?

The Minister has spoken of the Commonwealth Games. The lowest figure to develop facilities for that event is some $25 million. It would be marvellous to stage that event here in South Australia, but we should consult with the people most likely to be involved, that is, the amateur athletics and swimming bodies.

We need to do that, because they are the people who will provide nine-tenths of the support for the event and nine-tenths of the athletes! It was very interesting to note that the subject of cricket was brought up today, because in the last discussion I had with the cricket administration, only a couple of days ago, no decision had been reached by the Government in terms of its involvement, nor has there been any decision by the Federal Government as to how much money is going to be put into cricket. Again, we have another furphy from the Minister regarding the funding of the academy here. Certainly, we are going to have the academy here, but who is going to pay and how much will it cost? We support the academy being established in South Australia, but it is about time we knew what the cost is

going to be. Surely in such stringent economic times that is one of the most important aspects we should be considering.

The velodrome was also mentioned today. Who is going to pay for that? The Government has been trying to get a commitment from Mr Brown for the past 18 months, but so far he has promised three States—Tasmania, Victoria and South Australia—that they will get the velodrome. How much is it going to cost us to have the velodrome here in South Australia? It is critical that the Opposition asks these fundamental questions. The only response we get from the Minister is that we are 'carping' and 'knocking'. The simple list I have talked about totals something like $8 million to $10 million worth of facilities promised but nothing produced since 1982.

Finally there is that little oasis in the desert, the entertainment centre. The entertainment centre was promised at the last election, but where is it? I suppose we will be told that because of the stringent economy it cannot be produced. Why keep on about it if the goods cannot be produced? If the people of South Australia were told that there is a problem in fulfilling promises, I am quite sure everybody would be much happier. We support the principle of the development of a sports park at Samcor. Having said that, however, we reserve the right to ask why we are spending $3 million on the hockey ground and something like $1.5 million on the grandstand but leaving out the extra training fields.

Surely they are the sorts of questions we ought to be asking of the Minister. Officers of the department have continually stated that the money for the hockey field was granted some two years ago, but because of inflation that money is now worth less and we must get on with the development of this project in the next six to eight months. The grandstand is magnificent but the principal need in sport is better playing surfaces, yet the two training fields for hockey have been left off that plan. I believe that the priority is wrong and that these questions must be asked, and we will continue to ask them. The development has been sold as a hockey/lacrosse stadium, but how much lacrosse is involved? My understanding is that it is going to be less than 10 per cent. The community sees it as a hockey/lacrosse stadium, whereas in fact it is really a hockey stadium, with lacrosse involved every now and again.

At the presentation, it was indicated that we were going to have a golf course as well. As anyone in the northern suburbs would know (and I know the member for Briggs has lived in the northern suburbs for a long time), a golf course is something that is needed. The proposition put forward the other night was that a private developer would develop the golf course. I am told that the cost of developing a golf course from scratch is of the order of $1 million to $1.5 million, with a maintenance cost of about $200 000 a year. Where will that money come from? I do not believe that the Enfield council could find that amount of money to build a golf course and, irrespective of whether or not a private interest develops it, somebody has to pay.

Whilst it is easy to say that the public who use it will pay, somebody has to front up with the capital, and it can only be the Government in the first instance. So, why not come out and say that the Government is going to put money into developing the golf course? Nobody will be upset about that. There will be a lot of criticism as to whether it should or should not be done but at least we ought to know where the finance is going to come from. But this is pie in the sky stuff, because private developers have been going to develop golf courses in the northern suburbs for the past 20 years, yet it has not happened and is not going to happen. I can talk about this matter from first-hand experience because I have been involved in an attempt to do just that in the backblocks of Elizabeth.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: There are a few backblocks of Elizabeth. Dealing now with equal opportunity in sport, I would like to talk about a couple of practical problems that currently exist and some problems that I believe have been taken over the fence by the for Commissioner Equal Opportunity and unfortunately supported by the Education Department. The first event I will refer to is the national athletics carnival, which was held here towards the end of last year. In that carnival we had a situation for the first time of a girls' event and what was euphemistically called an open event. It was interesting that it was called an open event because, in fact, only boys entered it.

The reason that it was set up as an open event was that the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity said that because the girls in the past had been apparently disadvantaged there had to be a special event for the girls and an open event in which both boys and girls could compete. Interestingly enough, the community itself clearly decided that that was a lot of nonsense and the reality was that not one girl went in the open event. That indicates to me clearly that we should have had both a girls and a boys event, and it really shows what sort of nonsense goes on in respect of the elite area of athletics.

It was interesting to talk to interstate people, because they have less bias about this matter than we have. People from New South Wales and Victoria (who I would have thought would be more left than their counterparts in this State) could not believe that so much nonsense was being put forward in setting up a girls' event and an open event. We talk about physique, strength and stamina as being the criteria for equal opportunity in sport, and it was interesting to note that, in both girls' and boys' events from under 10 years to under 13 years, the fastest girl would have run sixth in every single event.

What is the point of all this nonsense about saying that at elite level we need to bring everyone together? There is a difference: it is an obvious physical difference, and one that is acknowledged by the community as being nonsense at this level. The thing that concerns me is that after that event was run, and after the criticism that has been raised by the sporting community, the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity sent out a letter on 2 February this year to SAPSASA (South Australian Primary Schools Amateur Sports Association—the people who in December reported to the Commissioner the problems with the event in question), saying that there was considerable disquiet and accusations of discriminations against boys and that people did not fully understand the issues involved. Of course we did not understand the issues involved. No-one there—male, female, husband, wife, mother, father, son or daughter—could understand the nonsense that was put forward on that occasion. Of course there was disquiet about it, and it could be seen in the public arena, and yet the Commissioner went on to say that we must have a commonsense attitude towards it.

So, what is being recommended this year is that instead of having an under-10 event, in which we would have boys and girls, we will have an open event with neither boys nor girls events. Thus, we are now guaranteed that only boys will be in the final of any one of those events. In two years there might be another call saying that we cannot have this because we are discriminating against the girls. Who creates this sort of nonsense? We have done it ourselves, and it needs to be straightened out very clearly.

The letter goes on to say that, because we cannot cause too much disquiet, it will be done only in relation to under-10s this year and that next year it will be the under-11s and the year after that under-12s. So, if we have a super young girl athlete in one school and she is not good enough to qualify for the event (but may be the best girl athlete in the State), she will not get an opportunity to run in the State event. And, of course, the reverse applies. Girls under 10 are predominantly the best at swimming at this time, and so therefore we will have the opposite case in that instance, where in the final of the under-10s swimming there will be only girls, because none of the boys will be able to qualify—and we call this equal opportunity. It is not equal opportunity, it is nonsense.

It is about time that we began to recognise that equal opportunity is about treating boys and girls on the same level. It is about encouraging girls to play more sport. As a parent who has two girls, I know very clearly the problems that girls have in competing and in relation to sponsorship. One of my daughters played in the State team and also played for the Australian team, and in both instances we have had to fund her. Yet, my son, who plays for a league football club, gets funded. So, I know very clearly what the difference in sponsorship is all about. I get the message from my children, who say, 'Dad, we don't want to compete against the boys, but we want better representation and more sports for us. We want the whole program better run for the girls. We want a recognition that girls are disadvantaged but that we want to play girls' sports. We do not want the nonsense that we have to have open football teams in which we have to play or we do not get a game. We do not want open netball teams in which if the boys play, we will not get a game. We want more emphasis placed on netball, better coaching, better facilities for netball, hockey and all the girls' sports, as well as better facilities for all the boys' sports.'

We do not need all the nonsense that is currently occurring at the moment. It is all happening because no-one had the guts to acknowledge that we cannot really guess whether in relation to 12-year-olds, strength, physique and stamina come into the matter. I have been involved with an athletic family all my life. I know that the girls are better at 10 and 11, while the boys are miles better at 12. Whoever agreed to 12 picked an arbitrary figure, and now the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity and the whole Education Department has lined up the greatest load of drivel and nonsense that I have ever seen in all my life. What will we do in three years time when a young boy goes to play in the football team, but we are not allowed to have any ruckmen in the team, because the girls have to be there and we might hurt the girls? That is part of Aussie sports. It is all part of this equal opportunity push, and it is all nonsense. In year 13, first year high school, suddenly the boys have to be real men. Suddenly during the year following year 12 the boys have to become real men in a real man's game. This is nonsense stuff—absolute nonsense. *The Hon. G.J. Crafter interjecting:*

Mr INGERSON: I was not here. I now refer to the seminar that was held last week at the Mineral Foundation, in Conyngham Street. Present that night were some 120 bowlers, and we had a very vigorous discussion, it could be said, on equal opportunity and the problems involved. The very next morning the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity said that there was not a problem on the bowling green. She was obviously at the wrong meeting, as not one group at that meeting supported the proposition that she put forward. She was obviously in cuckoo land. It was obvious that a minority there supported the sort of nonsense being put forward to the bowling clubs.

Everyone recognises that we must have a membership category that involves male and female and that there should be no discrimination. Everyone accepts that, but no-one wants to get themselves so regimented that a club itself cannot decide how it plays its competition and how it wants to run all its competitions. A member of a club either likes a club or leaves. It is pretty fundamental. However, the whole area of equal opportunity is being thrown into absolute chaos because of this madness in relation to sport.

It is something that the community itself just does not accept. It has been thrust on the community by what I would call absolutely extreme people, who are not prepared to sit down and consult or to listen to the problems involved. All they are prepared to do is put forward a lot of theoretical nonsense to people in the community. It is affecting dramatically young people and old people. The Minister should go into the Norwood Bowling Club (there are probably a few bowling clubs in the Norwood electorate) and ask the people there about this matter. That club was one of the most vocal at the equal opportunities meeting the other night about the nonsense that is being thrust on it, as the club itself does not want to change.

Ms Lenehan: Was there a majority of women at that meeting?

Mr INGERSON: There was not a majority of women at that meeting.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: One of the things you could probably do—

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: The member for Mawson was not there—she did not take the trouble to go.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members not to conduct private conversations across the Chamber, and I ask the member for Bragg to address the Chair.

Mr INGERSON: I would have thought that, when people want to quote things, they ought to go to meetings and find out the feeling. That is what this whole speech of mine started about tonight: that the Minister could not be bothered to go to Samcor. At least the member for Mawson could have come: she is very vocal on this whole issue. She ought to go along and find out what the bowling clubs think of it. The final thing I would like to talk about is a problem with the Murray Bridge trotting industry—

Mr Gregory interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I have been to a lot more places than you have been, and that is one of them. If you ever get out in your electorate, you are doing a good job. Every now and again you go to the dogs—and that is probably where you should be.

The next thing I would like to talk about is the problems that one club at Murray Bridge is having in this rationalisation of the trotting industry. I would like to put forward to the House tonight a request by the Murray Bridge Trotting Club for reconsideration of this whole rationalisation project which has been put forward by the trotting industry. It seems to me that—

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

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I want to address myself tonight to tourism in South Australia, the strategic plan, its launching and its implementation in several areas. I want first of all to congratulate those people who were involved in the production of the plan. I want to congratulate the

Minister for the launching of the plan and would like tonight to talk about two specific aspects of it. I would also like to address my remarks to the Government's purchase of Armstrong's Tavern for a major training facility for food preparation courses and food and bar service courses in relation to the objectives and strategies of the strategy plan.

Because of criticisms which were made both within this Parliament and in the media about the Government's role in relation to the implementation of the strategy plan, I wish to make several points. First, I would like to quote from the speech which the Minister of Tourism made in launching the plan. The Minister said:

> The plan is not a throw-money-at-it strategy. Rather, it suggests how we do the right thing the right way with the resources that we have.

The Minister went on to say:

> I remind you that the plan is a joint Government-industry document, and it seems that the onus in future will be on the industry to take more responsibility for its own development but, in turn, the plan says that the department has responsibilities. It must develop a stronger tourist identity for South Australia, and it must upgrade its information and packaging skills.

I would like to relate the Minister's comments to the original document so that I can substantiate that what the Minister has said is indeed what is contained in the plan. I would refer members to strategy 10 on page 31 of the plan, which talks about improved cooperation within and between Government and industry:

> Greater industry cooperation through a commitment to tourism as a whole is sought to achieve a stronger and more self-reliant industry. Opportunities for industry cooperation exist in the areas of marketing, contribution to the industry data base, and the development of the industry's position on significant policy matters.

It goes on to say:

> Within the past five years the State has changed from a situation where there was a single key marketing entity, namely the Department of Tourism, to one where there are a number of enterprises undertaking significant promotional activities. Cooperation and coordination will improve effectiveness.

If I refer to the first appendix of the plan it supports the position which the Minister has consistently taken on this matter, and that is under the appendix 'Key Issues'. It talks about the role of Government, and states:

> The tourism industry believes that tourism has not had a sufficient priority by successive Governments nor amongst Government departments.

It then goes on to say—and I would like the House to take particular note of this:

> In the past there have tended to be unrealistic expectations of Government largesse, which is a particular problem at a time of public sector expenditure cut backs. The challenge will be to ensure that public sector participation in tourism is cost effective, implying concentration of resources in specific priority development areas and activities. It also places a greater emphasis on the private sector to become more self-reliant through improved cooperation and coordination.

There we have the plan, and parts of the plan totally supporting what the Minister has said. Quite obviously, then, the plan calls for industry to work cooperatively with Government and to do more to promote itself in conjunction with the Government. Criticism is also made of the Government's financial commitment to tourism and, in particular, the financial commitment to the implementation of the strategy plan.

Let me give the House one simple statistical example. In the four year period since the Bannon Government took office, spending on tourism has increased by 61 per cent in real terms, or by more than $2.5 million.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: It is a heck of lot more than you were spending on tourism when you were in Government, so I find that criticism to be quite hypocritical. The second area that I want to talk about this evening is in relation to the Government's purchase, through the Department of TAFE, of Armstrong's Tavern. The Opposition, both in this Parliament and in the media generally, has strongly criticised this purchase. I would like to quote once again from the Minister's speech, when she announced the Government's purchase of Armstrong's Tavern:

> The tavern will be run as a hotel by the hospitality and catering students. They will learn what their jobs really mean in the only environment that really counts—the working environment. There will be a board of management made up of TAFE, industry and union representatives, and a licensee manager will be in charge. But the students will do the work and the hotel is expected to pay its way and help pay for their training while they learn.

What the Opposition seems to have failed to realise is that this initiative is the only one of its kind in Australia, and I would have thought that there might have been some congratulations and support for this exciting initiative taken by the Department of TAFE to provide professionalism and training for those people working within the hospitality area. The Minister goes on to say:

> It is important on two counts. It shows that TAFE and the hotel industry is determined to provide realistic training for its workforce. The second count is that it also is the kind of Government-industry cooperation which the 1987-89 South Australian tourism plan says must occur if South Australia is to compete effectively in the battle for the tourism dollar.

I would put it to the House that this is exactly what Armstrong's Tavern will provide for students. I would like to refer to the section in the plan which is strategy 11—and I am quite sure that every honourable member has read the plan, because the Opposition is making so much fuss about it that one would assume that they are totally conversant with the plan and have read it in detail. Strategy 11 talks about the need to continue to improve standards:

> Quality of service and hospitality are the lifeblood of tourism. There is agreement that responsibility can only rest with the industry for ensuring high standards.

This is a significant passage:

> Government can provide assistance and training, but the industry needs to set, encourage and police standards, as does any other strong profession or industry, rather than have them imposed externally. Training for tourism in South Australia has improved markedly since the inception of the previous plan. However, this must continue as a priority need with greater emphasis on hospitality, awareness of the tourism product, quality of service and standards.

It goes on to talk about the shortcomings of customer service. What the purchase of Armstrong's Tavern will do is provide the industry not only with future jobs of a professionally very high standard, but it will ensure that the students who are being trained by the TAFE College's School of Hospitality and Catering will in fact have career structures, because they have proper training and experience.

I want it on the public record that, despite the innuendo from the member for Coles, the Australian Hotels Association and the Liquor Trades Union are extremely supportive of this exciting first initiative of any Government in Australia in this area. We are talking here about 600 hotels which will in future provide many of the jobs for these people. I believe this to be extremely exciting, and I congratulate not only the Minister but also, as I said during my introduction, the signatories to the foreword of the shortened version *Tourism in South Australia, the Trends, the Challenge and the Future.* I urge the people who signed it to fully support the document that they signed.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The member for Bragg drew the attention of the House to a great number

of concealments and broken promises in the area of recreation and sport. One of my first comments is to invite the House to look at the state of taxation and indebtedness in South Australia over the past five years and to compare it with the preceding 22 years. I remind members of the House that irrespective of whether they were Liberal or Labor Governments, under Playford, Walsh, Steele Hall, Dunstan, Corcoran, and Tonkin the State's indebtedness increased year by year by about $100 million. However, in the five years of this present Government the State's indebtedness has risen by $1.5 billion; that is, in five years this Government has put us into hock by the equivalent of 15 years of any previous Government in South Australia.

We have raced into debt with the result that the Government, before it starts to provide any essential services, must provide about $260 million a year towards servicing its borrowings—a terrible state of affairs. The Premier only yesterday took members on this side to task for asking him to fulfil commitments in these times of tight financial constraint. One has to ask what has happened to that $1.5 billion that he has borrowed and all the additional taxes that have been raised in the past five years. One has also to remind him that members on this side are not asking for additional services but for present services to be maintained and for the Government to meet those commitments that it made prior to the 1982 and 1985 elections in order to buy government.

It is no good for the Minister on duty here this evening, or for the Premier, to say that we can no longer afford these things when promises were made quite unequivocally without any reserve at all. Let me remind members of a few of those promises. The Finger Point sewerage works in the South-East was one of them. The Premier promised that it would be commenced immediately that his Government was returned to power in 1985. The Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater) said to the press before the election, 'Finger Point is a goer,' and the Premier has written to me intermittently over the past 15 months confirming his absolute commitment to that scheme. However, it was only last week that the Public Works Standing Committee attended at Mount Gambier for a public hearing. I hope that its recommendation will remove the last hurdle so that the Government finds that it is free at last to make a financial commitment to the commencement of this scheme. That was promise number one, but there were many more.

I will try to point out a few more of these promises in the remaining minutes that I have for this speech. The second promise involved the Mount Gambier Hospital in particular, but also the many hospitals in South Australia that were promised total or partial redevelopment by the Minister of Health prior to the 1982 and 1985 elections. The Mount Gambier Hospital redevelopment, five years after the promise of upgrading to teaching status, has still to be commenced. The boilers and lifts have been improved, but they were on the agenda of the previous Minister of Health (then the Hon. Jennifer Adamson), yet here we are eight years down the track and only those relatively minor works have been undertaken. Many hospitals in South Australia are awaiting major commitments to be started, while at the same time we must remind members that the vast majority of those hospitals are already this year working on substantially reduced administrative and operational funds.

A third unequivocal promise made by the Government was to reduce, or at least control absolutely, State taxes and charges. They were even frozen for a while. But, what do we see? Rising Government costs are increasing far in excess of the CPI in Australia. Governments are increasing their charges unrestrainedly, at the same time as we have a Federal Government accord to restrict increases in salaries and wages of Australians. So, what is good for the Government apparently is no good for the worker. Government charges, Housing Trust rentals, gas, electricity, water rates, and transport charges have all risen far in excess of the CPI.

Another promise was the establishment of a new Childhood Services Commission in South Australia, which, it was promised, would improve services. I have never had more complaints than I had at the beginning of this year from kindergartens, not only in my electorate but across the State, saying that they are short of staff, that sessions have been reduced, that they have more children attending fewer sessions and that staff have increased numbers of children in their classes. There are waiting lists to be met and the Acacia Kindergarten in Mount Gambier is only one of many kindergartens in the South-East to which I drew the Minister's attention. The situation there, as in other kindergartens, is worse in 1987 than it was in 1986, despite the many promises made by the Premier and successive education Ministers that things would greatly improve under the Childhood Services Commission.

I heard paeans of praise being sung from the other side of the House only a little while ago about the success of the Commission. I remind members that Federal Government funding was withdrawn from kindergartens—$3.7 million that had been a flat payment for the previous 10 years has now gone completely, and improvements in early childhood services in South Australia have, I suggest, been made by the Federal Government at the expense of kindergartens: that is quite indisputable.

I refer also to another promise. The Premier said that he would reduce the State's debt. Instead, as I remarked when I commenced speaking in this debate, the State's indebtedness has increased by $1.5 billion in five years with the massive interest payments that that increased debt carries with it. We were also promised a better deal generally for education. The Government has had a substantial windfall in that far fewer students and new schools were required. We were spending between $40 million and $50 million a year on new buildings between five and 10 years ago, but now there is very little for new schools. The sum of $14 million was allocated last year to PBD for repairs, maintenance and construction, so the Government must have had windfall profits of between $20 million and $30 million, which it certainly has not put into repair and maintenance of those Education Department buildings that are sorely in need of repair; nor has it been spending additional recurrent expenditure funds on TAFE colleges to match the greatly increased Federal contribution to construct the Adelaide College of TAFE—incidentally, a funding that the Tonkin Government obtained from Senator Carrick when in Government. That was the commitment to Adelaide TAFE of $25 million.

We find that a lot of pensioners are now approaching members on this side saying that they cannot afford to go to TAFE stream five and six courses. They have gone from three terms to four terms and fees have been increased by 50 per cent to 100 per cent to 150 per cent, so that pensioners are now looking at vast increases in fees and are opting out of TAFE at a time in their lives when they would most benefit from the social and recreational impact that TAFE courses normally have for the elderly.

The Premier also said that his Government would improve South Australia's economic standing. One has merely to look at the status of new and used car firms throughout South Australia to realise that the economic situation is very drastic. If members opposite say that that was a Federal initiative, I remind them that 12 months ago the Premier

in this House said, 'I support the Federal Government in its initiatives,' and the fringe benefits tax is only one of those which has impacted on the new and used car industries. New car companies are standing down staff because new car sales are at a third of those at the same time last year, and used car firms are closing down, going bankrupt and standing down staff.

The end result is that the economy of South Australia, much of which revolves around the automotive industry, really is in the doldrums. It is time that someone at Government level in South Australia stood up and told the Federal Government precisely what they think about the Federal tax structure, because everybody else seems to be doing it, including new messiahs. Before the last election the Government said also that there would be no privatisation. Privatisation is—

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

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I was reminded by a comment contained in a report in the national press when referring to a campaign which is emanating from Queensland and which is going into our Federal Parliament that the method used by that Premier is called the KISS method, which is short for 'Keep it simple, stupid'. Members of the Opposition have peddled some theories today and I wonder how many stupid people there are in the Opposition.

In relation to the Opposition's attitude to the Government debt which affects our balance of payments problem, I am sure that the member for Mitcham, who claims to have some expertise in economics, would know (and I think he should agree with this) that the burden of debt, public and private, indicates that the private debt owed by companies in Australia comprises 71 per cent of the $110 billion that is owed and that the Government and local government debt comprise the other 29 per cent. That gives the lie to the suggestion that the Government is causing all our national debt. It demonstrates how members opposite will not allow facts to get in the way of a good story.

We are in this position today because the people whom they have supported nationally over a long period of time have made very crucial decisions about the future of our economy. I need refer only to Robert Gordon Menzies. Under pressure from various people, when he was Prime Minister he asked Sir James Vernon, who was the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Colonial Sugar Refineries, to undertake a study into the restructuring of Australian secondary industry. That report was given to the Government, but it was not acted upon. The Whitlam Government asked Gordon Jackson, another Managing Director of the Colonial Sugar Refineries, also to look at and report on what could be done in relation to the restructuring of manufacturing industry in Australia. That report was presented to the Federal Government and it was left to the Fraser Government to act upon it.

What did the Fraser Government do? It ignored all the recommendations contained in the report and said, 'We need not worry about the manufacturing industry; commodities will be our salvation.' It was talking about agricultural and mineral products. When looking at the value of world trade, we find that since 1964 there has been a very steady and consistent growth in trade and manufactured goods, so that, as at 1984 when the graph to which I refer was prepared, on a world basis manufactured goods comprised 60 per cent of the goods that were traded: minerals and agricultural products comprised 37.5 per cent; and agriculture comprised 12.5 per cent. That indicates that somebody made the wrong choice and, in the parlance of people who frequent the dog track and racecourse, they bet on the wrong animal.

As an indication of how wrong that decision was, Australian exports are dominated by primary products at a time when the world demand for them has declined. In 1984-85 78 per cent of our exports comprised agriculture and mineral commodities, while manufacturing comprised only 19 per cent. People in the Liberal Party and the National Party have stated that it is the fault of the Labor Party. The Labor Party has been in office on the national scene for three years and it has attempted to undertake a course of action that will reverse that trend.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: Six. You are an ex-schoolteacher and you should be able to count.

Mr Meier: Four years—not three—that you have been in Government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GREGORY: Will you tell this monkey to shut up?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, I think that the member opposite has been in this House long enough to know that one does not refer to other members in this House in the manner that he did. I would ask for an apology here and now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the point of order. The honourable member has been in the House long enough to know that he must refer to other members of the House by their correct title. At the same time, I take the opportunity to say that I did call the member for Goyder to order, and I was seeking that he do not interject. I make that point and, if I have to do it again, I will have to take action as far as he is concerned. I would ask the member for Florey to withdraw those remarks.

Mr GREGORY: If the member opposite is offended by those remarks, I withdraw them. Members opposite say that they have the salvation for the Australian economy, but I do not believe that they have. They have not at any time exhibited any concern for the ordinary working people of South Australia. That is evidenced by their insistence that the fringe benefits tax be abolished. That tax was introduced to ensure that people who avoid paying their proper tax were caught. If employers enter into schemes of arrangements with employees in order to avoid the payment of tax, they should pay. However, members opposite suggest that the fringe benefits tax should be removed, because it is catching the people who are attempting to avoid paying tax. I think it is a very fair tax, because it has caught people who deliberately set up schemes to avoid paying tax. It is interesting to note that members opposite also support a tax avoider who is not paying his tax on the sale of cigarettes in South Australia.

In relation to other countries (and perhaps a small middle ranking power like Australia could take a leaf out of their books), I refer to a report from a delegation of the Australian Council of Trade Unions which visited western Europe in 1986. It found that the successful countries were those with a high degree of integration of social and economic policies around the central objectives of full employment, low inflation and economic growth. In fact, the objective of full employment is a pivot around which the policies are judged, implemented and adjusted in countries such as Sweden, Norway and Austria. In the time when Australia could have developed policies to put us on a par with Sweden, Norway and Austria, the crucial decisions were made by the Liberal Party.

The Labor Party put people to work after the war and the Labor Party set up schemes to establish how we could

redress the problems which were created by 23 years of mismanagement. All those reports were washed away and no action was taken by the Liberal Party when it was in Government. If we placed an emphasis on training, retraining and integrated economic policies, perhaps we would be able to produce a car of world renown; perhaps we would be able to produce an aircraft which we could build and use in our Air Force instead of relying on another country; perhaps we could have 2 per cent unemployment, as is the case in those countries; and perhaps we could have our highly skilled youngsters at work. But, every time that policies were introduced to attempt such things, the Liberal Party took the short and easy cut, and not one member opposite could deny the campaign that was conducted here in the 1980s in relation to resource development. If one looks at the graph relating to capital expenditure in manufacturing, one will see that in 1981 from an expenditure of $1 000 million, it collapsed to about $500 million in just two years.

That was a resources boom, and they backed the wrong horse. If they has used money from their firms, they would have been imprisoned for embezzlement, because they did not back a winner. However, they have the cheek to stand in this Parliament and blame everyone else but themselves for these decisions. I would not mind if they were honest, but I wish they would be honest enough about who caused this country's debt. It is not the fault of governments but of private enterprise. I wish they were honest about the tax avoiders—those people who continue to avoid paying proper income tax. I have information about one person who stood up proudly in a $500 000 mansion and said, 'The only things I own are the clothes I'm standing in. The company owns the rest. We live here and don't have to pay taxes.' I think it is a shame that these cheats aspire to lead our country. The member for Flinders spoke about the plight of the farming community.

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

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Tonight I will outline the recent proceedings of a public meeting which I attended at Elizabeth West, which is part of my electorate. That public meeting followed the publication of an article in the *Sunday Mail* made up of allegations by one individual who lives at Elizabeth West. He told the *Sunday Mail* that he had been the victim of racial violence, that Elizabeth West had a substantial number of break-ins, that vigilante groups, and the like, roamed the area to deal with these problems and that, generally, the suburb could be characterised as one of lawlessness and substantial anti-social behaviour.

The public meeting was very strongly of the view that the allegations were entirely unfounded. It is a matter of regret that the *Sunday Mail* sought to give such prominence and publicity to these allegations without seeking to check them much more substantially than it did. My comments to the *Sunday Mail* reporter provided no such evidence, and the reporter also obtained comments from the local council, which again contradicted the allegations. It seems that the reporter went very little further than that. On the basis of those single unsubstantiated allegations, the reporter wrote a full page article implying the points that I have just listed.

I will not go into further detail about the allegations because I think that would give them unnecessary prominence and publicity and would simply repeat the slander and defamation laid against this community and against which it is fairly difficult for members of that community to protect themselves. The public meeting heard a report from the local police sergeant who detailed the true state of affairs prevailing in this area.

The sergeant was able to advise the public meeting that, contrary to the *Sunday Mail* report, the rate of break-ins, assaults and violence at Elizabeth West was nothing like the magnitude alleged in the article, and that comparative statistics with other suburbs in South Australia revealed that there was nothing unusual or in any way sensational about the crime statistics for the area. Naturally the area has some crime and, unfortunately, all suburbs in South Australia have that problem. However, nothing emerged from the police statistics about Elizabeth West to indicate in any way that it has an unusually high pattern of crime. In fact, quite the reverse is true.

In relation to the comparative statistics produced by the police it was clear that a number of other suburbs (which I certainly do not propose to name) came out far worse than Elizabeth West. The Elizabeth West community is very cohesive and certainly public spirited. They like to think well of their area and they expect others to at least give them the benefit of judging them on the facts and not on wild allegations. The source of the allegations—a gentleman who went under the *nom de plume* of 'Terry'—was interviewed by the police who, of course, did not break his confidentiality and reveal his name.

The police revealed that when 'Terry' was asked about the allegations, which he had not so far brought to the attention of the local police, the local member or the local council, he said that much of what had subsequently appeared in the *Sunday Mail* article was not what he had told the reporter. I am not in a position to judge who is at fault in this respect—whether the allegations were made as detailed or, alternatively, whether the gentleman was misreported. Because none of us is in a position to do that, I will make no allegations in that regard. However, I am concerned that the gentleman now refutes many of the more substantive and indeed almost wild allegations that were made or reported in the article. Unfortunately, it appears to be a case of the media making the news rather than simply reporting it as it occurs.

It is of particular concern that many of the allegations raised in the article related to racial violence and tension. It was alleged that some of the perpetrators of the public assaults were Aborigines. The gentleman concerned denied to the police that he made that allegation and said that on the one occasion that he was subject to an incident all of the people in the offending vehicle were Caucasian. Quite clearly, the gentleman himself has been able to largely refute many of the allegations in the *Sunday Mail* article.

The local councillor for the area chaired the meeting and the district clerk and mayor were also present. They also refuted many of the allegations presented in the article. In fact, they painted a much more appropriate picture of a reasonable and cohesive community which is certainly not in the grip of a crime wave in any way at all and of which the local residents can be justifiably proud. The meeting subsequently resolved to refer the matter to the Press Council, because it was felt that the allegations should be looked into by a responsible authority and that, if the Press Council deemed it appropriate, the media outlet in question should be required to publicise the other side of the case and what the meeting believed to be the facts. I believe that is appropriate, because it will allow the matter to be tested in the forum established for that purpose.

However, those present at the public meeting raised a couple of issues which I believe are worth putting before the House and therefore before the relevant Ministers so

that they can be looked into. The meeting felt that these things would improve the environment of Elizabeth West and indeed the environment of many other suburbs throughout the State. These problems are not unique in any way to Elizabeth West, but the meeting felt that if they could be addressed it would substantially improve the local environment and that of other urban South Australians.

The matters raised relate to the consumption of alcohol in public areas, such as streets, roads and footpaths and areas adjacent to licensed premises. While this is not a serious problem at Elizabeth West, isolated incidents have occurred and the meeting felt that it was worth bringing to the attention of the Attorney-General the fact that the meeting believed that more stringent measures should be taken to control that sort of behaviour. I strongly support that view.

I think a case can be made that, when Parliament examines the by-law making powers which should be given to local government, there is every reason to grant councils limited power to regulate and prohibit the consumption of alcohol in public places, including streets, roads and footpaths and areas adjacent to licensed premises. Since they are under the care, control and management of local government, it is only reasonable that that authority should make that assessment. The meeting also raised the question of the deposit on beer bottles. In many ways it is pleasing to note the decision of the Legislative Council to retain the present deposit level. That matter is now the subject of a High Court dispute. It is to be hoped that it will be resolved in favour of the South Australian Government and, indeed, the people of South Australia so that a significant deposit may be retained and, in my view, possibly increased to ensure that people do not dispose of bottles in an inappropriate way.

The meeting particularly commended the concept of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme for the area although, in fact, other areas must take priority because of the higher level of crime generally, and the meeting recognised that priority for other areas of the State. The meeting was very keen for a Neighbourhood Watch to be implemented and the police officer present indicated that he would take that matter up with the department and see what could be done in the near future.

I would also commend to the Minister of Emergency Services the view that Elizabeth West should be given some priority in that matter, not because of its high crime rate but because of allegations like these which are occasionally made and which I believe need to be adequately addressed. It would also be a very important factor in giving the people of that area a little more self-confidence to live their daily lives in peace and security, not only from those who might seek to break the law but also from the media.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

FISHERIES (GULF ST VINCENT PRAWN FISHERY RATIONALISATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 February. Page 3006.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I regard this measure as one of the most important measures to come before the House in a long time inasmuch as it deals with the long-term future of one of the important natural resources of this State. The long-term future of any natural resource should be of great importance to all of us in that we have a moral obligation to look after that resource and to hand it on to the next generation in as good a condition as we inherited it. In fact, in most instances we should aim to hand the resource on in an improved condition. That applies to any resources the State owns, whether it be a fishery, the Murray River or any other natural resource.

I would like to say at the outset that as far as this Bill is concerned I personally do not have any axe to grind. The manner in which I approach this legislation would be as though I were in the position of Minister of Fisheries, if the Liberal Party were in Government. So, my approach and that of the Opposition will be strictly on the basis of what we believe to be in the best interest of the resource and of those involved in that particular industry.

The fishery has had a history of ups and downs. I think it is worth referring briefly to the problems which have occurred within that resource and the manner in which the Government has been trying to correct the problems that have developed, particularly over the past 10 years. First, there is the situation of the two Investigator Strait licensees and the manner in which the Government saw fit to deal with them. It is worth mentioning the decision made by Cabinet (it is for others to debate whether the decision was right or wrong) which was referred to in a letter dated 3 December 1986 from the Minister of Fisheries to Messrs Mancer and Brown of Kingscote. In that letter he said:

> You may recall that Cabinet has previously determined that the two Investigator Strait experimental prawn fishery licence holders should be recognised as having the same rights and obligations as Gulf St Vincent fishermen on the basis of their well established commitment to the fishery, their positive cooperation with research surveys and overall management, and the fact that they previously held Commonwealth licences to fish the Investigator Strait area prior to the change to State jurisdiction. At the same time, Cabinet determined that the future of the two Investigator Strait licence holders in the amalgamated Gulf St Vincent/Investigator Strait prawn fishery must be considered in conjunction with Copes' recommendation relating to vessel reduction.

The Government has clearly acknowledged that it regards the two licensees in Investigator Strait as having the same rights, privileges and responsibilities as the other licensees in the St Vincent Gulf prawn fishery. As I have said, that is a decision that Cabinet has made. That determination having been made, obviously the 16 licensees within the combined fishery should be considered as being equal and treated on exactly the same basis. Unfortunately, the Government has not seen fit to do this but has taken the easy way out by terminating the licences of the two Investigator Strait fishermen on 31 December 1986. At this stage the Government is claiming it has currently reduced the number of boats operating in the combined fishery from 16 to 13, having received an offer from one of the St Vincent Gulf prawn boats to voluntarily withdraw.

I repeat that I believe that is morally incorrect and that they should all be treated equally. Only those who wanted to voluntarily withdraw from the fishery were to put in an offer. The two fishermen in Investigator Strait decided that they did not want to withdraw voluntarily so the Government determined that matter for them by cancelling their licences and offering them $450 000 each. The one voluntary resignation to this date, which has been accepted by the Minister, involved a sum of $600 000. If the Minister has the power and sees fit to approve whatever offer comes in, and then passes the account over to the remaining licensees in the combined fishery, it is virtually an unknown figure that ultimately the remaining 10 will have to pay over the next 10 years. That figure could vary anywhere between $70 000 and $100 000 annually. I will return to that figure at a later date and deal with the feasibility of

whether or not the remaining licensees will be able to cope and pay out that particular figure.

Can I also say at this early stage that the Opposition supports the general thrust of the Copes report. It does not altogether support the manner in which the Government has decided to implement the general recommendations, and some of the recommendations and discussion in the Copes report are fairly flexible. On reading the report from cover to cover one notes the areas in which Professor Copes to some extent is having two bob each way. I foreshadow that in Committee I will move amendments which I believe very firmly are fair and reasonable and in the best interests of the long-term survival of the industry.

This legislation, if passed in its present form, will place an enormous burden on the remaining 10 vessels in the industry. As I have said, the figure involved could vary between $70 000 and $100 000 per year, depending on the offers that come in and the size of the offer that is accepted by the Minister. As one who has been involved in primary industry all my life, I would have to think very carefully about whether I could tie myself down to that sort of burden, not knowing long the term future of the industry. It is only the department's belief that there will be a recovery in relation to the resource and that the value of the prawn catch will remain in its present vicinity.

If either of those things fails, quite obviously the operators of the remaining 10 vessels will find themselves in dire straits, particularly those lessees who happen to have a significant overdraft on their present fishing operation. Quite obviously, some of them probably do not owe any money at all on their vessels and equipment, but I would venture to say that probably some of them owe very significant amounts of money, and with interest rates at what they are today and with no indication that they are likely to fall, the situation is very precarious indeed.

In referring to the Copes report it will be necessary for me to quote extracts selectively. I do not intend to deliberately take out of context extracts from the report—but it could be construed that in certain instances I have deliberately done that. As I have said, I have no personal axe to grind whatsoever. I refer to a number of Professor Copes' comments in his report. First, at page 23 he states:

The Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery obviously has been the victim of massive capital stuffing. In a previous report for the South Australian Government, written in 1976, I suggested that the Gulf St Vincent prawn stocks might be underfished, so that there might be room for some additional effort in the fishery (Copes, 1976). Since then, however, there has been both an increase in the number of vessels in the combined GSV/IS fishery and a massive effort at capital stuffing, involving triple rigging and the introduction of sophisticated electronic gear.

That clearly sets the stage in relation to the problem with which we are confronted. I now refer to page 68 of the report. In relation to overfishing, Professor Copes goes on to say:

The mid-1970s have also turned out to be a turning point in the fortunes of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery, caused by a massive escalation in fishing effort. In 1973 there were only 10 vessels fishing the GSV/IS prawn stock complex. Four years later there were 22 vessels (see Table 5). I appear to have contributed, unwittingly, to this increase in effort. In a fisheries overview study I wrote up for the South Australian Government in 1975 (published early in the following year), I stated that from a 'cursory observation it seems possible (but not certain) that the Gulf St Vincent prawn stock is underexploited' (Copes, 1976, page 19). This very cautious comment on my part has been cited as a reason for allowing additional effort in the fishery. Based on catch statistics that were available up to 1973-74 my guess appears to have been a reasonable conclusion. Indeed, in the light of a dozen years of additional information (Tables 1 and 8) it appears that GSV/IS prawn stocks remained underutilised, probably through 1975. Thus some increase in effort was undoubtedly warranted, though not the massive increase that has taken place.

The report continues:

In 1977 the South Australian Government issued two additional prawn licences in Gulf St Vincent, bringing the number there to 14, while the Commonwealth Government allowed eight vessels to fish Investigator Strait. The combined fleet of 22 vessels obviously resulted in significant overfishing, reflected in declining GSV/IS catches from 1976 to 1980 (Tables 1 and 10). In Investigator Strait, where operators have been issued experimental permits rather than permanent licences, the number of authorised operators was reduced from eight in 1979 to two in 1982. Poor catches were causing some of these operators to withdraw in any case.

The reduction of fishing power in the Investigator Strait has been more than offset by developments in Gulf St Vincent. King (1977, page 51) lists the following factors that may account for increases in effective effort of the fleet:

(1) The development of new fishing techniques including finer otter board adjustment and the use of lighter 'tickler' chains.
(2) The use of more efficient net styles.
(3) Increased use of technical equipment such as radar.
(4) Increase in skill and knowledge of skippers.
(5) Increase in engine horsepower and, therefore, net towing speed.

Most importantly, the entire fleet of 14 vessels was allowed to convert from uniform single rigging in 1980-81, via double rigging for some vessels, to universal triple rigging in 1982-83. No calculation of the effect of this on fishing power is available. SAFIC has informally rated the power of a triple-rigged vessel as twice that of a single-rigged vessel (Table 8), but other informal estimates I have encountered ascribe greater power still to triple rigging.

So, we now have the picture of the massive increase in the effort on that fishery. I turn now to page 78 of the report, referring to the mismanagement issue. Once again, I quote selectively. Professor Copes states:

I consider that my obligations will be fulfilled by dealing with the heart of the matter, which requires answering the following two questions:

(1) Has there been mismanagement of the GSV/IS prawn fishery?
(2) If there has been mismanagement, to what extent is the DOF to blame?

My answer to the first question is 'yes, there has been mismanagement'.

On the next page he goes on to say:

Before it is possible to allocate blame for the mismanagment that occurred, it is necessary to determine what forces contributed to putting the excessive effort in place. I consider the following factors important:

(1) The issuance of excessive numbers of licences.
(2) The jurisdictional division between Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait.
(3) The authorisation of gear modifications to increase fishing power.
(4) The transferability of licences.
(5) The failure to apply strict time and area closures.
(6) The lack of management cooperation between the SVGPBOA and the DOF.

A brief recapitulation of the relevant discussion from preceding parts of this report will show how these factors together brought about serious overfishing. Until 1973 the GSV/IS prawn stocks were significantly underexploited by the 10 small single-rigged vessels in the authorised fleet. But the addition during the next four years of four vessels in Gulf St Vincent plus a new fleet of eight vessels in Investigator Strait brought the fishery from a state of considerable underfishing to a state of moderate overfishing.

Professor Copes goes on to talk about fleet size and composition, and says:

It is patently evident that the current fleet must be reduced in fishing power. I am speaking here of a single fleet for the combined GSV/IS fishery, assuming that my recommendation to combine the two zones into one will be accepted and put into effect. Fleet fishing power may be reduced by removing vessels from the fleet, by cutting back on the authorised fishing power of individual vessels, or by a combination of the two.

He goes on to say:

I will recommend a buy-back scheme—details of which will be given below—that can be used in an ongoing fashion to reduce the fleet to optimal size. It is my recommendation that this scheme be used to meet a first priority of cutting back the existing combined GSV/IS fleet to 10 vessels. This should take care of

the most immediate need of reducing greatly excessive fishing power and correspondingly excessive fleet harvesting costs. After that the scheme can be used to draw out further vessels as needed, which will be the case particularly if the fleet is allowed to upgrade to larger and more efficient vessels.

My proposal for an initial fleet reduction to 10 vessels from the current number of 16 is not based on any precise calculation, as sufficient data are not available therefor. I consider a cut-back by six vessels to represent a conservative estimate of the reduction in fishing power that needs to be achieved in the present fleet, assuming that individual vessel characteristics remain the same. Of course, if and when individual vessels are allowed to be replaced by larger and more efficient vessels, a further reduction in the number would have to take place.

Once again he is consistently referring to the excess effort in the resource, and he goes on to say:

Essentially, I am proposing a trial and error process of finding the right fleet configuration in relation to the optimum catch level.

This legislation does not rely on a trial and error process of finding the right fleet configuration. It is quite precise. The Minister, in his normal fashion, has decided to say 'Right: six is the answer.' How he arrives at exactly six as the right answer I do not know, when Professor Copes cannot really say that that is the magic figure. He states:

I am proposing a trial and error process of finding the right fleet configuration in relation to the optimum catch level . . .

To me, that indicates that Professor Copes has to some degree an open mind on exactly what is the right fleet configuration. If we then go to page 161, he says:

It seems unlikely to me that the Government will find grounds on which as many as six vessels should be compulsorily removed from the GSV/IS fishery. I assume, therefore, that there will be a need for a scheme of voluntary buy-back for up to six vessels.

I think that statement by Professor Copes is extremely important, and I will refer to it again for the benefit of members:

It seems unlikely to me that the Government will find grounds on which as many as six vessels should be compulsorily removed from the GSV/IS fishery. I assume, therefore, that there will be a need for a scheme of voluntary buy-back for up to six vessels.

I find it difficult to have anything placed before me which is more clear than that statement. Of course, if we keep that in mind and then go to the actual recommendations of Professor Copes, the key recommendation we are talking about in this report is No. 9, which states:

Measures should be taken to remove six vessels from the Gulf St Vincent/Investigator Strait prawn fishery at the earliest opportunity, by a process of buy-back.

He is not saying that they have to be removed tomorrow: what he is saying is that they should be removed at the earliest opportunity. The 'earliest opportunity' will very much depend on the ability and capacity of those left in the industry to achieve that end result. The Minister offered to make senior officers of the Department of Fisheries available to members of the Opposition this morning for a briefing on what the Government was endeavouring to achieve with this legislation, and the department freely acknowledged that the measures they have in mind will result in a significant increase in effort by the 10 remaining in the industry.

The reason that the 10 remaining in the industry will have to significantly increase their efforts is because, if they are going to be required to meet somewhere between $70 000 and $100 000 annually to pay back the loan—and that is annually over the next 10 years—from the fund the Minister has established from which those leaving the industry will be paid then, quite obviously, there has to be a massive increase in their effort in the resource to meet the payment.

The department does not anticipate that there will be any reduction in the effort on the resource. What we are talking about is reducing the effort on this resource because it is being overtaxed, and I have referred to comments where Professor Copes has said that the vessels should be removed at the earliest opportunity.

Quite obviously, he would be wise enough to acknowledge that that will be very much determined and dictated by the ability of those remaining in the industry to buy out those leaving it. That cannot be achieved overnight. If one takes into account those licensees within the industry who have a significant overdraft on their operation and the level of interest rates with which they are confronted, one realises that to meet an additional $70 000 or $100 000 above their operating expenses will be an enormous task. Indeed, the increase in effort by them will have to be quite astronomical.

In foreshadowing the amendments that I will put forward, I point out that we are doing this for a number of reasons. First, we are endeavouring to create a situation which will require the Government to face up to its responsibility for the problems that it has created in the fishery over the years. It is totally unreasonable for the Government to expect those remaining in the industry to pay for the blunders of the Government in years gone by. For that reason, the Opposition will move amendments requiring the Government to meet 50 per cent of the cost of compensation to be paid to those persons leaving the industry. That will have a twofold effect: that of leaving those remaining in the industry with some chance of surviving and that of making the Minister extremely cautious of accepting offers that are on the excessive side, because the Government will be contributing to the pay-out. That will have a stabilising effect on the Government.

As the Bill stands, the Minister can accept virtually any offer that he believes is reasonable and pass on the account to the remaining licensees in the fishery. We see that as being too open ended. It does not acknowledge the fact that in the past 10 years the Government has been responsible for the development of this situation which has developed not as a result of what licensees have done but as a result of Government decisions and administration by the Fisheries Department. I am not trying to apportion blame to anyone in particular, but the Minister has just exercised his authority over the vine pull scheme, and in that situation the Federal and State Governments provided the total funds required.

I am not suggesting that that should be the case here. However, the fishermen did not allocate additional licences or approve triple rigging: the Government did. That is history, and it was done in good faith in the belief that going to triple rigging would enable a reduction in the cost of operation of those in the industry. Unfortunately, it resulted in a significant increase in the effort on that resource, and we are now paying the price for that with this legislation. Above all else, it is our responsibility not only to protect this resource for future generations but also to see that those involved in the fishery are fairly and justly treated.

The Opposition believes that that is not the case in this instance, so I foreshadow that we will move amendments to provide for the Minister to remove up to six vessels, if necessary, over the next three years. That means that three vessels will be removed forthwith, and any other voluntary retirements from the industry (and I believe that an additional one or two licensees are considering making an offer to the Minister) will increase to five the number of those withdrawing from the industry.

The Minister and Government will find that the amendments that we are proposing are in line with Professor Copes' recommendation. I trust that the Minister will seriously consider the position that the Opposition has put

forward. As I said in my opening remarks, I have no personal axe to grind in relation to this Bill. Rather, I have endeavoured to adopt a responsible approach that I would use if I had the responsibility held by the present Minister of Fisheries.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I have shown a great deal of interest in the fishing industry during the time that I have been a member of Parliament. It has involved a considerable amount of controversy and has been of great interest to members of Parliament. It is an industry that people have virtually been invited to enter as new fisheries have developed. They developed on an ad hoc basis. After that process caused considerable problems and controversy, a program of management was eventually arrived at.

It appears to me that Governments must be very careful when accepting recommendations from instant experts from overseas. I recall some years ago that, when Professor Copes was in this country, he made recommendations to the fishing industry. I happened to attend a well attended meeting at Elliston where this matter was discussed and where I came into great conflict with a Mr Kirkegaard over those recommendations, which I described as nothing more than a socialist report implemented for a socialist Government by a socialist officer with some zeal. I make no apology for making those comments on that occasion because I think I was spot on: I certainly got a reaction from Mr Kirkegaard.

Now the Government has seen fit to bring Professor Copes out here again from British Columbia to put all things right in the prawn fishery in the Gulf of St Vincent. It is easy for those of us who will not be affected by the decisions being made: we will still be paid our salaries, as long as we can please over 50 per cent of our constituents. It is all very well for public servants to sit in judgment of these particular matters. But, the unfortunate fishermen who are endeavouring to make a living in the gulf went into the fishery believing that they had a lifetime of fishing ahead of them and planned their lifestyles and work patterns on that basis.

Unfortunately, there has been a considerable amount of agitation by certain people in the gulf. It is always dangerous to ask Governments to carry out investigations or to appoint people to conduct surveys or inquiries unless you have the chance to at least have some influence over what they will look at. I understand that Professor Copes went out on the prawn boats for only a few hours and that he was so seasick that he had to return. I was told that on the best of authority.

Mr S.J. Baker: And he is an expert!

Mr GUNN: He is an expert. It is all very well for the Minister and others to draw up a set of options as to how to eliminate three or six people from the industry. That is all very well if one is aged 65 or 68 and does not have a family. The boat may be at the end of its commercial life and it may involve a person who is keen to surrender the licence and get out of the industry. But, what happens to the person who has spent $750 000 on purchasing a boat and he may be offered only $650 000 when he has been fishing for only two or three years? I am told that, if this scheme is implemented, it will cost each fisherman approximately $80 000 per annum to meet their commitments. It would have to be a very good business that could run efficiently, meet its commitments, pay for the boat, cover depreciation and pay the taxes because, out of that $80 000, the taxes had to be paid on the $80 000. How does the Minister anticipate that these people will be able to meet this commitment? That $80 000 figure is not one that I drew off the top of my head; I conferred with a person who is well versed in the industry. While my colleague the member for Chaffey made his excellent contribution—

The Hon. M.K. Mayes: You ought to see another one if that's your advice.

Mr GUNN: You are telling me that, if you are paying for capital—

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I pose the question, and I want some straight answers. It is all very well being like Fred Astaire and being quick on your feet, but that will not help the fishermen. We want some direct answers, because we are dealing with people's livelihoods. If the Minister tried to remove some of his friends from the Public Service without providing adequate compensation, we would really have some fun. I want answers to my questions.

My prime concern is the way in which the matter will be handled, because already we have seen two people on Kangaroo Island suddenly put out of the industry. I know a little about those two people, because they fished from Venus Bay for a number of years. I well remember the afternoon when those people received the notification that they could fish off the shores of Kangaroo Island. I remember joining in the festivities with them and observing the great joy and relief that they felt in having the opportunity to be involved with a permanent fishery. In the meantime, suddenly their livelihoods have been cut off in midstream. It is all very well to say that they will be compensated by a payment of $450 000 and that may seem a reasonable amount. But, when one looks at the number of years that they had anticipated being in the industry (and obviously their families wanted to remain with them), one sees that all has gone, because it is virtually impossible to enter any of the other fisheries.

In my view, it is most unlikely that any other prawn grounds will be found in South Australia. It is most unlikely that there will be a further entry into the prawn fishery at Port Lincoln or in that area in Spencer Gulf. Also, it is most unlikely that there will be any further entry into the fishery on upper Eyre Peninsula. An attempt has been made to reduce entry into the scale fishery. A quota has now been placed on tuna, and there are problems in the rock lobster industry, as a result of which there will be no new entries there.

These people who are born, bred and raised as fishermen want to remain in the industry. It is not unreasonable that, if people are to be treated this way, they should be given some notice and some opportunity to adjust or change their lifestyles. I have read these documents very carefully and, in my experience as a member of Parliament, it is most unwise for Parliament to transfer to the Minister some of the powers that are contained here, because really the power involves determining the livelihoods of people. If they will not pay, the Minister has the power to arbitrarily set the amount of money that is to be paid each year into the fund. It has been suggested to me that that amount will be $80 000. What is to stop the Minister from saying that it might be $90 000, because no consideration will be given to the fisherman's ability to pay or to the economic viability of the fisherman concerned. No two fishermen are in the same financial situation.

Although it will not solve the problem, at least the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Chaffey will ease the burden. I believe that it is reasonable and fair to adopt that approach. I say to all the fishermen of South Australia that, if this proposal is put into effect, they should be fully aware that some of them could be next in line. Fishermen in the rock lobster industry could come under scrutiny and eight, nine or 10 of them could be arbitrarily removed from the industry without proper consultation or without proper financial compensation. In this context Parliament and the

people should be very careful. It is all very well for academics and other people to advocate buy-back schemes. It may cause the Minister some hilarity, but the Minister, like a number of members in this House, receives a considerable salary, whether or not he does any work, and he is probably a member of a generous superannuation retirement scheme, from which most of us will benefit also.

I am talking about the real world, where people can be deprived of their income and their lifelong involvement with the industry. It concerns me that these people should be given the opportunity to move into another area where they can put their talents to use. If someone's name is drawn out of the hat and suddenly they are put out of the industry and, if that person has a family who have conditioned themselves to be involved with fishing, that really affects the whole lifestyle of that group. That is something to which we should give very careful consideration.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr GUNN: As the member for Chaffey says, Professor Copes advocated voluntary withdrawal. Tonight I talked to a person who is involved in the industry, and that person is most concerned that he might be affected. He is a relatively young person, and his whole livelihood and lifestyle will be thrown into complete confusion. It affects not only the people who own the boats but also the skippers. I know what has happened. I am very concerned about extending these sorts of powers to the Minister or to the bureaucracy.

Recently I have seen what happens when the bureaucracy is given discretionary powers; it is a most dangerous course of action. Parliament should be very careful before it adopts that suggestion. In conclusion, there is a lesson to be learnt by all industry organisations. First, they should be very careful before asking the Government to carry out inquiries, reviews or other investigations into their industries, unless they are fully aware of the possible result because, once outside instant experts are imported who do not have a great deal of knowledge of the industry and who do not have to stay here and suffer the results of their recommendations, that industry can find itself in the sorts of problems faced by the fishing industry today. Some of those fishermen who never imagined that this would happen will be hit over the head.

People who belong to associations should make sure that they have some input and control of those bodies; otherwise recommendations which are not in the best interests of the organisation can go forward. Organisations should be very careful when their executive officers become too friendly with Government and Government departments, and we have seen that happen from time to time.

The member for Chaffey has put forward a set of alternative proposals which we believe will benefit the industry. His approach is far more humane and reasonable. I am concerned about the fishing industry in general, because I believe it has an important role to play in this State's economy. The coastal area of my present electorate is not as large as that of my electorate when I first entered Parliament, but I have grown up alongside the fishing industry and have been involved in representations and discussions which led to the right of people to transfer their fishing licences to give them some security in the industry. I believe that that security should be protected and that we should be very careful about arbitrarily removing people from the industry.

I look forward to the Committee deliberations, because I believe that a great deal of information must be obtained from the Minister. This morning I appreciated the briefing I was given by a departmental officer who explained the operation of the Bill's machinery. I obtained valuable information from that briefing, and I thank the Minister for making the officer available. I strongly support the member for Chaffey's comments, and I believe that any member who listened to his speech would realise that he thoroughly researched the subject. The alternatives proposed by the member for Chaffey will greatly improve the Bill if they are adopted.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I support the Bill as a South Australian, because I believe we need to protect this very important resource. If it is properly managed, the resource can be exploited for the benefit of the State. If it is not properly managed, it could disappear. From time to time, I am amazed at the member for Eyre. I think he has a fair knowledge of farming practices, but I do not think he knows much about the conservation of our natural resources. If we allowed over-fishing of our prawn stocks in St Vincent Gulf, we could reach a stage where there is nothing left to exploit. We need only look at the experience overseas in the countries which exploited their resources.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: The member for Mitcham is entitled to speak later; I suggest that he put his name on the list. If we are not careful, we will have nothing left to exploit. It is important that the House understand the summary of the Copes report, because I think it is pertinent to this issue, as follows:

> The terms of reference for this enquiry instruct me, specifically, to report on three areas of concern with respect to the prawn fishery of Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait. The precise terms in these three areas are shown below, together with a brief summary of my response in each case.
>
> 1. To assess and report to the Minister of Fisheries on the effectiveness of the management strategies being implemented in the Gulf St Vincent/Investigator Strait prawn fishery.

That is the first of the instructions. The response states:

> The Department of Fisheries is in the process of implementing a harvesting management regime in Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait similar to one that it developed and applied very successfully in Spencer Gulf. While this regime is now in operation for the Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait, it cannot be fully articulated until the results of recent survey work have been fully processed. Its effectiveness may also be limited by the less than harmonious relations that exist between Gulf St Vincent fishermen and officers of the department. I consider this harvesting management regime to be a very promising one, but believe that it requires some adjustments along the lines that I have indicated in the report. The good work in harvesting management, however, is not matched by equally effective measures in effort management, where additional initiatives are urgently required.

The report then continues:

> 2. To investigate and report to the Minister of Fisheries on the allegations of mismanagement against the Department of Fisheries by the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishermen's Association.

I have found one instance of mismanagement of a serious nature. It concerns the introduction of triple rigging in Gulf St Vincent that was authorised by the Department of Fisheries in the early 1980s. While the department explicitly recognised the need to offset this gear change by a severe restriction on trawling time, actual measures taken to control trawling time appear to have been inadequate. This error was a major factor in the serious over-fishing that has taken place in recent years. Two qualifications should be noted. In the first place, some political decisions of the past and changing practices of fishermen beyond the influence of the department, have also contributed in several ways to the fishing pressure that is responsible for the over-fishing. Secondly, I consider the general management record of the department to be good, despite the error I have noted.

> 3. To investigate and report to the Minister of Fisheries on additional management measures, where appropriate, for the Gulf St Vincent/Investigator Strait prawn fishery.

Several additional measures are called for, particularly in the area of effort management. They are summarised in the 'Recommendations and Options' section at the back of this report. Some recommendations that may be proceeded with immediately include

amalgamation of the Gulf St Vincent and Investigator Strait prawn management zones and the withdrawal of six vessels from the combined fleet. Among those that should be implemented after further research and investigation are the upgrading of prawn fishing vessels, along with an ongoing buy-back system to keep effort in the fishery at an optimum level, and the reform of the current licence fee formula.

In several areas of management the specification of further measures must depend on the Government's decision as to what distribution of benefits is the most equitable. In these areas I have analysed a number of options that the Government may wish to consider. The principal options are also listed at the back of this report. They include considerations regarding licence values and access by practising fishermen to prawn licences.

The report resulted from a call by the fishermen; they asked for it and agreed to Mr Copes chairing the committee. It is all right for the member for Eyre to denigrate Mr Copes for preparing the report, but I ask him who agreed to triple rigging in the early 1980s. I suggest that it was the then ill-fated Tonkin Government, which was mismanaging the affairs of this State. I understand that at that time no agreement could be reached on management whereby triple rigging and the effort put into fishing would ensure conservation of the stocks so that we could continue to exploit that resource. Through that argument and pig-headedness, we have seen a degrading of the resource. It is a resource that belongs to all South Australia—not just to some people.

I am very concerned at some of the proposals put forward by members opposite, particularly by the member for Chaffey. One proposal suggests that the State could pick up 50 per cent of the costs. Why should it? If the fishermen muck it up, why should someone else pick up the tab? It should be remembered that it was the fishermen who wanted triple rigging; it was they who approached the Government of the day; and it was the Government of the day which agreed to it. However, no agreement could be reached with the Fisheries Department on how the triple rigging should be used. If the fishermen were left to their own devices, the resource in St Vincent Gulf and Investigator Strait would be exploited until all the fish had disappeared. That is one option for the Government—to do nothing and simply not worry about it: let the business failures take their normal course, and those people can go bankrupt! These people—and also members opposite—believe in the free enterprise system but they want the Government to pick up the tab.

The Hon. H. Allison: You put the additional licence in, we didn't.

Mr GREGORY: I am just telling you about the triple rigging and what Professor Copes had to say. There is no ducking and weaving, because they wanted it and they got it, and now they are crying because they got what they wanted. What really intrigued me was the Investigator Strait prawn fishery situation. In 1982 six fishermen were taken out of that fishery by the Federal Government with no compensation.

Members interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: I do not think members opposite complained then like they are complaining now. The two remaining fishermen understood that they were licensed on a year by year basis. In this country we have well managed fisheries, and I am of the view that, if we abrogate our authority in this area, we will not have prawns to fish in St Vincent Gulf. The Spencer Gulf fishery is well managed, and it shows, because people there cooperate. I understand that the fishery on the west coast is one of the few fisheries in the world to have recovered from being over-fished; it has been managed properly, and now two more boats have been allowed back into the fishery and are experiencing good catches.

I have been advised that the St Vincent Gulf fishery should produce about 400 tonnes of prawns a year and, if these vessels are removed, that can be achieved with good management. One fisherman has made a sealed offer and wants to get out. What other way is there to reduce the fishery? Of course, we could take the easy option and do nothing and just let the catches go down until somebody goes bankrupt, but that is not being responsible. Sometimes being responsible means you have to make a tough decision. Perhaps if a tough decision had been made in the early 1980s and you said, 'There'll be no triple rigging unless there's a reduction of boats in the fishery,' we would not be experiencing the present problems.

It is always very difficult when decisions have to be taken that result in somebody being unable to work in his chosen field of endeavour. I sympathise with the member for Eyre when he talks about people who set themselves up with the intention of spending a lifetime in the industry, because I spent all my life representing people who thought they had a lifetime in industry but found out they did not, and this is the first time that the people in question have come across this situation. It is something I have experienced with the people I represent for a long period.

The Hon. H. Allison: They didn't provide the capital.

Mr GREGORY: They provided their labour and they just got wiped off as though they were dirty. What is so sacrosanct about capital when, if the people concerned are not going so well, the State has to pick up the tab? Members opposite are supposed to have a philosophy of free enterprise, but when businesses fail they want the Government to pick up the tab. We experience that time and time again.

Members interjecting:

Mr GREGORY: Why don't you be honest about it? A mistake has been made, and this is the only way to get out of it. The people who are going to benefit are those left in the industry. Let them pay for it and, if they do not want to, perhaps we will not have a resource at all, which would be a shame. There have been reductions in effort in other fisheries. If the Government had not seen to that, there would be no rock lobster industry in the South-East; if limits had not been placed on scale fishing, we would not have that resource and area of recreation for the tourist industry.

These hard decisions need to be taken, as they do in other areas, for the conservation of our State's resources and its heritage. If we do not take those decisions, we will have nothing left. To do nothing, as suggested by the members opposite, is to just sit back like Nero did with his fiddle while Rome burnt. Let us see when we can get by with just three boats out of the fishery. The trouble is that when they finish seeing there is nothing left to see except water and some seaweed—no prawns! That is what their policy, if successful, would mean. If that happened, it would be a damn shame.

A number of people working in processing plants in this industry have no capital except their lives; there are a number of South Australians who like to be able to eat prawns from time to time who would not be able to eat South Australian prawns but would have to rely on prawns from somewhere else. They are the important things. This is a responsible measure that is being taken by the State Government to preserve a valuable State resource so that we can exploit it properly for years to come. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FAIR TRADING BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TRADE PRACTICES (STATE PROVISIONS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRADE PRACTICES AND FAIR TRADING) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TRADE MEASUREMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I take this opportunity to draw two matters to the attention of the House. The first matter relates to changes which have been effected within the Engineering and Water Supply Department whereby the number of persons available for overtime emergency situations has been greatly reduced, thereby markedly reducing the operations that they are allowed to undertake if they are called out.

We have a situation where, if a break is reported, an officer will in most cases attend and decide whether it is a genuine emergency that will have an influence on a very wide area. If it is, then the crew may well be called in; if it is viewed as something of lesser importance, then the possibility exists of the turncock turning off the water from that area throughout the night until a normal crew can attend the following day.

We then have the situation where homes are without a water service for some time during the night. Not only are people unable to wash, shower and see to their normal requirements but they cannot use the toilet in the proper fashion. Also, we must consider the situation of a person in a country area who has stock to look after, and being out of water for an indeterminate time is to the detriment of the wellbeing of stock. I draw to the attention of the Minister of Water Resources that he sits on the edge of a very major calamity. Pigs and poultry in a battery situation may survive for only a very short period of time indeed if denied access to water in such circumstances, having regard to the prevailing environment that exists in those batteries.

Also there is a situation of a person with horses, and such a circumstance occurred at Roseworthy recently. A person in the township of Roseworthy, with five horses in a paddock, reported to the department a rupture of a pipe on a roadway at about 8.30 at night. The water was turned off, and the only water that his horses had access to was the trough full that was available at the time. Anyone who has looked after horses would know that they are heavy consumers of water and that they will go through fences looking for an alternative supply if they are denied access to their usual supply. I foresee the distinct possibility of claims being made against the E & WS Department for injuries to horses that have broken through barbed wire fences.

One might think that this is a slight embellishment of the situation, but I warn the Minister that this sort of thing can happen very quickly. I refer particularly to the situation concerning intensive industries associated with pigs and poultry. For example, tens of thousands of birds can be involved and, in the case of Intensive Industries, that company has three piggeries in the Gawler area with about 100 000 pigs. If they are denied access to water (because of this new direction from the E & WS Department) very major losses will occur.

I point out to the House that the memorandum that has been issued to the district superintendents of the E & WS Department indicates that a recurrent expenditure blowout has occurred to the end of December 1986. It states:

> Expenditure to the end of December 1986 indicates that the Metropolitan Operations Branch will significantly overspend its budget allocation, by about $.5 million. All areas are contributing to this, with Metropolitan North [which covers the Gawler area] being accountable for approximately $140 000.

I recognise that there are difficulties associated with budgetary constraints. I realise that there is an important need for ministerial direction or departmental direction to contain overexpenditure. I refer specifically to the damage that is likely to be done to health and to animal wellbeing, and I urge a quick rethinking of the circumstances that have brought about the situations to which I have just referred.

I shall advise the House later in relation to other aspects of activities associated with the E & WS Department. At this stage I refer briefly to the E & WS memorandum. It provides:

> *(a)* Leaking or Damaged Service
>
> (i) The Waterman will effect the repairs listed in clause 18 of section 1 of the Watermans manual—see appendix 1.
>
> (ii) If the fault is a defective jumper valve in a departmental stopcock larger than 20 mm, he will advise the consumer to call a plumber to remedy the fault in the consumers internal piping which necessitated the use by consumer of the departmental stopcock, and that the stopcock will be repaired ASAP during normal working hours.

This refers to the continuing argument of a consumer having responsibility of ensuring that no breakdown to a service occurs, but I believe that things are getting to a pretty sorry state if late at night—and particularly in view of the sorts of charges that are demanded by plumbers—they cannot use a departmental stopcock to turn off the supply that is affecting them alone and having no effect on their neighbours.

There are other situations where it is known quite simply that after having been told of a breakage and of water running away the department has said, 'Just let it run overnight and we will think about putting a stop in it.' What sense is there in the major promotions that are heard on radio and being seen on television at present to reduce the use of water in South Australia, when water is allowed to go down the drain, due to this community service organisation being denied the right to stop that unnecessary wastage?

The second matter to which I want to refer tonight I believe is an indictment of the system and the present Government. It may not be entirely the Government's fault, as the matter has not been addressed by Parliament for a number of years. I refer to a headline that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 21 February 1987 headed 'Widow to sue over policeman's death'. The article revealed that the widow of the late Martin Harnath, who was the police sergeant in charge of the underwater police control group and who unfortunately was blown up in an accident at Thebarton Barracks, now more than 12 months after his death is still

in a destitute state, because the system has not allowed proper consideration to be given to her needs.

Mr Ferguson: Some workers compensation would have been paid out.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I point out to the member for Henley Beach that the system does not allow for the unfortunate widow of a person who has given his life in the service of this State and who provided a very vital service to South Australia in the Police Force over a long time to lead a normal or a reasonable life, with some financial assistance to tide her over the long period that it took to get this matter before the Coroner. Either the system of getting the information to the Coroner was inordinately protracted and led to the circumstance or there has been a lack of compassion which has been addressed by the Parliament over the time, which has led to the headline referred to, that is, 'Widow to sue over policeman's death'. The article stated:

> The widow of a policeman who died after an explosion at Thebarton Police Barracks last year plans to sue the S.A. Police Department for unspecified damages. Mrs Rose Harnath, wife of the late officer-in-charge of the police underwater recovery section; Sergeant Third Grade Matin Harnath, said yesterday she was seeking further legal advice despite being told by one solicitor that she had no case against the police. On January 29 the Deputy State Coroner found that Martin Henry Harnath died in hospital as a result of injuries sustained in an explosion which blew him out of a boat on a trailer on 18 September 1986. He found the explosion was caused after Harnath lit a welding torch . . .

It goes on to describe other aspects of the difficulties that this woman and indeed other members of the Police Force have found themselves in over a long period of time.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I refer again to the matter that I raised yesterday in relation to the problem of the poor financial advice given to my constituents from time to time. I drew the analogy of someone robbing a bank, and the headlines that they draw from robbing a bank and getting away with certain amounts of money, whereas the advisers to whom that I have referred are handing out poor financial advice and getting away with far larger amounts of money, with very little being done about this.

The frustrating part about it is that, as a member of the South Australian Parliament, I know that there are people who are tendering advice on which my constituents will eventually lose money, but until an action is perpetrated there is very little I can do as a Parliamentarian to stop it.

I refer also to the problems that occur from time to time of being approached by constituents who have invested money in very doubtful ventures; some of them include real estate, fruit farms in Queensland, pine forests in New South Wales, and a whole host of investments where anyone with any knowledge of the investment world at all could see that these schemes are no more than money making schemes that will be used to bleed the public of their money.

The *Advertiser* of Monday 9 February had a half-page article by Malcolm Newell on a gentleman called Eddie Solomon. Mr Newell utilised his space in the *Advertiser* as far as was practical to warn investors about the gentleman concerned. I am aware that Mr Newell was in a situation where he had to be careful because of the laws of libel, and probably could not have inserted into that article many of the things he wished to properly say. The said Mr Solomon circularised my small business people in August of last year with a document entitled 'Eddie Solomon Bank and Trust Corporation Incorporated'. This bank—and I use the word 'bank' very lightly—was in fact allegedly a portfolio management account.

Mr Solomon has stated that the bank would remain secret, private and confidential, and that the identity of all investors in it would be kept secret. Investors were promised that in the portfolio management account the money could be accepted in any major world currency, including US dollars, Japanese yen, Swiss francs, Deutschmarks, Canadian dollars, Australian dollars, pounds Sterling, etc.

Mr Solomon also promised that the account would offer depositors a 22 per cent per annum income of funds deposited. The interest was to be calculated from the day that the investment money was received and it was to be credited to the accounts on 31 December each year or on the closure of the account. Mr Solomon also suggested that only 24 hours notice was required to withdraw funds from the account and that withdrawal may be made in any currency that the person wished to nominate. The investors were to be provided with a numbered bank account of which the identity of the depositors would never be revealed. Both deposits and withdrawals would be on the basis of using numbers and no names.

Mr Solomon stated that his bank is managed from the best tax havens and financial centres of the world and protected by strict confidentiality, and he mentioned the Cayman Islands, the Turks and Nauru, Vanuatu and Bahrein. Mr Solomon went on to fully explain that, for example, in the Cayman Islands confidentiality is preserved by way of legislation. He also explained that confidentiality is also available in the other tax havens mentioned. He made the point that Eddie Solomon's bank could not divulge information to anyone, even the Governments and Government officials, and he assured people that the money that they were investing in the Eddie Solomon bank would be kept extremely confidential. He mentioned the Banking Act of Nauru and its provision for secrecy, Bahrein with similar provisions and he also mentioned that Bahrein is a major financial centre for oil rich Arab money and the offshore banks conduct business on a tax free basis.

Mr Solomon then mentioned the way in which he would accumulate this interest and the income derived from the bank's portfolio management account, and he stated that this account is (and I quote) 'absolutely tax free'. Mr Solomon stated this is an ideal opportunity for private investors to take part in a world wide investment program to acquire high yielding investment in various part of the world. Mr Solomon assured investors that, more than ever before, crooked Government officials are interfering with the private lives of innocent people in most countries. He then went on to list the way that checks are made on people's accounts, and so forth.

Mr Solomon has also stated that his bank can afford to give a high return on the money deposited and that people earning money through hard work and taking the right financial decisions were, in fact, entitled to high returns. He assured depositors that the money was invested wisely in high quality real estate development, bullion, rare coins, fine arts, the stock market and various profitable business ventures. Mr Solomon was then loud in the praise of people who invested in his bank and he then gave tables of how a person investing in his bank could double their money within four years.

Now I was extremely interested in this proposition, Sir. Attached to the circular letter was an application to open an account in U.S. dollars, Swiss francs, French francs, Japanese yen, Canadian dollars, Dutch gilders, Deutschmarks, Australian dollars, and anything else. It was a roneoed sheet, which was attached to his circular letter, inviting people to open an account with this particular bank.

I took this matter up with the Taxation Department, with the Department of Corporate Affairs and had some discussions with Federal Bank officials over the telephone. This resulted in some interesting things being revealed to me. The first one was that there is no such thing, at the moment, as a tax free investment. The Australian Taxation Department has informed me that taxation must be paid on all income, no matter what source it is derived from, so that the claims by Mr Solomon that he had a tax free proposition was wrong for a start. The Taxation Department has also stated that before Australian money can be deposited in a tax free haven, (and I have been a bit surprised that there are some tax free havens), then permission to do so must be achieved from the Australian Taxation Office and the law would not assist anyone who would merely want to take out their money in Australia and deposit it in a tax free haven.

My investigations have revealed also that officials in the Australian Taxation Office and Corporate Affairs would be extremely interested in the sort juggling in international currency that this document presents. I believe that there have been some South Australians who have been caught up in this proposition, but no action has been taken in South Australia because the matter is being investigated by the New South Wales Corporate Affairs Commission.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Before I turn to the substance of my remarks tonight, I would like to compliment the Minister of Transport on the delightful way in which he aroused the House to considerable enjoyment at Question Time today by taking me apart quite systematically in a way which, surprisingly, I found enjoyable. I am certain that I did not enjoy it as much as the Minister or his colleagues did, but it was done without malice and very cleverly. My only regret is that he did not mention what might have been a page 3 photograph at the time I launched the VISA campaign, unless I missed it in the uproar and furore—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The T-shirt.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The T-shirt. I do not think the Minister on the front bench was in Parliament at the time.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: We were there, wherever it was held. I cannot remember the venue, but I certainly remember you in the T-shirt.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I thought it was before the Minister entered the Parliament. That aside, Mr Speaker, having congratulated the Minister on a delicate and clever performance, I must now say that he missed the point. The point that I was making is that, whilst publicity is important for a Minister of Tourism (indeed, for any Minister), performance is essential, and it is the Minister's performance which was the subject of my speech and which I wish to proceed to assess once again.

I have in front of me the statement which the Minister made in another place this afternoon, a quite extraordinary statement in which she attempted to refute some of the policy criticisms that I made of her administration of the portfolio. One of those attempts reads:

> The department's budget is fully committed, as well it should be in a well run department, but the department has sufficient funds to complete its scheduled program of activities for 1986-87.

If that is the case, why is the department holding cheques for six weeks? Why is it sending out to small businesses to whom it is a debtor cheques which are dated early January, which are arriving at the end of February and which should have arrived at the end of December? Why is there a ban on the use of couriers? If travel agents want urgent material from the department they cannot get it. Why are composite brochures not available from the Travel Centre? Why can one not get information on holiday flats from the Travel Centre? Why, when one seeks this information, is it provided not in the form of brochures but in the form of computer print-outs? It is because the Government simply has not got the money to provide the basic necessities to the tourism industry in accordance with its function in the Travel Centre.

Indeed, a key person in the industry who deals frequently with the Travel Centre said to me today—endorsing the remarks that I made in the House last night—that the place is not a patch on what it used to be. The Minister went on to attempt to say that brochures will continue to be produced between now and the end of the financial year and that all planned brochure commitments are to continue on schedule. What she did not say is that the brochure commitments which are planned are so puny, so mean and so inadequate that they simply do not meet the needs of the industry.

It was public knowledge at the South Australian Tourism Industry Conference held last year and attended by most key people in the industry that the Regional Tourism Associations were absolutely irate when told at that conference that no funds were available in the budget for the production of regional literature. It is no use the Minister's saying that that is the province of private enterprise: it is not. There is a Government responsibility to sell this State in a corporate way, and the Government is not fulfilling that responsibility.

The next extraordinary statement that the Minister made was a pseudo explanation for the fact that the department had no maps of the State to be provided from the Travel Centre. As anyone who has travelled within South Australia or visited any other State will know, tourism and travel maps are absolutely essential. They are normally freely available from any Government outlet; in fact, they give them away in bundles. The Minister says that the departmental map is not available because it is being redrafted to reflect recent changes in tourist products such as the sealing of the Stuart Highway. If that statement were not so pathetic, it would be comic.

These things do not spring up on the Government six months after they occur: they are well planned. Everybody knows that these changes are going to occur. You do not build big resorts, for example, or make changes to Lincoln Cove overnight: these things happen with months, if not years, of lead time, and that gives the department ample time in which to prepare a map to replace depleted supplies when they run out so as not to leave a department actually selling Shell road maps from the Travel Centre for $1.10. If members opposite are not blushing at the inadequacies of their Minister in regard to that basic commodity of a travel centre, then they should be.

The Minister then went on to attempt to defend the fact that the contract with the advertising agency was not renewed because of 'the impending report of the market research study and the completion of the Tourism Development Plan'. Again, the Minister knew when the contract would run out. I understand that it was a two year contract, and for two years she must have known that it would run out in December. To commission market research at a time when a contract is about to run out and then to wait for that market research to be assessed before undertaking a new contract again clearly is a case of bad management, bad planning, lack of foresight and a very clear indication

that there is a big attempt to stretch things out in order to create gaps so that expenditure will not be required and thus budget overruns and inadequacies in the budget cannot be met.

At this time of perfect weather and the wine harvest, agencies want to shoot video film for television commercials, but this is the downtime when the Department of Tourism does absolutely nothing, because it does not have the funds. The Minister then blandly attempts to explain away resignations of senior officers in the department on the grounds of, 'Isn't it lovely: they are going into the private sector.' I think we should ask why six senior officers, in a matter of weeks, have decided to leave that department. A department with so few staff (not many more than 100) cannot afford to lose key, experienced and longstanding people and certainly it cannot afford to lose them en masse.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Indeed. The Minister says, 'Isn't it a mark of their confidence in the industry that they are willing to give up Public Service security?' What balderdash! Some of those resignations may have been planned for some time, but there is no way that the Minister can explain away six of them. There is no doubt whatsoever that the officers in the department are very deeply concerned about her lack of leadership. The Minister says that shortly she will announce details of a review in the Department of Tourism.

I am very glad that the Premier has come into the Chamber, because I think that, if he is interested in his future and that of his Government, he would be very wise to address himself to the failure of the Minister of Tourism through her inadequacies and, in order to deal with these matters on a matter of policy and logical debate, I challenge the Minister of Tourism to a public debate in which these issues can be canvassed.

The Minister is in another place. There is no possibility of my questioning her directly or responding to her directly. I would like to be able to do so, and I challenge the Hon. Barbara Wiese to a public debate on tourism issues any time, any place in South Australia.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 26 February at 11 a.m.