

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 August 1987

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

WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE BILL

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

FISHERIES (SOUTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERIES RATIONALISATION) BILL

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

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 90 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any measures to legalise the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Bannon and Meier.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CRAB FISHING

A petition signed by 210 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit professional crab fishing within five kilometres of the Ardrossan jetty was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 26, 37, 38, 48, 63, 82, 104, 111, 112, 118, and 165.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott):

Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Fees and Yarding of Livestock.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold):

Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1986.

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

Highways Department—Approvals to Lease Departmental Property, 1986-87.

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

Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Regulations—Document Fees.

Supreme Court Act 1935—Regulations—Document Fees. Justices Act 1921—Rules—Document Fees.

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

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—

Gulf St Vincent Fishery—Licences (Amendment).

General Fishery—Restricted Netting (Port Pirie) and

Razor Fish.

QUESTION TIME

INVESTMENT IN PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Mr OLSEN: I address my question to the Premier. Is the South Australian Government examining a Victorian scheme to allow private investment in public authorities? The Cain Government is to allow private investors and financial institutions to buy shares in its public authorities as a means of reducing their long-term liabilities. Initially, shares valued at \$300 million will be on offer. The Western Australian Government has already said it is examining similar proposals for its State Energy Commission. In South Australia, the scheme could have particular application to the Electricity Trust, which has total liabilities of \$1.3 billion.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member would be aware that, for instance, in the case of the South Australian Oil and Gas Authority and the South Australian Gas Company, a very exciting and interesting merger operation has been announced and work is under way to present legislation to this Parliament to give effect to aspects of that project. So, in some respects in relation to getting the best value from our assets, we are certainly well ahead of Victoria or Western Australia or anybody else.

I have not been able to examine the details of the Victorian scheme and I must say that, at first glance, I can see some problems with it. For instance, I am not sure how members of the public could be induced to subscribe to a public floating of the State Electricity Commission of Victoria when one looks at the debt burden that that authority carries. They could be assured of a dividend only if, first, a dividend was guaranteed for their participation (I am not quite sure how that would tie up with market forces operating in that area) and, secondly, by making it pay by raising electricity prices.

For some time this Government has been involved in various financial schemes aimed not at raising electricity prices in order to pay dividends to private shareholders but at lowering electricity tariffs because of the importance to the State. I do not really see how the scheme as proposed in Victoria—I have yet to examine the details of it—could have any great advantage in this State. Having said that, I point out that the Government is always willing to look at financial opportunities and arrangements, but I stress again to the House the bottom line. This Government is not involved in the sale of public assets that are either in the public interest to maintain or are making a profit. All that the Government is interested in doing is getting maximum value and return from those assets in which the community has invested. That commercialisation policy will be followed. It has shown great advantages for ETSA in terms of its financing. However, I do not believe that, in the case of the various utilities of this State, the Victorian scheme is necessarily an appropriate course to follow.

PASS SCHEME

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Education advise the House on what has been achieved with the PASS (Parents and Students in Schools) scheme and Government

support for primary education in South Australia? Last year the State Government highlighted the increasing need for involvement by parents in schools by designating 1986 as the year of parents and students in schools. At that time the Minister said that he was working towards enabling parents to have an input into the selection of their local school principals. Last week, primary schools celebrated Primary School Day. Can the Minister advise of the many good things that are happening in our schools as a result of the partnership between parents and teachers who work for the benefit of our students?

Mr LEWIS: I could not quite hear what the member for Albert Park was asking when he put his question initially but, unless I am mistaken, he said, 'Can the Minister tell us?' I draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to those two words: 'tell us'. I would be amazed if that is not another way of asking the Minister to comment and I ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule that question out of order on the basis that it simply asks the Minister to comment on a statement that was made under the guise of an explanation by the member for Albert Park about the subject matter on which he pretended to seek information.

The SPEAKER: Order! Like the honourable member for Murray-Mallee, I had some difficulty hearing the exact words used by the honourable member for Albert Park. However, I interpret the words 'tell us' as meaning, 'Could the Minister inform the House'. On that basis I am not prepared to rule the question out of order. However, I repeat my caution to members with respect to the use of explanations which are in themselves comments.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am pleased to advise the honourable member and all members that last Thursday the Government was able to announce that agreement had been reached with interested parties to provide for the role of parents to be formalised and that, in future, on each selection panel that chooses a principal in one of our schools a parent will be invited to take their place. That is one of the many matters that has evolved from the year of parents and students in schools and it confirms the role that parents are playing in school communities throughout the State. I very much appreciated the exposition of our primary school programs on Primary School Day last Thursday, when most primary schools in this State were able to present their work to the broader community. All too often that work is not understood by the wider community.

I also take this opportunity to say that, indeed, over the past decade there has been a substantial increase in expenditure per capita on education in our schools—a 40 per cent increase in real terms. Efforts have been made over the past four years to modify the primary school staffing formula where real progress has been made. In particular, significant improvements have been made to the library formula to the benefit of primary and junior primary schools, especially the smaller primary schools in the State.

Also, in 1984 it was possible to introduce a new set of formulae for primary and junior primary schools. Primary schools have been provided with additional Aboriginal resource teachers, additional language teachers and additional curriculum support, and there has been an increase in non-contact time for teachers in primary schools. In addition, 100 new school assistant positions were provided last year and they focused on primary schools and children in the system who have special needs. Indeed, a great deal has been achieved in recent years by way of additional resources for the primary sector and very real progress has been made in formalising the tremendous work that parents do in the life of our school communities.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Following new moves within the Labor Party to rewrite policy so that major public assets like Telecom, Qantas, Australian Airlines and Australia Post can be sold, does the Minister stand by the statements he made to the annual conference of the Public Service Association on 26 July—less than a month ago—in which he said that the 'entire community will suffer' from such a policy and that it 'would provide nothing more than one-off revenue gains to meet short-term budgetary shortfalls'?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I thank the honourable member for his question, which has nothing at all to do with my portfolio, of course. However, I welcome the opportunity to make a short dissertation on the merits of privatisation and commercialisation and to expand a little on the speech I gave to the Public Service Association. My suspicion is that the Deputy Premier has not read that speech.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Deputy Leader has not read it. And my suspicion is that the Deputy Premier has not read it, either. I will certainly send him a copy and it has, if I may say so in all modesty, become something of a best seller. The speech pointed out quite clearly the very clear difference recognised by the Public Service Association between a policy of privatisation for privatisation's sake and a policy of commercialisation. In fact, I will ask the PSA to contact the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to give him an explanation of it. However, the issues are very important for the Labor movement. I suppose we can have public ownership for a variety of reasons, the relevancy of which changes from time to time. There are people who say that public ownership is a very important principle for ideological reasons. I have some sympathy with that point of view—although not a great deal. I accept that it is a legitimate point of view. There are others who would argue that public ownership for public ownership's sake is not necessarily a good thing, and that is the point of view that I would argue. I would argue that there can be public ownership for a variety of reasons.

I now refer to two reasons. It is important for public ownership to play a social role. In relation to the examples given by the Deputy Leader, I think that Qantas plays a very important national and social role, although it is arguable whether it should be 100 per cent Australian owned. I think that Telecom provides a very important social benefit, particularly for those people who live in the country. If Telecom were run purely on a commercial basis, those of us who live in the country would be enormously disadvantaged, particularly when one considers that it can cost between \$15 000 and \$25 000 to establish a telephone connection in some remote part of the State. If members of the Opposition believe in privatising Telecom, let them stand up and argue that matter in their country electorates among all those agrarian socialists, because they will find that their constituents do not agree with that proposition.

I think that if a problem exists with Australian Airlines it is probably a management problem, and that is something that should be addressed, because I believe that, where there is no social necessity for public ownership, the only rationale can be a commercial necessity. That is a view that I support very strongly. I support the idea of Australian Airlines staying in public hands, provided that it makes money for us. I say that, not because we are particularly avaricious but, rather, because we have to broaden our income base, and that applies to any Government, whether it be Liberal,

Labor or some other Party—there is no option. I made that point very clear to the Public Service Association. If members opposite feel that I have not answered them fully, I am happy to continue, but I repeat that public ownership may be desirable for not only social but also commercial reasons. Any case that is presented to me in relation to public ownership would be measured by those criteria, and the PSA completely agrees with that.

GRAND PRIX CELEBRITY RACE

Mr RANN: Will the Premier invite the newly re-elected Prime Minister of New Zealand (David Lange) to attend this year's Australian Formula One Grand Prix in Adelaide? I have been reliably advised that the New Zealand Prime Minister is an avid supporter of motor racing. Last January he participated in New Zealand's summer series of formula saloon class car racing. I understand that Mr Lange drove a somewhat souped-up Ford Laser at the internationally famous Pukekohe motor circuit, south of Auckland, and acquitted himself rather well during another event at the Mansfield Park circuit at Palmerston North.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I welcome the question from the honourable member. It gives me an opportunity to place on record our congratulations, from members of this side of the House anyway, to Mr Lange for a stunning victory in New Zealand. It is an endorsement and vindication of policies implemented in difficult economic times, and I suppose that the complete disarray of the conservative forces in that country causes no joy to members opposite.

Certainly, I would be delighted to invite the Prime Minister to attend the Grand Prix. I understand, as the honourable member mentioned, that Mr Lange has a personal interest in the sport—and indeed some competence as a speedway driver. As members would know, the celebrity race is one of the features of the Grand Prix, and I have already asked the Grand Prix board whether, if the Prime Minister could come, it would be possible for him to participate. Obviously subject to checking both with Prime Minister Lange and with the organisers, I understand that there is a strong possibility this will eventuate.

I might add that such a visit highlights how important the Grand Prix is to us in economic and international terms. If Mr Lange accepts this invitation, we will have an opportunity to talk about the growing trade relationship between South Australia and New Zealand. Members will recall that Mr Lange's Government was the first to establish a trade and tourism office, as well as a local consular representation, which Prime Minister Lange opened here in Adelaide in July 1986. That was very welcome indeed. The trade that I mentioned is very big: it has been estimated that in the past financial year South Australia exported goods worth \$140 million to New Zealand. That was 35 per cent up on the previous year.

In terms of bilateral trade, South Australia also imported from New Zealand directly through our ports \$30 million worth of goods, and if one adds those goods coming indirectly from other parts of Australia, emanating from New Zealand, the total is probably some \$100 million. So, it is a big trade; it is a growing trade, and it is of great economic benefit to this State. Mr Lange's New Zealand Government has recognised its importance by the establishment of that office. Next year Australia and New Zealand will be involved in the next round of CER between Australia and New Zealand and, again, I would point out that it would certainly give an opportunity to talk about the relevant aspects with the New Zealand Government. I am certainly keen to invite

the Prime Minister of New Zealand to the Grand Prix, and I will do so. I hope that he will come, and I hope that he will be not just an observer but a participator.

PRIVATISATION

Mr OLSEN: I address my question to the Premier. Whose attitude to privatisation does he support—that of his own Minister of Labour or that of the Prime Minister, or does he want to continue to have a bob each way under the guise of 'commercialisation'? We have heard the Minister repeat this afternoon his opposition to any form of privatisation, fullstop. We know that the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer want Labor Party policy changed so that major assets can be sold. In South Australia prior to the last State election we saw the Labor Party's opposition to privatisation, but subsequently it implemented key components of the Liberal Party's privatisation policy, under the guise of 'commercialisation'. So that the South Australian public can be clear about where the State Government stands—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is clearly debating the question. If he cannot simply stick to one or two basic facts of the matter, such as will make the context of the question clear, then leave will be withdrawn.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, with respect, the South Australian public does not know where this Government stands on the principle of privatisation. It is having a bob each way, and I am merely stating the facts of the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has been here long enough to know that clearly that is comment.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, with respect, it is fact as to the circumstances that prevail at the moment, as is the growing rift within the Labor Party on the matter of privatisation. That is a statement of fact, not comment by me. In recent days newspapers have been reporting continually the rift within the Labor Party on the subject of privatisation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask Government backbenchers to come to order. The Chair is trying to pay particular attention to the wording used by the Leader of the Opposition, as part of the Chair's endeavours to restore Question Time to what it should be. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier should say whose position he supports—and he will shortly be called on to do so publicly—that of his own Minister of Labour, who will not have a bar of any privatisation in any circumstances, or that of the Prime Minister, who wants to undertake a major sale of public assets.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition was clearly putting forward an argument. When any member embarks on even so much as a 30 second speech that is putting forward an argument, then that member is arguing or debating the question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is interesting to see the Leader hogging Question Time by asking a supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, it would seem to be a carefully typewritten speech. It is a pity that the preparation that went into that spontaneous supplementary question was not reflected in the content of it. He made some ridiculous statements. First, he said, 'We know that Mr Hawke and Mr Keating have this attitude.' However, I have not seen any official statement by Mr Hawke on behalf of his Government, although I have read media speculation and a comment by Mr Hawke that he was pleased to see this

debate proceeding—and the debate certainly has been proceeding for some years.

Labor Party policy will be determined at the Party's Federal conference, which is the appropriate venue. There has been no statement by the Federal Government on its attitude. So, for a start, one aspect of the Leader's question disappears. The second is his suggestion that this non-view of the Federal Government in some way is in sharp contrast to that of one of my Ministers, but we have just had the benefit of the Minister's explaining his views to us.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Coherent and sensible, they indicated the ignorance of the views expressed by the Deputy Leader. If one reads in full the speech made by the Hon. Frank Blevins, one will see that it expresses the views of this Government on this issue. We do not believe in the fire sale of Government assets: we believe in the productive use of Government assets, in getting maximum commercial benefit from them and in finding more ways in which that can happen. For those who have forgotten the distinction or do not believe that there is one, I refer members to page 3804 of *Hansard* of 2 April 1987.

CHLOROFLUOROCARBONS

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say what is the outcome of recent United Nations discussions about an international convention and protocol on the manufacture and use of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and the Australian and South Australian Government attitudes to such a protocol? A substantial body of scientific evidence suggests that chlorofluorocarbons are damaging the ozone layer, and I am advised that in some cases there are effective alternatives to CFCs: for example, my hairdresser tells me that not only are non-aerosol hairsprays better for the environment but that they are also better for the hair and are readily available.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: True, a causal link seems to have been established between the use of chlorofluorocarbons around the globe and the reduction at certain times in the intensity of the ozone layer. In particular over the past couple of years, what is sometimes called a hole has been detected in the ozone layer at certain times of the year, actually during the southern summer. It is not technically a hole in the sense that there is no ozone there: in fact, it is about a 40 per cent reduction in ozone concentration in that vicinity. However, I guess that that is serious enough and, since it extends to 40 degrees south latitude, it covers some Australian territory. Chlorofluorocarbons are also understood to be greenhouse gases as well as having an effect on the ozone layer. That is to say they act to magnify the influence of carbon dioxide, methane, and other gases in the atmosphere which are probably increasing global temperatures over a reasonably short time span.

Mr Lewis: How does that compare to Krakatoa?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If I may pick up the interjection, I point out that the effects of Krakatoa were probably to release into the atmosphere much solid material which would have filtered sunlight and therefore had an opposite effect on global temperatures to that of carbon dioxide and the trace gases. Maybe that is something the honourable member did not understand.

The problem we have is not simply that chlorofluorocarbons are used as propellants for hair spray and other such devices, but also that they are used as refrigerants, and the

freons are the best known group of CFCs which are so used. Complete cessation of their use and manufacture in this State would, of course, in effect bring our whitegoods industry to a halt. There is a search going on around the world for alternative forms of refrigerant. At one time ammonia was used, but that in itself has its problems. So, what are we doing?

First, since 1974 Australia's production rate of CFCs has reduced by about 33 per cent which is better than anywhere in the world. In addition, the Federal Government is being urged to sign the Vienna protocol which would have the effect of freezing production and use of the chlorofluorocarbons at the 1986 level and then a stage reduction. I am given to understand that the Federal Government almost certainly will sign that protocol and join with other nations around the world in a stage reduction in the use of chlorofluorocarbons.

ID CARD

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I direct my question to the Premier. Will the South Australian Government refuse to cooperate in the introduction of the ID card? Today's half-page newspaper advertisement identifies that 13 trade unions are expressing strong and broadly based opposition in South Australia to the introduction of the ID card. Previous attempts to establish the South Australian Government's attitude have met with ambiguous answers.

Most recently, in answering a question on 31 March this year, the Premier indicated that his Government would make up its mind when it knew the precise form of the Federal legislation. The form of the legislation which the Federal Government intends to present to a joint sitting of both Houses has been known publicly and, therefore, to the South Australian Government for more than four months, so I suggest it has had long enough to determine whether it will cooperate in the exchange of births, deaths and marriages records without which the system cannot be introduced. Any decision to provide full cooperation to the Federal Government would ignore very strong opposition in South Australia to the introduction of this card.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, the honourable member draws attention to advertisements which have been taken by some unions expressing their opposition to the ID card. There is nothing new about that. That union opposition has been expressed consistently over some time. If one refers to the *News* of 14 June 1986—more than a year ago—one would find those same objections expressed by those same groups of unions. So, nothing has changed in that respect in terms of the position taken by those unions.

What has changed is a double dissolution of the Federal Parliament, triggered by the rejection by the Senate of the Australia Card legislation. That means that the Federal Government is now in a position to reintroduce—at a joint sitting if the Senate continues to block it—the legislation it requires. The issue of whether or not legislation will be passed is finished.

If the Federal Government wishes to put it in, it will do so. What then will be the position of the South Australian Government? That has been expressed consistently by both the Attorney-General and myself over a period of time. We made a submission to the select committee looking into the matter in the Senate in which we raised some 14 points that we believe ought to be addressed in any particular legislation. That submission was received and the extent to which it has been taken account of is fairly limited. If the legislation becomes a reality, the question of South Aus-

tralia's participation relates only to the need for the Federal Government to have access to certain records held by the South Australian Government.

The issue is what is the value of those records. The Government is not prepared to participate in a scheme on an open slather basis, to make available records which have been assembled by South Australian taxpayers over the years at some considerable expense, simply hand them over and say, 'There is a body of information that we can use.' That is being discussed among the States and some agreement will have to be reached with the Federal Government concerning access to those records. When the legislation is passed and the Commonwealth has specific proposals to put to the Government, negotiation will take place. At this stage, that is not the case, so I can take the matter no further than I did in response to questions on 31 March in this House (page 3613 of *Hansard*). No change has occurred, except that it looks as though the legislation will be a reality.

Members interjecting:

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

JETTIES

Mr ROBERTSON: I ask the following questions of Minister of Marine:

1. What is the Government's policy on the repair and maintenance of recreational jetties in South Australia?
2. In particular, what damage was suffered by Brighton jetty during the storms of 22 and 23 June this year?
3. What action has been taken to assist the Brighton city council with the cost of repairs to the Brighton jetty?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Quite a number of recreational jetties along the South Australian coastline suffered varying degrees of damage during the recent storms. It is important to understand what is Government policy on recreational jetties, as sought by the honourable member. Under the present policy regarding repairs to recreational jetties, local councils are required to contribute at least 20 per cent of the cost where such repairs are due to normal wear and tear. However, in the case of storm damage, it was agreed that the Government would meet the total cost of repairs, except that the Minister has the right to determine whether badly damaged sections should be demolished or repaired.

That is the Government's current policy. It should be recognised that the majority of recreational jetties on the coastline are more than 100 years old and, when they suffer damage during storms, it is a very expensive exercise to repair them. The jetties that were most severely damaged recently were at Port Rickaby, Port Noarlunga, Second Valley and Brighton. A number of other jetties, including those at Cape Jervis, Semaphore, Marion Bay, Moonta Bay, Port Germein and Franklin Harbor, suffered minor damage. In most cases, repairs have been effected, with the remainder to be completed shortly.

Specifically in relation to the Brighton jetty, a substantial number of decking planks either lifted or were broken. I understand that they have been repaired. However, pile repairs, estimated to cost approximately \$5 000, will be completed shortly. Repairs to the Brighton jetty represent a small cost compared with repairs to the Port Noarlunga jetty at \$60 000, Second Valley jetty at \$38 000 and Port Rickaby jetty, estimated to be around \$50 000. In some cases local councils will be asked to contribute a small amount towards the cost as their share of the repairs deemed necessary prior to the storm damage. I report that all repair work will be undertaken by departmental work force and within existing budget allocations.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT VOTING

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My question is directed to the Premier. In view of today's further evidence of strong public opposition to the introduction of compulsory voting at local government elections, as demonstrated by a poll of Adelaide residents showing 58 per cent against such a move, will the Premier give an absolute guarantee that the Government will not implement Labor Party policy in this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter is under discussion with local government at the moment, and I do not wish to pre-empt those discussions. If the honourable member is interested in any further report, I suggest that he direct a question to the Minister of Local Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TAFE LECTURERS

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise whether he has received a copy of an anonymous circular entitled "Quack! Quack! Quack" said the Quaker quacker' which relates to the current issues of working conditions of TAFE lecturers? On Friday last I received through the mail a copy of this anonymous circular in a plain franked envelope. In the same mail, but in a separate envelope, I also received an open circular letter to the Minister of Further Education and Technology signed by Mr Alec Talbot, the President of the South Australian Primary Principals Association. On examining the two envelopes it was apparent that the labels were identical. Also, the franking stamp was identical, with both envelopes having been sent from Welland. On closer examination of the two circulars it would appear that they had been typed on the same typewriter or on similar typewriters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. I have seen a copy of it but I did not receive a copy from the anonymous sender but rather from the member for Mawson. I was not extended the courtesy of having forwarded to me, either anonymously or otherwise, such information. I know that all members in this place on both sides would agree that any attempt to bring in the private views of people with respect to religion or any other social characteristic is taking the depths of debate to lower levels than we would want to support. I make the point that I believe that the author of the document, first, has been cowardly and gutless by anonymously sending the information and, secondly, is indicating extreme poor taste, if not offensive behaviour. It is indicative that he doubts that he has any facts to support his case as this is the only thing that he can do, namely, sink to this kind of low level.

One point that can be made is that articles or items in poor taste, or offensive articles, can contain humour because they may be well written. However, this article is a particularly poorly written piece involving no skill at all. The joke is not in the content—the joke is in the writer; he is the joke himself. I have seen the envelopes in which the member for Mawson received the article, "Quack! Quack! Quack!" said the Quaker quacker' and the other article from the South Australian Primary Principals Association, 'An open letter to the Minister of Further Education and Technology'. He could not even get the title right.

It is interesting to examine that. The addressograph labels are clearly the same for both envelopes, even to the extent

of having a black bar at the top, which indicates the way it appears on the photocopy original. It is also interesting that the postmark reads identically on both envelopes—'Welland, 13 August 1987, South Aust. 5007', with the word 'Paid' down the side. It is further interesting that the typeface on both articles is identical. Therefore, we are faced with a conclusion. Either it is an unusual coincidence that someone using the same type of typewriter and living or working in the same area chose to mail articles at the same post office, or it was a collaborator of Alec Talbot or it was Alec Talbot himself who has chosen to do that.

Given the track record of this gentleman over a long period of time, I believe it is not unreasonable for one to draw the conclusion that it was, indeed, Alec Talbot or a collaborator who was put up by him to do this. I may say that, given the kinds of things he has said about Ministers, past and present, over a long period of time, he has shown a severe lack of credibility and integrity in the way he has performed. I believe that there are questions that could well be asked about the way in which Alec Talbot uses taxpayers' resources—Government resources—in his position as President of the Primary Principals Association. It is quite clear that he is using facilities at the school of which he is a principal and I think that that is something that would concern members on both sides of this House. I must say that that kind of misuse of resources in order to peddle misinformation, lies or untruths about people is something that should concern everybody.

If Alec Talbot had any credibility at all, he would have dealt with the issues at hand (and this does not involve my personal views or anything to do with my background) relating to the terms and conditions of TAFE lecturing staff. I call on him to come back to that kind of issue and to stay away from the personal denigration in which he has been involved. I would ask also that this matter, which falls within the realm of my colleague the Minister of Education with respect to the principal, be investigated by him, and I will refer it to him for his attention.

Alec Talbot would do well to examine his own colleagues, the principals within primary schools, and to examine the way in which they work longer hours than some of the people who are questioned in the TAFE terms and conditions issue. At the moment he defends a position where some—not the majority—are lecturing as little as 15 hours a week. I am certain that he could not identify anybody within primary education who has as little as 15 hours a week contact time. I ask Alec Talbot whose interests he is trying to support. Is he trying to support the interests of his own colleagues in the primary education system who work very hard, those of the majority of the TAFE lecturers who work very hard, or does he choose to side with those who are living off what have been over-generous conditions? The time has been ripe, in these very hard financial times, to change those conditions. He is a discredited person. I think that to have involved himself in such activities over recent years reflects on him and not upon any views or private opinions that I may hold.

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr S.J. BAKER: Why are the Premier's statements on promoting the development of Port Adelaide in stark contrast to his Government's actions in evicting seven small business tenants from Marine and Harbors Department land at Birkenhead? Currently there are seven businesses: Oveco Enterprises, E. & E. Furniture, Rodame Fine Furniture & Cabinets, Vecchio, Indmar Engineering, D. & R. Excavations and Outdoor Decor, most of which have estab-

lished themselves since 1982 under a leasing arrangement in Swigg and Martin Streets, Birkenhead.

At the time of setting up, each company inquired as to its long-term future and was assured that, whilst Marine and Harbors could only grant five year leases, prospects were for 20 years or more. This was confirmed by the Commercial Manager of Marine and Harbors when leases were renegotiated in 1984. On the basis of these assurances the firms involved spent over \$200 000 on capital improvements. In about June 1986 rumours were circulating through the Port that the Government intended to sell the land and that they would be forced off. It took until April 1987 for this to be confirmed. I have been assured that none would have taken up the leases or invested in improvements had they been properly informed. The estimated cost of relocation is about \$500 000. Does the Premier intend to bankrupt these firms?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will ignore the gratuitous comment made at the end of the question, but I think that the best way to handle this issue, the details of which I am not aware would be to obtain a report. I am a little wary of material that the honourable member puts before the House in this way. There may be a lot more to it than has been suggested, and I say that on the basis that the Port Adelaide redevelopment scheme, which has been under way now for a number of years, has been one of the most successful urban renewal and redevelopment schemes in this State's history. Its results are very tangible, and it has involved both commercial and cultural elements. Further, there have been major industrial connotations. I am not aware of the terms under which businesses have established on land, their lease requirements, and so on. I certainly undertake to get a report on that matter and will consult with my colleague the Minister of Marine.

NEGATIVE GEARING

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House whether a return to full negative gearing for residential rental accommodation will significantly assist in providing housing for low income earners? We have recently read of the repeated calls from members of the Opposition, in particular the member for Hanson, urging the State Government to put pressure on the Federal Government to restore full negative gearing. The member for Hanson has said that negative gearing is the only way in which the number of people on the South Australian Housing Trust waiting list can be reduced. I refer members to the press release that the member for Hanson sent out on 27 July this year, which was printed in the *News*.

It has been put to me that a return to full negative gearing would not necessarily provide any new rental housing accommodation, particularly in view of the sorts that were occurring under the previous system. I refer to the Senate *Hansard* report of 30 April 1987 (page 2080), where Senator Walsh said, in part:

Indeed, round robins were operated between a group of high income people negatively gearing... and thereby wiping out a good deal of their personal tax liabilities. At the time, because of repayments and inflation, when the project ceased to be negatively geared to the extent thought desirable, they just swapped them around; they bought each other's blocks of flats, houses or whatever; therefore, there was no increase in the available stock of residential accommodation.

In the *News* on Tuesday 11 August 1987 (page 11), the Housing Industry Association (South Australian Division) Chief Executive, Mr Don Cummings, is quoted as saying:

Somewhere along the line the Government must realise that the withdrawal of negative gearing has severely hurt the housing industry.

Mr Cummings has provided a series of alternatives that he sees as being of assistance to those people who will be encouraged to invest in the housing industry if such suggestions are taken up.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I congratulate the member for Henley Beach for researching the background to that question. In line with your request, Sir, in relation to replies by Ministers to questions, the short answer is: no, it would not significantly assist low income people.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That is the short answer, but I shall enlighten members opposite as to exactly why it will not help those people on low incomes. I make it perfectly clear—and the member for Henley Beach reinforced this point in his question—that negative gearing has been used as a rort, and is still being used as a rort, despite the fact that the Federal Treasurer quarantined it in June 1985. It is interesting to note the lead time that is required by the Opposition to pick up an issue. It should be borne in mind that it was in June 1985 that negative gearing was abolished, with only those existing recipients being allowed to continue with it. Until the Federal election we heard not one beep from the member for Hanson, the Leader of the Opposition, or anyone else about the effects of negative gearing. It was only during the final days of the election campaign, when the Prime Minister mentioned that there would be a possible review of negative gearing, that they all then started to say that negative gearing was the answer.

It was conveniently forgotten that during that campaign the Opposition was advocating to the public of Australia that it would abolish the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and take \$700 million out of public housing. That did not seem to affect members opposite, with their double standards. There is a story going around—and I believe it—that when the term 'negative gearing' was raised it was thought by members of the Opposition that it was a lovely flowing phrase relating to some newfangled attachment to a Tour de France racing bike and that it was an issue that they could get on.

The abolition of negative gearing has had a minimal effect, in fact no effect, on vacancy rates in South Australia, despite what the member for Hanson and Mr Don Cummings say. Investment in the private rental market has always been at the top end, the expensive accommodation, which does not help those people on low incomes seeking private rental accommodation.

The problem is the price of private rental accommodation or the capacity of people seeking it to pay the rents required. That, in effect, highlights the abysmal ignorance of the Opposition on the private rental market. Opposition members know nothing about it and they never will know anything about it. They should look at other ways of solving the problem. I will make available to the Opposition the report of the national working party on private and community rental housing, which is the line that this State Government supports. That report, which has been supported by the previous Federal Minister for Housing and Constuction and by the housing Ministers of all Labor States, talks about ways in which we can encourage people to invest in public housing without getting into tax evasion.

If the Opposition members want to support tax evasion, let them come out and say so. They should not dress it up as they are doing by talking about low income people, because we all know what are the Opposition views on low income people. I will outline the package from the national working party. This involves the introduction of an accelerated depreciation allowance (10 per cent in the first five years and 5 per cent in the second five years) or an 8 per

cent depreciation allowance. In that way, we can target this to people prepared to invest their money in public private rental agreements.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That sort of statement shows the ignorance of Opposition members. We will restrict it to private investments and public-private joint ventures. This Government will not get involved in tax rorts, nor should the Opposition.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr OSWALD: Can the Minister of Labour say how households will cater for compensation insurance in respect of people employed in household chores, such as babysitting, cleaning, gardening and minor repairs? About two months ago, the Minister informed a group of insurance brokers that the insurance industry could no longer cover any form of workers compensation insurance when the new Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act came into operation on 30 September 1987. Some persons have attempted to ascertain through SGIC how such coverage can be obtained, but no answers have been forthcoming. There is considerable concern that the new corporation has made a decision which will leave about 200 000 households in this State with no means of cover for part-time household employees. I have been informed that a more recent decision specifies a \$5 000 limit under which employers need not register. Will the Minister please say exactly what the Government intends?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I can do that exactly. I thank the honourable member for his sensible question. Indeed, it is close to being the first that the Opposition has asked today, and it is certainly much more sensible than that asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The reply to the question is extensive, and I am sure that all members will want to study it in detail in the *Hansard* record. Essentially, there is certainly no intention for people having a casual domestic or gardener to be involved in the new workers compensation legislation that will apply after 30 September. The system will not be significantly different from that applying at present. One dilemma is that, although we do not want to be involved in covering people who work for only eight hours a week as a domestic in a household, full-time employees who work in more lavish households should be covered. Therefore, there are clear problems of definition. Also, people employed as full-time gardeners should be covered. After reading this reply, members may wish to pursue the matter further.

The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act does not apply to 'casual' domestics. The intention of the Act is to cover those domestics who have an ongoing employment relationship with a householder. The corporation has under current review the adoption of a policy which will exempt all householders from having to register with WorkCover or pay a levy (unless their domestic employees earn in aggregate more than \$5 000 per annum). The policy will require a householder who engages a worker to work on a once only basis of less than five working days in any calendar year to seek private insurance cover to protect themselves from a negligence action in the case of such employment. The test that is currently before the corporation for its consideration is as follows: if the domestic worker is engaged by a householder to do a particular job for less than five days on a once only basis in any calendar year the worker is considered to be a casual domestic and will not be covered by WorkCover. The householder will need private insurance cover for such casual domestics.

In all other cases the worker and the householder will be covered (with levies only payable by the householder where the remuneration paid or payable exceeds \$5 000 a year). Once the policy on domestics is adopted by the corporation this will be well publicised so that householders are made well aware of their rights and can seek appropriate insurance cover where that is needed. The Insurance Council of Australia will be advised of this policy once it has been adopted by the corporation so that insurance cover to cover casual domestics can be tailored to fit in with the wide cover of domestics proposed under the WorkCover system.

It should be pointed out that under the current Act casual domestics are also excluded from the Workers Compensation Act and there is currently a problem of determining what in fact a casual domestic is for the purposes of that Act. The policy on domestics that is currently before the corporation will, if adopted, makes clear for the first time which class of domestics is covered by workers compensation and those who are not. It should also be noted that in practice very few domestic claims arise (in Victoria where domestics are covered they have only had some 24 claims in two years of operation). In summary—WorkCover is about to adopt a policy on casual domestics which will for the first time clearly define householder responsibilities in this area. That policy will be widely communicated to ensure that householders are aware of their rights and responsibilities when they employ domestic labour.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the time allotted for the completion of the Address in Reply and all stages of the following Bills:
Supply Bill (No. 2),
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill,
Egg Industry Stabilisation Act Amendment Bill,
be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.
Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 229.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): At the next South Australian election, provided it is not called early, Labor will have governed this State for 20 of the past 25 years. Labor, therefore, has had the opportunity to influence the affairs of this State for the last quarter of a century—in much the same way as the Playford Liberals shaped South Australia during the previous 25 years.

So, the next election will be a fair and timely opportunity for South Australians to make a judgment not just on one term of government but on two distinctive periods of two very different styles of government. They will be able to tell us whether their State and their own personal well-being have gone ahead or slipped back under Labor. Today, I ask the House to consider some of the factors which must influence that important decision.

In 1965, the starting point of Labor's domination of the Treasury benches, South Australia had 9.4 per cent of Australia's total population. Now it is down to 8.6 per cent,

and we are continuing to lose our share, particularly to Western Australia. In that period, our population growth has been the lowest of all the mainland States—27.5 per cent compared with the average for all the States of 40.5 per cent. We have contributed only 6.4 per cent of the total growth in Australia's population since 1965, compared with New South Wales, 29.6 per cent; Victoria, 21.7 per cent; Queensland, 20.9 per cent; and Western Australia, 13.6 per cent.

Right through the 1940s, 1950s and for most of the 1960s, South Australia's rate of population growth was well above the national average and often the highest of any State on an annual basis. It fell behind the national average in 1967—the year Don Dunstan became Premier—and has fallen further behind ever since. What is of just as much concern in relation to this trend is the increasing urbanisation of South Australia: 72.3 per cent of all South Australians now live in their State capital—the highest urban concentration of any State.

Decentralisation in South Australia has failed, and that must concern us all. It is a failure that the Government will compound with its decision to withdraw payroll and land tax rebates for country businesses. The more country towns are deserted, the greater the pressure on housing and community infrastructure in the suburbs of Adelaide. Outer demographic trends suggest further serious issues for our future. The proportion of our population aged under 19 years is 30.4 per cent—the lowest of any State.

Our young are also losing out in the quest for higher education. South Australia has only 7.7 per cent of the number of students going to university in Australia, compared with 10.4 per cent in 1965. The decline in our birth rate over the last two decades is now showing up in figures like those I have just given. In 1965, South Australia recorded 9.4 per cent of all births in Australia. Last year, our share was 8.1 per cent. The total number of births last year in South Australia was actually lower than in 1965.

Nor is this State a prime location for new settlers in the same way as it was under successive Liberal Governments in the 1950s and 1960s. Our share of overseas arrivals in Australia was 15.3 per cent in 1965; it is down to 5.1 per cent on the latest figures. Looking at job opportunities for our young people and new settlers, we see that South Australia's growth in total employment of 80.4 per cent compares with the average for all the States of 94 per cent since 1965. Meanwhile, our share of Australia's jobless has almost doubled from 5 per cent to 9.9 per cent.

Turning to other key indicators of economic activity, we see that, in 1965, 11.4 per cent of all Australia's exports came from South Australia. This share is now down to 5.2 per cent—less than half. We had 10 per cent of all building approvals in 1965; this was down to 7.8 per cent on the latest figures. In retail sales, South Australia accounted for 9.1 per cent of Australia's total in 1965 but now accounts for 8.5 per cent, and in one of the major items of purchase families make—the car—South Australia had 10.7 per cent of total Australian registrations in 1965 but now has only 8.9 per cent. In manufacturing, our share of value-added production has been at a standstill.

These key indicators show that South Australia has slipped well behind in economic terms over the past 25 years and, with this decline, bankruptcies have escalated alarmingly. Since 1965, our bankruptcy rate has almost doubled. Last financial year, bankruptcies were occurring in South Australia at the rate of almost four a day. The total number of bankruptcies was at the highest level ever—even higher than in the great depression of the 1930s. Some of these economic

statistics cannot be divorced from rising crime rates and other measures of social decline.

In 1965, the total number of offences reported to police per 100 000 population was 7 659. On the latest figures, the number is running at 12 053. Offences against the person, such as various forms of assaults and robberies, have shown a more than tenfold increase—from 64.7 per 100 000 population in 1965 to 681.3 on the latest police figures. However, it is a commentary on Labor's lenient approach to criminals that the average daily number of inmates in our goals is running at 775 compared with 812 in 1965. We have had a tenfold increase in the number of offences against the person, but we are giving the community far less protection from the offenders.

Stress on families because of various economic and social factors is becoming more obvious. South Australia's divorce rate has escalated ahead of the average of all the States. More and more families are being squeezed in a financial vice. One factor hurting South Australian families in particular has been a declining average weekly wage. In 1965, the average weekly wage in South Australia was 94.7 per cent of the average in all the States; it is now down to 92.7 per cent. In this period savings bank deposits in South Australia have also declined. They represented 10.6 per cent of total savings in Australia in 1965. Now they are down to 7 per cent.

An examination of the financial difficulties facing families on fixed incomes shows where the cost pressures are greatest. First, let us consider the supermarket bill. Let me take a basket of food comprising the following: a loaf of bread; 2 kg self-raising flour; tea; sugar; peaches; potatoes; onions; butter; cheese; eggs; bacon; milk; steak; sausages; 1 kg lamb; and 1 kg loin chops. In 1965, in Adelaide, this basket of food cost \$7.80; today, it costs \$41.47.

But to give a true comparison, these costs need to be related to the average wage. The 1965 bill took up 15.1 per cent of the average weekly wage, but now, the same basket of food costs 11.8 per cent of the average weekly wage. While I can recognise that families trying to make ends meet find it increasingly difficult to meet rising supermarket prices, I believe that their pay packets are now being eroded much more by the cost of housing and Government taxes and charges.

I will consider a family on the average wage with the following outgoings: the average residential electricity tariff; rent of a five room Housing Trust home; 10 two section bus fares per week; income tax; and per capita State taxation. The take of the State and Federal Governments from these items in 1965 amounted to \$21.60 a week, or 41.8 per cent of average weekly earnings. Today it amounts to \$167.19 a week, or 47.4 per cent of the average wage. And when, to the high tax policies of Labor, is added the bill for spiralling interest rates, it becomes easy to see just how much Labor Government policies have put the average family further behind.

The interest bill for the average home mortgage lent in 1965 in South Australia was \$7.30 a week, or 14.1 per cent of the average wage. Today, it is \$132.35 a week, on the value of new mortgages—more than one-third of the average wage. Adelaide has lost its reputation as a low cost city and Government taxes and charges have been a major reason. Indeed, I just do not know how anyone on the basic wage can make ends meet.

I am sure that no member of this House would want to try to survive out there on the average wage. Since 1976-77—the past 10 years—the rise in Adelaide's consumer price index has been above the national average every year when,

for many years before that—for at least three decades—it ran below the national average.

Since 1965, State Government tax collections have gone up almost four times average weekly earnings. That has paid for government, which has become much bigger and more intrusive. In 1965, the number of departments and Government authorities audited by the Auditor-General was 58. Now it is approaching double that number; it is up to 96. In that time, employment in the State public sector has increased by almost 75 per cent. Since 1965, the South Australian Parliament has passed 2 263 Acts, and that is almost double the number passed in the previous 22 years, when we had a world war to contend with, when we had to cope with a massive intake of migrants and when we had to develop basic infrastructure such as power, roads and water. The Governments of the 1940s and 1950s achieved a lot more but legislated far less.

In 1965, the last Playford Government spent taxpayers' money at the rate of \$567.81 per minute. Last financial year, this Government spent taxpayers' money at the rate of \$7 189.02 per minute. State Government outlays as a proportion of gross State product have increased in the last four years alone from 19.5 per cent to 21.9 per cent. In the same period, while inflation has gone up by 50 per cent and the average wage by 32 per cent, State tax collections rose by more than 86 per cent.

But has much higher Government spending and taxing improved services? The State Transport Authority now has a \$100 million plus operating deficit. For 1965, it had a surplus of just over \$400 000. A deliberate act of Government fiscal policy has forced the Electricity Trust to run up deficits over the past two years after maintaining a tradition for almost four decades of profitable operation. Its tariffs are now no lower than those in the other States when, for a long time, South Australia could pride itself on its cheap, efficient electricity. The Housing Trust waiting list is growing by almost 13 families a day. Rental concessions cost the trust \$650 000 a week, compared with \$1 600 in 1965.

Priority as well as efficiency in State Government expenditure is in serious doubt when the community now pays, through the South Australian Government, \$36 000 a year to keep a prisoner locked up but only \$3 495 for each secondary student's education. Indeed, figures such as these beg fundamental questions about the state of South Australian society. Economically and socially we have been falling behind for almost two decades. Any analysis of the reasons cannot overlook the fact that, during this period, Labor has occupied the Treasury benches in this State for much longer than in any other State.

In 1970, Don Dunstan promised South Australians 'the most comprehensive plan for change and growth any State has seen since Federation.' Yes, South Australia has changed. But it has not progressed as far or as well as other States in those areas which most affect South Australians in their daily lives. In his 1970 election policy speech Mr Dunstan also pledged, 'It will be the State with the most highly developed and diversified economy.'

In 1979, the people of South Australia made their judgment on the abysmal failure of Labor to deliver economically. But Labor is still promising. The present Premier won office in 1982 with the appeal, 'We want South Australia to win.' At the 1985 election he said that we had won the race. 'South Australia is up and running,' the Labor slogan went. 'Our recovery is a reality. It's all coming together,' said the Premier.

The Premier claims that South Australia's recovery is a reality when in 1986 our population growth rate was the lowest of any State; our employment growth was the lowest

of any State; less overtime was worked in South Australia than in any other State; our inflation rate was the second highest of the States; the value of building work was the lowest of all the States; and our private investment lagged behind all the other mainland States. In 1986, our 150th year, we shattered the dreams of our pioneers. It is certainly not coming together. Quite the reverse is happening.

Our pioneers came to these shores with common aspirations. They wanted to live in a good, decent, law-abiding society, a society in which everyone had an equal opportunity to make good in the communities in which they lived. Their values were as simple as they were supreme. They wanted freedom, they were prepared to work hard, they applied thrift and they wanted reward for their efforts.

For much of South Australia's history, these values have been the ingredients of and the inspiration for sustained growth, a broadly based prosperity, happiness and success. They helped this State to overcome massive challenges: spreading water through the driest State in the driest continent; providing cheap, efficient power in a State once thought to have no useful energy resources; and turning vast tracts of harsh hinterland into productive properties that supply grain to the world. That was the result of people having the freedom to use their energies, to innovate and to work out their own affairs within a system based on responsibilities as well as rights.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: We were the envy of every other State in the Commonwealth.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed we were. Underlying everything those people did was the recognition that progress and prosperity can come only from an honest day's work. Because South Australians worked with goals founded on these basic beliefs we became, through the 1940s, 1950s and for much of the 1960s, pre-eminent in Australia's new industrial era.

The greatest goal we must have today is to become pre-eminent again in the new economic order that Australia faces. To do so, we must recognise that, so far, we have not managed very well the transition to the post industrial era and to the new challenges in a high technology and information dominated economy where the ability to compete and to export determines living standards.

Since the mid 1960s, we have wasted opportunities and we have become a backwater. We have fallen behind. Other States, notably Western Australia, have surged ahead of us. It is important to measure this decline in terms of people rather than just statistics; the poor, who have become poorer; our young people who increasingly find themselves unable to get work; and the elderly who find more of their life's savings grabbed by government.

The reasons for our decline are summarised, I believe, by this assertion once made by Abraham Lincoln:

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Put in more contemporary terms, we have a crisis of values. The leadership and direction that Labor promised decades ago failed and still fails to proclaim the values that, decades before, elevated us as a community within Australia. Labor has transformed the sense of responsibilities with rights which South Australians once had into a sense of selfish entitlement by some. It has encouraged too many people to believe that there is absolutely nothing a Government cannot do for them. It has intruded into virtually every aspect of our lives with the result that it has encouraged many people not to work while it penalises those who do.

Our forefathers paid insurance so that we might prosper. Their premiums were personal integrity; abiding by the law;

a commitment to the family; economic self-reliance; a willingness to work hard and to make the most of their potential; and regard for their neighbours. However, over recent years, instead of investing the same premiums, so that our children and their children might prosper, we have been borrowing against the insurance left to us.

We now have confessions of failure from the Prime Minister and the Premier. This year they have admitted that Governments cannot go on spending, taxing and borrowing in the way in which they have been. They have said, as well, that we must all lower our horizons, our hopes and our living standards. But this admission has come too late for too many. I refer, in particular, to the poor. The very people who were promised the most from Labor's collectivist policies have suffered the greatest. They are counting, in higher prices for essential commodities such as food, energy, transport and housing, the cost of Labor's taxes, restrictions and regulations on the productive capacity of our economy.

When needless expensive regulations and higher taxation are forced on businesses, those most adversely affected are the small firms struggling to stay in business or to get established in the neighbourhoods crying out for more job opportunities, just as it is not the wealthy but the poor, the elderly and anyone on a fixed income who suffer the most when the heavy hand of Government forces up the price of essential goods and services. Adelaide has pockets of poverty which are becoming deeper by the day.

When the Premier tells the people of South Australia that our recovery is a reality, all this suggests to me is that he has been mixing too much with the Grand Prix set. How can our recovery be a reality when we have so manifestly failed to absorb the baby boom generation into our economy when the breadwinner of so many young families cannot get a job, or afford a home, when so many young couples cannot begin a family because both have to work just to keep up the mortgage payments, when the first income one in three of our school leavers can look forward to is the dole cheque, and when, on the Prime Minister's own admission, almost 80 000 South Australian children are living in poverty?

Our first priority must be to enable people in circumstances like these to find a place in the economic and social mainstream of our life and our community. Only in this way can we free more of the community's resources—its human resources—for productive investment so that those who are in genuine need can gain in self-esteem by breaking their cycle of poverty and dependency. To do this we must identify how many South Australians are in real need, where they live and what can and should be done to rid our community of genuine poverty. We must measure the extent of poverty by relating it to earnings, residential location and access to basic community services and assistance. But the Premier has refused even to admit that poverty exists in our community. Labor's response to the disadvantaged has been the constant promise that Government will lift more people above the poverty line and give more help to those who remain below it.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Sir, in the course of a series of interjections the member for Albert Park referred in an unparliamentary manner to the comments being made by the Leader of the Opposition. In accordance with a ruling given by the Speaker, I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry, but I did not hear the interjection.

Mr HAMILTON: I said that it was an outrageous lie. I withdraw it: an outrageous untruth.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member unreservedly withdraws?

Mr HAMILTON: Yes, Sir.

Mr OLSEN: It is interesting that the honourable member who has just withdrawn earlier today moved a motion in relation to the proceedings in this House and the importance of parliamentary proceedings. It shows just how hypocritical he was in moving the motion earlier today in this House.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: There are many more poor South Australians now than when Don Dunstan first promised us delivery to the land of unlimited fun and prosperity. As we have discovered over the last two decades, uncritical, open-ended recourse to the State only creates its own greater problems. Those who suggest this are, of course, denigrated by Labor as uncaring and unsympathetic. Labor thinks that it is sufficient to mouth compassion and malign those who say that too much reliance on Government hinders a community more than helps it in the longer term.

It is very easy to stand in front of a television camera, cotton-woolled and controlled by minders, and pretend to be concerned about poverty, about the elderly, about the unemployed. It is far more difficult to provide solutions which are realistic, which do not create false hopes, and which do not treat the disadvantaged as mere fodder to be served up at election time on a platform of feigned compassion. But that is exactly what Labor has done.

The Liberal Party intends to identify the real magnitude of the problem in South Australia—the legacy of two decades of Labor. Only in this way can we be sure that what we commit ourselves to at the next election will be based on a full appreciation of the plight of real people in real need. At the same time, our commitments will recognise what are the real keys to improved living standards for all South Australians. These keys are not the exclusive possession of a Government sector able to promise more, nor are they the monopoly of a private sector determined to tell Government to spend less because it wants more control over the resources we as a community develop through our work and our wisdom.

Recent experience, both here in Australia and in other countries, must persuade us that no economic blueprint is universally or inevitably valid; that no economic blueprint can work if the people who weave it or participate in it—Government, business, trade union leaders, and ordinary people—do not recognise that they must all share some fundamental responsibilities.

We cannot afford to make the posting of a profit subservient to social goals—no matter how desirable. If we do, neither will be achieved. Today, there is much more evidence in Australia of government, rather than business, acting with disregard for the social well-being of the community. Labor has staked its claim to the role of the natural Government—here in South Australia for two decades and federally for a third term—on the promise to its traditional supporters that it would pull business into line, that it would redistribute the wealth first created by the risk-takers, by business. Instead, what we have seen are Labor Governments redistributing wealth not for the benefit of the whole community, but squandering it on bigger government which has not been better government measured by any objective standard.

We now know that smaller government is better government. To achieve better government it is the task of the advocates of smaller government to persuade the majority that what they are not about is the blind striving for personal gain with all the risks of injustice and exploitation,

that their pursuit of profit is not an end in itself but a means of generating more opportunities, more jobs, and more money to build our schools, our hospitals, our roads and that business, that enterprise, is concerned, is enlightened and does understand.

They must also recognise the reality that workers do have legitimate aspirations to share in the wealth which their endeavours generate, that profit sharing ventures should be encouraged through taxation policies and other means and that the individual at the bottom must have full opportunity to rise to the top. For their part, worker representatives, trade union officials, must not seek or assume power to the point that they upset the balance of an efficient economy. They must recognise that rigid rules which stop new technologies or discourage productivity prevent only the optimum use of resources. There are responsibilities that men and women in business, in the work force, in unions, must accept.

We should start the process in our schools as an investment in the quality of our future work force—our chief competitive source, our foundation for the future. We must establish a firmer, more meaningful link between school and work. We must develop programs that connect students with their future responsibilities—programs that will convince the next generation that striving for success does really pay.

Our school students need to receive greater encouragement to develop self-esteem, to develop good work habits and to understand that there must be limits to the help available to them from the rest of the community if they will not help themselves. This could be developed even to the point of helping students establish businesses while they are still at school. This is now being tried in the United States with some interesting and successful results in giving students much needed first-hand knowledge of the world of work. We should all have the goal of working towards a guarantee of a job to every South Australian student who successfully completes high school. This will give them greater motivation to stay at school, to work harder and to strive for excellence. The alternative is a society with a permanent and growing class of people who have no role, identity or hope.

This would be a tragedy not only for those young people but for their parents and for our nation. While we have slipped behind in being able to offer all of our young a place in our future, our competitors, particularly our Asian neighbours, have been making sure that more of their citizens have the education necessary to become full participants in their nations' futures.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They seek to inspire excellence by rewarding initiative.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, initiative. As countries like Singapore, Malaysia and South Korea have followed the Japanese example and have increased their confidence in their own ability to compete with us, we find that even in the race to develop new technologies to export to the world we are losing out. The only way to get back into the race is for Australians to be convinced from the earliest possible age that higher levels of productivity and excellence are the only way to compete. We must produce more of a better quality in a given time. Improved productivity and excellence are the keys to revitalising our manufacturing base and underpinning an expanding service economy.

People need to be encouraged to think—not just work—for a living. More people have to be willing to take risks, rather than avoiding them. Quality management must play its part, just as much as quality labour, to secure our competitive edge. Excessive executive salaries and corporate

bureaucracy must be avoided as they impact just as much as labour costs on a company's competitiveness. The priority and preoccupation which recently have become apparent for rearranging existing assets through mergers and take-overs should give way to greater emphasis on creating new assets. For their part, union officials must accept that wage demands cannot be divorced from company performance.

With these sorts of goals developed from the earliest possible age, and shared by executives and workers, we will be able to plan with much greater confidence for the next century. Let us not underestimate the importance or the immediacy of this challenge. Many of the new technologies and production facilities being designed today will not go on stream until the mid-1990s. They will not repay the capital invested in them until after the turn of the century, and they will not reach the peak of their potential until well into the twenty-first century. In other words, the career opportunities which are going to be available to our children and their children are being fashioned very much by what we are doing today, and not only by what we are designing but also by the example we are setting in attitudes to work. We must not go on letting them down.

South Australia's quality of life is one attribute which must continue to give us an advantage in the search for greater economic development and diversification. It needs to be given more emphasis in the way in which we promote our State to others. We all agree that South Australia has a special quality of life: it always has had—ever since Adelaide was lucky enough to be planned by a man named Light. Our State is a great place in which to live. It offers a lifestyle which is very appealing to the successful young entrepreneur—the investors and business leaders of the future who are seeking a stimulating business environment and a pleasant and peaceful living environment for their families. We must do everything we can to preserve that lucky inheritance. We must not jeopardise our environmental heritage. But, in devising policies to maintain it, let us not forget that economic prosperity is an essential part of any good environment.

Governments have assumed a supervisory role over a great deal of what we can and cannot do; what we can produce, what we cannot produce, from the land, from our natural resources. Government regulation touches more and more of us every day, so that even the look of our homes, the quality of the goods we eat and the design of our cars are influenced by Government fiat. This trend towards greater Government regulation had its origins in legitimate concerns about issues like improving the quality of the water we drink, the air we breathe, safety and health in the work place, and the reliability and quality of items we buy at the supermarket. Few would disagree with these objectives, but their pursuit has spawned some radical, embittered, self-styled watchdogs who have dominated the debate, with the result that the objectives of regulation have become distorted. In fact, the process of regulation appears to have become more important than the end results.

Problems perceived by Governments inevitably become elevated into exercises requiring research, conferences, surveys, overseas trips, reports, committees and consultants. How many seminars have we had about education standards, about child abuse, about drug abuse, about decentralisation—about virtually any subject one cares to name? How much has all this Government activity done to have any measurable effect in dealing with important community problems? It has to be admitted that Government has a fairly consistent record of not solving the major problems it tackles—ensuring that the jobs of problem-solvers are not only safeguarded but multiply.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They're wasting a lot of money.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed. It is important for the community to have respect for its Public Service, but that respect has declined in direct proportion to the number of tasks that the Government has set the Public Service. A respected Public Service is important not only so that we can continue to attract good people into it to provide vital community services, but also because a stable and efficient service underpins any healthy community. But when the Public Service is required to give every special interest a special hearing, this can only compromise its ability to serve the wider community interest. It is about time Governments were put in their place so that they recognise that there are many things they are not qualified to do.

Instead of drawing up a regulation or appointing a committee whenever a problem is perceived, the role of Government must become more goal orientated. Let the Government suggest the goals, but let the people best qualified take the field to establish the most effective and efficient way to reach the objective set. When Government intervention is really necessary, a cost benefit analysis should be prepared and published before the introduction of any legislation or regulations. To give Parliament more say and to make the Government more accountable to the people, much greater use should also be made of sunset provisions calling for explicit renewal or termination of legislation and regulations by Parliament.

There will be circumstances in which we need more government—when it helps us to grow, to develop, to expand individual opportunity—when people in real need have nowhere else to go. But we need less government when government penalises those who do work hard and profits the bludger; when it encourages individuals to assume rights and avoid responsibilities; and when the need or the task can be accomplished more efficiently by others who are better qualified. These are the standards by which the role of government must and should be judged.

In the period to the next election, Liberals will be raising those matters again as the Liberal way ahead. A State with these standards, encouraging a spirit of enterprise which is concerned and enlightened, will grow and become stronger. Liberals are determined to make the politics of concerned and enlightened enterprise the politics of the majority of South Australians. By doing so, we will re-establish those values which transcend people and Parties and which once made all South Australians pull together to build our State.

Liberals did not play their part in creating the preconditions for South Australia's development, growth and prosperity, only to have the opportunity, the potential, the future, squandered in the way it has been under Labor. Today, I have raised the challenges facing this State:

- the need to identify the extent of poverty in our community and offer practical solutions;

- the need to encourage all South Australians to accept that we have some fundamental responsibilities as well as rights;

- creating a spirit of concerned and enlightened enterprise;

- establishing firmer links between school and work; recognising business and work ethics which encourage cooperation rather than confrontation;

- maintaining South Australia's quality of life;

- supporting a respected Public Service; and

- putting government in its place so that it becomes more relevant and efficient.

No problem, no matter how great, how apparently insoluble, can stand in the way of free people cooperating with each other to find those solutions. That was once the true great-

ness of South Australia—our ability to harness the hearts and minds of people in our homes, in our educational institutions, our factories, our offices; to work together to find new ways to deal with old problems; to bring within reach the wide horizons open to all those prepared to roll up their sleeves, to take a risk, and to give it a go.

This true greatness was not achieved by Government alone. It cannot be restored by Government alone. This is the key difference between the Liberal approach and the failed Labor approach. The major issue at the next election will be the direct political, personal and moral responsibility of Labor for putting South Australia behind—not just during this current parliamentary term—but over the past quarter of a century. The alternative at the next election will be a Liberal Government showing the way ahead to all those South Australians with community values embodied by the words 'family', 'freedom', 'work', and 'reward'.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I support the motion. I wish to congratulate His Excellency the Governor for outlining a blueprint for sound economic management and social reform for the coming year.

Like many other members, I wish to extend my condolences to the families of former members of this Parliament, the Hon. Ron Loveday and the Hon. Don Simmons. While I did not personally know Ron Loveday, I certainly had the honour and privilege of knowing Don Simmons, who was a most caring and compassionate man and who was greatly respected by many members of this Parliament, the Australian Labor Party, and the community generally.

I turn now to a matter of fundamental importance to me, and, I would hope, to all Australians, namely, the distribution of wealth in Australia. Up to three million Australians now live in poverty. The life of one in every five people is restricted in opportunity, basic comforts, security, nutrition, health and justice. At the same time, two individuals and one Australian family are now worth more than \$1 billion: that they are Robert Holmes a Court, Kerry Packer and the Murdoch family should come as no surprise to anyone. Indeed, I am sure that many members of the Opposition and the proponents of the philosophy expressed by the New Right will see this as being a cause to celebrate the great financial market's 'bull run' that put the wealth of these men and their families at over \$1 billion each.

I, however, find this news distressing, especially when one considers the net wealth of this country's 200 richest individuals—estimated at \$24.9 billion, and up a staggering \$10.9 billion from last year. There are now over 30 000 millionaires in Australia: one-tenth of the population owns 60 per cent of all the wealth in Australia. How numerous are the rich? In answering this question, I seek your leave, Mr Deputy Speaker, to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table from *Australian Society* of May 1987.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure the Chair that it is purely statistical?

Ms LENEHAN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

HOW NUMEROUS ARE THE RICH?

Range of wealth	Number of individuals	
\$375 000- 450 000	41 381	47 581
\$450 000- 600 000	46 791	43 213
\$600 000- 700 000	25 176	34 176
\$700 000- 825 000	15 058	16 602
\$825 000-1 000 000	12 674	13 182
\$1 000 000-1 500 000	14 343	13 592
\$1 500 000-3 000 000	9 641	11 591
\$3 000 000+	4 144	6 646
	A. Williams data	B. Piggott's new data

Ms LENEHAN: As this chart shows, the gap is widening, and that will continue as long as Mr Robert Holmes a Court

and others like him double their personal income each year. The *Business Review Weekly* estimates that Mr Holmes a Court, working an average of 80 hours a week, accrues his wealth at a rate in excess of \$3 000 per minute. Now I ask members of this House: is anyone's labour worth more than \$3 000 per minute? The wealthiest 2 500 Australians now own as much of this country's wealth as do some three million of the poorest people in the community.

To help give the House a visual image of the extent of the poverty problem in Australia, I wish to refer to some comments made by Mr Peter Staples, MP, for the Victorian seat of Jaga Jaga. If those some 2.5 million poorest Australians stood hand in hand, the line would stretch from Sydney to Perth—a line of people over 3 000 kilometres long stretching all the way from Sydney to Perth. However, if the wealthiest 2 500 Australians, who own as much wealth as the collective 2.5 million Australians at the bottom end of the income scale, stood hand in hand they would be lucky to reach a distance of 3 kilometres—the distance between a couple of suburban railway stations.

Nearly 800 000 children are included in Australia's poorest 2.5 million people. Many children are born into poverty, spend their childhood in poverty, grow up in poverty and die in poverty. This is a reality in Australia. The myth of a community with a relatively equal distribution of wealth is just that—a myth.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: What does it mean to be poor in Australia? It means being forced to miss meals and to suffer nutritional deficiency. It means sometimes missing school because of lack of clothing; the elderly being unable to afford the use of heaters; being isolated, through the inability to afford a car or telephone; being unable to attend school excursions or to participate in such things as the 'learn to swim' campaign; or missing out on social outings and even visits to and from friends. Most importantly, it means living with the constant fear of eviction. While many people may experience some of these restrictions at some time, those who subsist below the poverty line experience these things with an unrelenting constancy. One of the most disturbing aspects of children growing up in poverty is the long-term effect that this has on the individual and on society as a whole. There is evidence that supports the theory that poverty is self-perpetuating.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Children who grow up in poverty become trapped in the poverty cycle.

Mr Lewis: Nonsense! I didn't.

Ms LENEHAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I find that the interjections of the member for Murray-Mallee are as inane as ever: as though the instance of one individual is in fact going to stand up against a whole body of research. I repeat my assertion, which can be totally supported by research, that children who grow up in poverty become trapped in the poverty cycle.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume her seat. I do not like interrupting a speech, the time for which is now only 30 minutes, and that is why I have restrained myself thus far. I have been able to accept a certain level of interjection while this debate has continued, and in the cut and thrust of politics the Chair ought to do that, but when one side attempts to drown out the other then I think it is time for me to intervene. I ask the House to come to order and to respect the speaker who now has the floor.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Insufficient family income forces children to leave school as

soon as possible. They are unable to attain the skills necessary to compete in today's job market and they tend to experience longer periods of unemployment, interspersed with low-paying jobs. It must be realised that education is not purely an economic tool, that is, a means of getting a job, but rather that it should provide vital life skills and that it should be a right of all Australians.

Studies have shown that unemployment does cause poverty, contrary to many widely held beliefs. According to the Commonwealth Government's background paper 'Poverty in Australia', unemployment, and thus poverty, is disproportionately high among Aborigines, the young, women, and migrants. Over the last decade, single parent families have become the largest group among the 'new poor'. Since about 1980, women have been bearing an increasing share of the unemployment burden. In fact, many social observers are reporting that the feminisation of poverty has become the most compelling social fact of the decade.

Recently, research by Professor Bettina Cass has shown that a female-headed household is five times more likely to be very poor than a male-headed one. Many of these single-parent families have lost their homes and are now living in rental accommodation. Few low income earners are able to afford their own homes. Most single mothers, pensioners, beneficiaries and people in poverty rent their accommodation, the majority renting privately.

Why then should we concern ourselves with poverty? It is because the social costs of poverty are too high to ignore. These costs devolve from more heart attacks, infectious disease, accidents, mental ill health, suicides, alcoholism, drug addiction, crime and violence. A very small percentage of Australians are enjoying the lion's share of this country's wealth. Of even greater concern, though, is the socially unjust way in which this wealth is transmitted—not on the basis of individual merit, hard work or need but largely on the basis of social class, gender and race, handed down from generation to generation. As a result, the polarisation of Australia continues to accelerate into a society of haves and have nots, winners and losers, the rich and the poor.

Because of the evidence that I have presented to this House, I wholeheartedly support the calls on a national level for a national inquiry into the distribution of wealth. It is absolutely necessary that the community know how the rich become wealthy, how they maintain their wealth, and what they do with their wealth. To have only a profile of poverty, which we have had since the definition of the Henderson poverty line, which has been consistently updated by the Brotherhood of St Laurence (and I congratulate the brotherhood on its work in this area) is indeed to have only half the picture. To develop policies and strategies for a more equitable distribution of wealth—

Members interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I will state that again. I am sorry that I have been put off by the Deputy Leader's interjections. For the benefit of *Hansard* I will reread that. To develop policies and strategies for the more equitable distribution of wealth—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, is the member for Mawson confessing to the House something that I have suspected from the time she got to her feet: namely, that she is reading her speech? She has just said, 'I will read that again.' I ask you, Sir, to rule whether it is within the province of Standing Orders for a member to read a speech to the House or whether a member must deliver a speech.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In due course, I will ask the honourable member for Mawson whether she is reading her speech, but I ask the honourable member for Murray-Mallee to take note that any ruling from the Chair applies to both

sides. Is the honourable member for Mawson reading her speech?

Ms LENEHAN: I have copious notes, and from time to time I am quoting, as I have done in my speech thus far, from those notes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mawson.

Ms LENEHAN: The development of policies and strategies for a more equitable distribution of wealth will provide a complete picture of wealth distribution and I believe that this must be established if we, as a community, are to develop the sorts of policy and strategy that will address this growing inequity and imbalance.

Turning to a recently released report of the South Australian Working Group on Women in Apprenticeships, among a wide range of findings, recommendations and strategies, the report included a detailed analysis of female participation in the trades. That analysis indicates that both the actual number of female apprentices and the number of female apprentices as a proportion of total apprentices have increased in South Australia in recent years. I am delighted with those figures. However, the report also found that the percentage comparisons in the period 1981-86 between male and female participation in the trades is by no means equitable.

The analysis suggests that the current low level of female participation in the trades is the result of a wide range of social and institutional factors on both the supply and demand side. The report states:

...the negative attitude prevalent in the community towards women who seek to enter occupations that are traditionally male dominated is a major barrier. Such attitudes, often held by the girls themselves, as well as male and female peers, parents and teachers, reflect the overall socialisation process which stereotypes some jobs as male and other jobs as female.

The lack of available information on opportunity in the trades further exacerbates the situation and limits the quality of vocational guidance provided by schools and parents. Attitudinal barriers by both small and large employers often prevent the employment of women as tradespersons, with a number of factors cited to support these traditional beliefs. The report strongly suggests that, in order to overcome these obstacles, employers should be exposed to the provisions of the South Australian Equal Opportunity Act 1984 and, for larger employers, the Commonwealth Government's affirmative action legislation. I heartily concur in and support that recommendation.

To further redress the imbalance of young women in male traditional apprenticeships a number of strategies and recommendations have been suggested, including the continuation and development of employment and training programs aimed at girls and women such as group apprenticeship schemes, Government apprenticeships, and special courses for women at TAFE level. Of particular significance, and one which I wholeheartedly support, is the importance of changing attitudinal factors so that girls and women are encouraged into the trades.

This can be done in a number of ways. First, as the most important influence on girls' career decisions are their parents and peers, it is vital that parents cast off the traditional career stereotypes for their daughters and encourage them to consider non-traditional occupations in the trades. Secondly, schools should encourage girls to consider a career in non-traditional areas, beginning at the early primary years. Thirdly, campaigns should feature successful role models to whom girls can relate, thus making non-traditional trades normal and attractive.

Although I am aware that much work in primary and secondary schools, as well as through career counselling

units of the Education Department and the Department of TAFE, is being undertaken, many parents are still unaware of the advantages and benefits for their daughters in moving into areas that traditionally have been seen as unsuitable, unladylike, or men's areas. Parents owe it to their children to question these attitudinal barriers and to become more conversant with the opportunities and rewards of a changing labour market in the 1980s and beyond.

My comments on this important issue relate directly to section 11 of the Governor's speech, which states that 'it is particularly important in this changing environment that parents be involved in the education of their children'. I therefore call on school councils to examine and consider the relevant information, recommendations and strategies that are contained in the report of the South Australian Working Group on Women in Apprenticeships. Unless parents and teachers give a lead to the community in breaking down traditional barriers to real career choices for our children, both the community and the individual will not benefit from the use of the skills and talents of all citizens irrespective of sex.

In conclusion, I congratulate the Government on the announcement, in section 16 of the Governor's speech, that an expansion of the community service order scheme is being examined to include offenders who have been fined but whose financial situation makes payment of that fine unlikely. A community is judged on how it treats its poor and underprivileged, and this measure will benefit both the individual offender and the community as a whole. I am pleased to see that the Minister responsible for the community service order program is in the House, because he is aware of my strong support for the principles of this program and the fact that it benefits both the individual and the community as a whole.

Sir, before concluding my contribution, I wish now to make reference to section 19 of the Governor's speech, which refers to the continuing and coordinated action to help in combating child abuse in our community. Members may recall that in my last Address in Reply speech I devoted a large proportion of my time to outlining the problems of child abuse, particularly child sexual abuse, and calling on the various agencies to look carefully at this very serious community issue. I must say that I was delighted to read in the Governor's speech that the Government intends to amend a number of Acts so that we can seriously address the problems that I and many other members of this community have highlighted. Once again, I add my congratulations to the Governor on outlining the program for the Government in the coming year.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I am delighted to have this opportunity to participate in the response to the opening address by His Excellency the Governor. In so doing, I also take the opportunity to express my regret at the passing of Don Simmons and Ron Loveday. I had the privilege of serving in this House with both members in years gone by, and I would be one of the first to acknowledge that they did contribute a great deal to the well-being of all in South Australia. I also pass on my condolences to their families.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the contributions of members opposite—members supporting the Government—who have diligently tried to talk up the economy and bolster the Government. I give them full marks for the tremendous effort that they have put into it, because that really is what they are doing: they are working very diligently in trying to create a perception in this State that all is well with the economy and that the Government is

doing a great job. Unfortunately, when one analyses the situation, that is far from the truth.

In fact, one could say that the contributions from Government members have been long on rhetoric and short on substance. There is no doubt, when we analyse the situation, that South Australia is falling drastically behind the rest of Australia, and we do not have to look far to see why that is so. We have had massive increases in South Australia in taxes and charges. How long can the economy withstand that sort of situation? Wages have increased by 3 per cent or 4 per cent per annum, although I suggest that we should not even have that increase. We should have the inflation rate down to zero. We are competing with countries such as Japan, which has a zero inflation rate, and West Germany, with a minus 0.5 per cent inflation rate, while in Australia we have an inflation rate of between 9 per cent and 10 per cent. So, while people receive wage increases of 3 per cent or 4 per cent per annum, and while the Government increases taxes and charges on essential services by 10 per cent to 15 per cent per annum, the compounding effect is a drastic fall in the living standards of all South Australians.

Having seen essential services charges increase by 10 per cent to 15 per cent, we saw a few days ago STA fares increase by 25 per cent and, in many instances in relation to pensioner concessions, by 50 per cent. That can result only in a massive decline in the standard of living in South Australia. Listening to the member for Mawson, who has just made her contribution to this debate, one could be excused for thinking, from the remarks in the early stages of her address, that she was a member of the Liberal Party, in that she highlighted the disaster that has occurred in the past five years under the Hawke and Bannon Labor Governments, when poverty has increased dramatically. She said that not only do we have numerous millionaires in Australia today, but that we have many billionaires—all achieved under Labor Administrations. I do not know whether she is congratulating herself or the Labor Party on this fact, but hers was a more honest contribution to this debate than were those of many members on the other side.

Let us look at the effect on pensioners of this Government's time in office. In relation to electricity charges, for example, using the CPI for all groups in Adelaide, the maximum concession is \$50 per annum (the level has not changed since November 1982). In 1985-86, 107 565 pensioners and 5 000 beneficiaries received the concession, resulting in a total outlay of \$5 627 000. The CPI for the December 1982 quarter was 121.8 per cent. The current CPI June quarter for 1987 is 168.4. The updated value of the concession on that basis would now be \$69.13, so the loss in real terms to the pensioner is \$19.13 or 27.7 per cent. That is a further decrease in the living standards of pensioners.

Looking at water and sewerage charges and again using the CPI for all groups in Adelaide, the maximum concession available is 60 per cent of the rate up to a maximum of \$75. To be eligible for the concession, a person must hold a pensioner health benefit card, a State concession card, or be in receipt of social security benefits. The last change was in July 1978, when the amount was \$75. The CPI for the September 1978 quarter was 81, and the figure for the June 1987 quarter is 168.4, so the updated value of the concession would be \$155.93. In other words, the loss in value since the last update is \$80.93 or 51.9 per cent. So, in considering water and sewerage charges, pensioners are 51.9 per cent worse off than in 1978. If one owns or is paying off a home, the value of the concession in relation to local government charges is 60 per cent of the rates, up to a maximum of

\$150. The criteria for eligibility are similar to those for water and sewerage charges.

The following update in the value of the concession, based on the all group consumer price index for Adelaide, does not take account of the additional impact or adjustment to the rate following property valuation reviews. It was last changed in July 1978, when the concession was established at 60 per cent. The amount that changed was \$150, which was the maximum rate charged. In the 1978 September quarter, the CPI was 81; for the 1987 June quarter, the CPI was 168.4. The updated value of the concession has increased from \$150 in 1978 to \$311.85. The loss in value is \$161.85 or 51.9 per cent. In other words, with regard to their rebate on council rates, pensioners are now worse off to the tune of 51.9 per cent. The effect can only be a further lowering of living standards, particularly among low income earners or pensioners.

Other indicators further substantiate what I have been saying. A comparison of the population growth figures of the various States and Territories in Australia indicates that South Australia rates bottom. South Australia's employment growth rate is the lowest of all of the mainland States in Australia. In terms of overtime hours worked, once again South Australia has the lowest level of all the States and Territories. The Government suggests that all is going well in this State, yet it can be seen clearly from the figures to which I have referred that all is not well. Talking up the economy will not change the situation one iota.

What we need in South Australia is a bit of genuine, hardworking, investigative journalism, something that we have not seen in this State for a long time. The Government's propaganda machine churns out endless press statements, making it so easy for the media to pick them up and trundle them out. As a result it produces the illusion that everything is well in this State, and that is far from the truth. South Australia deserves better from the media than it gets in many instances. The media can have a massive impact on the people of this State and, therefore, people have a responsibility to carry out their duties to the best of their ability, and that means some genuine hard work and investigative journalism which will get to the bottom of things.

Every time we in the Opposition endeavour to highlight the problems existing in South Australia we are branded by the Government and by the news media generally as knocking the State. If the facts are not brought to the attention of the people out there on the street, how on earth will they realise the plight that this State is in? The figures to which I have just referred indicate clearly that South Australia is at the bottom of the ladder in some of the critical areas, such as population growth, employment growth and the number of overtime hours worked. South Australia is literally right on the bottom and, until there is an improvement in some of those areas, the situation in this State will not improve.

The Government has shown its attitude in relation to payroll tax, and the Opposition will deal with that subject at greater length in the near future. The Government has made a decision to do away with country rebates for manufacturing industries. In my own district, that decision will have an impact of \$1.5 million annually. The Premier endeavours to justify this action by saying that the system will be replaced by an alternative scheme for which industries can apply. The Premier has made the claim that the decentralised industries rebate that has applied since the beginning of the Tonkin Government's term of office has been of no benefit to country areas. If he really believes

that, it is high time that he got out into the country areas found out what the position really is.

He claims that the removal of the decentralised payroll tax rebate will have little effect on most of the businesses in the country. In many instances, businesses revolve around the prosperity of the primary producer. If \$1.5 million is withdrawn from the economy of a region such as the Riverland, \$1.5 million less will go back to the primary producers who, basically, provide the economy of that region. If primary producers in that area have \$1.5 million less to spend, that will have a drastic effect on the living standards of the fruitgrowers and of all concerned.

The Federal Government introduced a wine tax and, more recently, a citrus produce tax. I will deal with that subject in more detail later. Suffice to say, the Prime Minister came to South Australia during the 1983 Federal election campaign and gave an unequivocal guarantee that no wine tax would be imposed by a Labor Government. He soon abandoned that commitment and introduced a 10 per cent wine tax, which caused an immediate downturn in the wine industry, and that was passed on directly to the growers. The growers are carrying the brunt of it. The price of wine did not go up at that stage. The return to growers went down that much more in the price per tonne that they received for their fruit. Following the election 2½ years later, the Prime Minister increased the wine tax. There is now a 20 per cent wine tax and the decline in the consumption of wine in this country has been much more rapid.

The imposition of the 10 per cent sales tax on citrus produce has been devastating in that industry. In the past day or so, the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) said that the citrus produce tax had nothing to do with the downturn in the citrus industry and that it was a fact that there is overproduction of citrus fruit. What absolute rubbish! The overproduction or surplus of juice concentrate is directly attributable to the tax that has been imposed by the Federal Government, yet very little has been said by the State Government as to what it intends to do to try to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government to remove that tax.

South Australia is the principal wine and citrus producing State in Australia, and a very important part of the economy of that area. The Engineering and Water Supply Department recently released a set of management proposals in a paper headed 'River Murray Water Resources Management Review'. A number of similar documents have come out in recent times. The Minister of Water Resources has made numerous statements relating to development regarding the River Murray Commission and legislation is to be introduced into this Parliament to create a Murray-Darling commission. The Opposition applauds that move.

It has been due for a long time. The Murray-Darling system in total needs to be considered as one. We need much more than legislation and rhetoric; effective resources must be put into this enormous resource that we have in Australia in the form of the Murray-Darling Basin. It is acknowledged by the present Federal Government that it is worth about \$10 000 million annually to the economy of the nation. I refer to page 4 of the management proposals document, which states:

1.1 Water Resource Management Objectives.

The South Australian Government's corporate objective for water resources management by the Engineering and Water Supply Department is to ensure that the State's surface and underground water is used for the greatest ultimate benefit to the community. This objective involves increasing long-term benefits to the community considering the present and future competing uses of water . . .

That is fine, and no-one has any objection to that whatsoever. However, if we look down further, the document states:

- to ensure full recovery of costs from those using river management services, except where explicit Government subsidies apply.

If we carry that through to the end and look at some of the Government undertakings in relation to the Murray River in South Australia and Government irrigation undertakings and the manner in which they have been developed and managed over the years, and if we apply the principle of ensuring full recovery from those who receive the benefit, we find that such people will be paying massive costs far in excess of what they should be paying—if that was carried out to the nth degree.

We have seen the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas, headworks and distribution systems as part of Government undertakings. In the main, that work has been carried out by Government day labour at an exorbitant cost to the taxpayers of this State. The works that have been undertaken in Waikerie and Berri could have been undertaken effectively by contract at half the cost. However, that was a decision of the Labor Government of the day: it decided that the work would be undertaken by day labour for the purpose of endeavouring to make its unemployment figures look a little better. It was an expensive exercise and in no way can the growers who utilise the Government irrigation system be held responsible for the manner in which the rehabilitation was undertaken. To suggest that ultimately they will pick up the total burden of the debt servicing on the works undertaken is totally out of the question.

The Government has to be competitive in the service it provides. It has to be competitive with the Renmark Irrigation Trust and the First Mildura Irrigation Trust. Their charges have to be the benchmark for the costs applied in South Australia. One is a smaller undertaking than the Government operation and the First Mildura Irrigation Trust is a much larger undertaking. The Government should be able to manage its operation so that it can fit somewhere in between the costs and charges applied by those two organisations. Until that occurs the Government will continue to drift along with vague proposals that the growers should be paying surcharges and so on towards the debt servicing charges created by the manner in which the rehabilitation was undertaken.

Recently the Government proposed that all irrigators in the Government irrigation areas should have to pay drainage rates whether or not they utilised the system, whether or not they have access to it or whether or not the Government is ever likely to provide them with access to the drainage system. Some 30 per cent of growers in the Government irrigation areas do not have the ability to drain into that system. Any suggestion that we should pay a rate for a service that we do not receive is absolutely wrong in principle and cannot be sustained. I will certainly oppose any efforts by the Government to go down that path. If we allow that to occur, every South Australian will be paying water rates whether or not they receive a water supply or have access to water. The principle is absolutely wrong and cannot be sustained in any way whatsoever.

Another indication of Government charges getting absolutely out of control is the way in which charges are being applied by the E&WS Department on behalf of the Government in relation to water diversion licences or meters. There is a meter charge. I refer to a letter received from a constituent in Barmera who states:

I am writing to lodge a formal protest regarding the increase of 320 per cent in rent of my irrigation meter in two years. When

others have to review costs, it seems hard to justify such excessive increases. Maintenance is the given reason to me from the E&WS Department. It is these types of increases that contribute to the unviability of the farming community. This is a constant worry to us—where will it end?

I now refer to water diversion licences. In this case the rent two years ago was \$39; on the same meter last year it was \$90; and this financial year it is \$125. That is an indication of the sort of increase being applied by this Government. At the same time it is trying to convince the public that all is well in South Australia under a Labor Administration.

I now refer to the Government's promise to build the Berri regional hospital. It would be a regional facility, the intention being to provide specialist health resource facilities for people in the Riverland region. The Government has acknowledged on other occasions that the Riverland is the worst served health community in the State, but it has a concentration of some 30 000 people in a confined area, which should make it relatively easy for the Government to service. However, there are no facilities for specialist health people to operate in that area. Whilst the proposed new hospital was approved by the Government—the project went before the Public Works Standing Committee—the Government is now backing off from that essential project.

It is a matter of priorities. Here we have a regional health facility that will provide essential specialist services competing for funds with, for example, the hockey stadium that the Government is hell-bent on building. We would all like to see a hockey stadium built in South Australia, but when it comes down to the real priorities and what is needed in the State in an economically tight situation, surely there is no argument. Surely health and education have to be top priorities.

As much as we would like to see more sporting facilities, it irks many people, particularly those in the country, to see the Government backing off from an essential facility such as a regional hospital and proceeding with a sporting complex such as that under consideration. I hope that the Government and the Premier will review that situation. I have sought to make a deputation to the Premier for and on behalf of the people of the Riverland on this important matter, but to date we have not been successful in arranging that deputation.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I would like to bring to the attention of the House certain changes that are under consideration in the secondary school structure in the Northern Region and to make some general comments about education at all levels—primary, secondary and tertiary—in South Australia. First, I refer to the most successful Primary Education Day held in South Australia recently.

It has been referred to already in the House today, and this concept is an excellent one. I hope that at this time each year we will be able to focus on a different area of education in order to bring education and its achievements closer to the public. Education changes from year to year, and it is therefore essential that parents are able to see what new innovations are current to better cope with its impact on their own children.

However, it is just as clear that the education budget cake must be kept under constant review to ensure that each slice is allocated in accordance with the needs of the recipient. The ongoing struggle between primary and secondary schools as to how their relative shares are calculated is an example of this problem, and I am sure that all members would be familiar with this. As workload changes occur due to shifting demographics, so must adjustments be made. It is not feasible to be too precise in this area but certainly broad changes must be made on an ongoing basis to ensure

that primary schools do not take the brunt of the funding squeeze arising from the present economic climate while secondary schools are insulated because of their falling student numbers.

Next, I turn to the related question of the proposed rationalisation of secondary schools in the Elizabeth and Munno Para area. This region has seen a dramatic reduction in the number of school age children over the past decade and, although this demographic trend is not unique to the northern area, it is perhaps at its most dramatic here. The Elizabeth and Munno Para housing estates were built by the Housing Trust in the 1950s to accommodate the large number of new migrants to this country, many of whom had young families who filled the local schools to the point of overcrowding. My own family was one such, and a simple comparison with the prevailing school numbers during my own time at the Elizabeth High School is very instructive of the magnitude of the changes which have taken place. I attended Elizabeth High School during the period of its peak enrolment—some 2 100 students—whereas at present the total enrolment figure is below 500.

There are a total of six secondary schools in the Northern Region and, although they have not all experienced such dramatic swings in enrolment extremes as Elizabeth High, the trend is much the same. Some changes have already taken place as a result of decisions taken some years ago. One such example is Fremont High School, which was established by the State Government as a special Music Education Centre and which now enjoys a very high reputation among the music fraternity in this State as a centre of excellence in the teaching of music at this level.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr M.J. EVANS: The member for Fisher quite rightly points to the expertise that this school enjoys. Fremont students are drawn from a wide geographic area, and it is indeed a true regional facility. Students are prepared to travel to attend the school, and their parents are prepared to make sacrifices in their own domestic arrangements to accommodate the special needs of music students in this context. The school offers a fully comprehensive education as well as its specialist music curriculum, and its total enrolment is close to the widely recognised ideal figure of 800 students. A larger school would lose touch with the needs of its students and their parents, while a smaller school would be unlikely to be able to generate the student base necessary to economically offer a range of course options.

Fremont in many ways serves as a possible model for the changes which may need to take place in the other five schools in the district. Fremont has adopted a specialist role while continuing to offer a general education. Other schools could also accept this challenge and offer to mount courses with a special emphasis in a particular subject area such as science (including mathematics and computing), humanities (including economics) and language studies, to name but a few of the more obvious combinations.

However, I feel that at this point it is very desirable that we consider seriously just how many options we want our secondary schools to offer to their teenage students. I am aware of the popularity in educational circles over the last few years of offering a very wide range of options with the result that students choose from a veritable smorgasbord of subjects, with a consequent diminution in the emphasis on the more traditional core subjects, known colloquially as 'reading, writing and arithmetic'. I do not favour a wholesale return to these traditional subjects as the be all and end all of secondary education, as such an option would be far too limiting both educationally and personally for the students,

I do feel that some schools in an overzealous but genuine effort to offer something for everyone are running the risk that they will allow secondary students to leave their sector ill prepared for tertiary education or the workforce both of which demand a high minimum standard of literacy and numeracy skills.

Some people, with a more cynical outlook than mine, would also say that educational courses obey Murphy's law and have expanded to fill the space available, and that teachers have been forced to expand their offering in order to justify their positions in the face of declining enrolments. In my view such cynicism would not be appropriate in the context of the dedicated professionalism shown by South Australian educators, but it must certainly play a peripheral role in the sense that those involved in the provision of education at all levels, from the Minister of Education to the local school council, have long held the objectives that class sizes must be reduced and the range of options increased—almost as a Holy Grail. While these were indeed very desirable options a few years ago, the twin forces of declining enrolments and increasing allocation of resources to education in the 1970s, especially at the Commonwealth level, have combined to bring about a situation where it is necessary to reassess our objectives.

Stabilisation of school sizes at about 800 appears desirable, with a comprehensive education provided at every school. However, this does not mean that every school must offer a full range of every potential elective course area. Rather, schools must ensure that each student is properly equipped to deal with life after school and, contrary to the opinion expressed by some eastern State Education Ministers, who were prominent on recent television current affairs programs, it is the duty of the State school system to prepare students for the rigors of employment and to ensure that they are both literate and numerate at the minimum standard acceptable to the business and tertiary education sectors. This does not mean that they cannot offer exciting and innovative elective subjects: it simply means that they must ensure that the highest priority goes to the basic life skills.

Just as Fremont High has excelled in music, so can other schools in a given regional grouping or cluster excel in other subject areas. However, the concept that children will need to travel between these clustered schools on a regular basis in order to receive their basic education is simply unacceptable to parents, children and teachers. I do not think that point can be emphasised enough. Movement of students on a periodic basis for special education at local centres of expertise—say one afternoon a week or fortnight for attendance at schools with a concentration of expensive capital equipment which cannot be economically provided at every school is one possibility—but bussing between schools several times a day is entirely another.

Combined with this is the option under which some teachers themselves with special expertise may move from school to school in a cluster of, say, three schools. Such an option is particularly feasible in Elizabeth, with the way that the schools are grouped in two groups of three. Although timetable problems would need to be resolved, this would be much easier to accommodate and would still allow a specialist teacher in an elective with only moderate demand to teach to a student base of over 3 000 students, even if that was spread over three or four separate schools—but all within a few miles of each other, as is certainly the case at Elizabeth.

These various options and the review of the diversity of subject offerings must take place within the context of extensive consultation with parents, students and teachers. The active cooperation of all these groups is essential, and

if everyone approaches it in a positive light, with a view to maximising the educational environment for the children, it should be possible to achieve savings through economies of scale, to retain a reasonable diversity, despite the shrinking student base, and to allow teachers to continue to teach a diverse range of subjects to a full age and ability range of students.

Another critical aspect of the broader question is the retention of year 11 and year 12 students. The Government has already recognised the importance of this question with the appointment of the Gilding inquiry into post-compulsory education. I understand that the report is due later this year, and it should certainly make interesting reading. Our retention rate as a country has gradually improved over the last decade, as more students have stayed at school to improve their employment opportunities in a period of relatively high unemployment. Recent changes in the Commonwealth benefit system applicable to young people will also have a significant effect on retention rates, although the magnitude of this change is impossible to predict at this stage.

I remain astounded that the Commonwealth Government refuses to acknowledge the special position of South Australia in respect of the lower average age of our senior students, who are thereby discriminated against *vis-a-vis* their Eastern States counterparts who are able to secure their secondary school Austudy grant when they need it most and when it is most useful in promoting higher retention rates—and that is at the time that the decision is made to stay on for year 11—at the commencement of the school year, not part way through when they happen to turn the magic age of 16.

Although the State Government has protested this ill-considered decision on the part of the Commonwealth, I suspect that their protest could not have been vigorous enough, or surely the decision would have been overturned. However, it would appear that logic will not prevail in this matter and that we will have to live with this failure of the Federal bureaucracy to properly comprehend the special needs of South Australia in this context. Be that as it may, we must act to increase the retention rate of our secondary schools. They are well behind those of other fully developed countries, and if Australia is to have any serious pretensions to dominance in the high technology and high finance areas of the service economy of the 1990s we must educate our children now for this future inheritance.

One vital component of any such comprehensive education-based recovery must be TAFE, and this brings me to the third leg of the education trifecta. The present undignified public vilification of the TAFE sector by its Minister has done a great deal of damage to the credibility of the institution as a whole. TAFE is a massively under-utilised resource, with significant unrealised potential, and while it may be true that there are some in the system who are not pulling their weight, I very much doubt that the solution is to gazette inflexible regulations which can then be used as a blunt instrument to bring these underworked staff members into line.

The tertiary education sector simply does not function along that kind of line, and in my opinion a much more effective answer would be to work within the system and to apply greater pressure to TAFE management at all levels—and, after all, that starts with the Minister—for those people to gainfully employ themselves and to go about the jobs for which they are employed. They are required to ensure that every staff member is fully and gainfully employed. That is the duty of management. The regulations are simply too simplistic and run the risk of alienating the

large, indeed overwhelming, number of staff members who work in excess of the minimum requirements—and who always have done.

Peer pressure is very effective in this context and it is a management responsibility to ensure the full utilisation of each individual staff member. Accordingly, I would appeal to the Minister to calm down his public rhetoric and to reform the system from within. After all, he is at the top of it. This objective of improving overall efficiency is admirable, and I commend him for it. I am certainly not advocating that he abandon his target of maximising the teaching return while minimising the cost to the taxpayers. That should always be the ongoing objective of any manager in the education system at any level. I simply seek an alternative approach more related to consensus and conciliation—an objective for which the Government would be much better employed. Dedication and loyalty cannot be imposed by regulation: they must spring from a sense of shared commitment and the pursuit of a common goal, namely, the best possible education within the financial resources available to the community.

The promise of TAFE has only just begun to be realised, and I hope that the next few years will see a broadening of its entry criteria, to allow more of the so-called second chance or re-entry students to attend TAFE courses as an alternative to attending high schools which are currently dominated by younger students. While the two groups can interact well, I share the view of many parents that it is much more appropriate that mature-age students should undertake their senior secondary education at a TAFE college. The adult environment which prevails at such colleges would also be much more comfortable for these students. TAFE already makes a significant contribution to mature-age matriculation but entrance requirements limit the range of mature-age students who can attend these courses which do not meet the needs of all students.

The TAFE system also possesses a wide range of expensive capital technology and equipment which ought to be available to secondary students under controlled conditions. This is particularly true of computer equipment and mechanical workshops, which are almost impossible to provide at the secondary level. Rather than retain the Goodwood Technical School concept, as it was originally formulated many years ago, it would make far more sense to allow regional TAFE colleges to act as the focal point of 'technical' electives for secondary students in much the same way as some of the high schools may be required to specialise in particular subject areas. Students wishing to take such options may spend, say, a day a week, or a day a fortnight, depending on their own seasonal requirements in such an environment, which would facilitate student movement between institutions, that is, between the secondary schools and the TAFE colleges, for that specialised education, while enabling a much better utilisation of TAFE resources.

While such a move would no doubt necessitate an increase in the resources available to the TAFE sector overall, any increase in retention rates would otherwise require an increase in the resources made available to the secondary sector and the redirection of some of these resources is simply a question of policy. After all, if the secondary sector numbers rise dramatically through increased retention rates, someone is going to have to pay for that, and it would make much more sense to allocate the resources properly from the beginning.

TAFE colleges have always adopted an open door policy with respect to the community, but attitudes and policies need to change even further if the community is to gain the

maximum educational output for the shrinking tax dollar. Given the twin forces of changing demographics and financial restraint, some brave decisions will be required in respect of the allocation of future budget funds for the education sector, and the boundary between education and training will start to blur at the State level, as it already has in the formulation of the new Commonwealth Ministry.

I sincerely hope that all those involved in this process will approach it with the needs of students uppermost in their minds and that they will be tolerant of the changes required and receptive to the innovations demanded of educators, administrators and policy makers in the 13 years that remain before the third millennium.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am privileged to have such an audience. It is my privilege to take part in this traditional Address in Reply debate and to record my condolences to the families of those former members who have departed the scene since the last Opening. I refer specifically to the late Don Simmons, a fellow member of the Class of 1970. I am pleased to note that Mr Simmons' widow regularly attends in her role as a member of the Roseworthy Agricultural College council and continues the public and community service to which her husband was party. The late Ron Loveday left this House just as I entered it, but I was privileged to know him for some years thereafter when he frequently called at the House. His part in South Australian education and his contribution to his community at Whyalla were highly regarded by members on both sides of the political fence.

I am also happy to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and to express my pleasure that His Excellency the Governor and his lady have been accorded an extension of their service to the State of South Australia. That announcement will earn the approbation of people throughout the State because, wherever they have gone, both Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan have brought a dignity to the office, have shown a warm community spirit and, as they have said themselves, have benefited from mixing with South Australians so as to better understand their difficulties.

It was with sorrow that I noted in today's press that a former Governor of South Australia (Sir Mark Oliphant) had left this State to live in Canberra. I fully appreciate the reason for his leaving, to be near his family. The loss of his wife in January this year proved not only traumatic to Sir Mark but something that left him remorseful. His major contribution, not only as Governor of South Australia but subsequently, is something of which he may well be proud and of which South Australia may also be proud. He was a native born South Australian who moved on to a significant place in the scientific annals not only of South Australia but of the world. Subsequently, his involvement as Governor of this State was highly regarded and his service was given with warmth, if not altogether without controversy from time to time. Nonetheless, by being controversial he drew to our attention matters which he believed needed further public consideration, and he did this with a flourish.

Before commenting about the situation relating to our present quality of life in South Australia—a theme with which you, Mr Acting Speaker, concluded your remarks when moving this motion—I want to refer very quickly to one or two of the statements contained in His Excellency's address. In the third paragraph, for example, we find that, for the first time for a long time in a public sense, the

present Government acknowledges its close association with the Federal Hawke Government. The relevant paragraph states:

3. The economic situation facing our nation and this State is again the most important issue before my Government. The Commonwealth Government continues to pursue policies designed to stabilise our economy through restraint in public spending and tight budgetary controls, and my Government is prepared to play its part in achieving the longer-term prosperity this country so greatly needs.

There is no argument that we need to consider urgently where we are going and how we will get there. At least the Government there acknowledges that they are as one—that is, they are of the family of the Labor Party, both Commonwealth and State—yet this afternoon, as on many previous occasions, the State Government tried to distance itself from its colleagues in Canberra by saying that it is not the same organisation, does not have the same philosophies, and is not party to a number of reprehensible actions which have been taken by the Federal Government and which have had and are continuing to have a very serious impact on this State.

A little further on, we find an acknowledgment that the Government understands and acknowledges the importance in our economy of farm income. Never let us forget that. It is not infrequent that we find members from the other side decrying the position of the farming community in this State seeking to claim all manner of qualities adverse to the representation of the agricultural electorates and the desires of people in that area. For years the rural community has carried and continues to carry this State on its back, particularly since the demise of manufacturing industry.

For a long time, I have indicated on the public record that, whether one lives in the country or the city, we are all part of South Australia and therefore ought to be striving for the same excellence and the same benefits for the South Australian community. However, in saying that, I seek continuing recognition by the Government, and more particularly its very vocal backbench members, that at all times it is important that we recognise the specific problems of country people. We must recognise that, whilst they have a great quality of life, they do not necessarily have access to some of the very important facilities that are commonplace to those who live within the metropolitan area or close to the provincial cities. It must always be recognised that the rest of the State owes something to those people who produce 47 per cent or 48 per cent of its total income. I do not want to dwell on that because that is not the purpose of my contribution to this debate.

I want to point out very clearly that, although we are as one in the State of South Australia, regrettably we are seeing occasions when South Australians in rural areas are being picked off. I will refer to those occasions as I move on. Mr Acting Speaker, I had referred to the statement that you made in concluding your remarks in this debate, and it picks up another point contained in His Excellency's speech, which states:

... my Government faces new and demanding challenges to strengthen the economic base which is so important in the development of this State as a balanced and caring community, where all citizens are treated with respect and understanding.

I repeat: 'where all citizens are treated with respect and understanding'—and with those words, Sir, we link the importance of being a caring community. I took the opportunity only a few minutes after you delivered those words, Sir, to draw attention to the lack of care and opportunity presently given in this State to people who are in need—and vital need in many circumstances—of access to transportation by the St John Ambulance. I drew attention to the major problem in our main city hospital, the Royal

Adelaide Hospital, of transit patients being referred from a country hospital.

For example, I mentioned one instance of a gentleman from Gawler who was sent to the Royal Adelaide Hospital having been in hospital some time. He had been on a drip and on four-hourly temperature monitoring because of the nature of his condition. However, he became lost in the system—lost in the passageways of the Royal Adelaide Hospital—for 6½ hours before he found a bed. He was taken off the drip, with no opportunity to receive the benefit which that facility provided, and with no real monitoring of the temperature rise and fall which was a problem specifically referred to by his medical advisers in Gawler. That is not caring for the community. There is a complete lack of the caring which is so necessary for people in desperate circumstances—not from the staff, who go out of their way and who are applauded for what they do for the patients put into their charge, but from the system, which does not allow the natural flow and type of assistance so vitally necessary.

I point out to many of the Ministers who sit on the benches in this place and elsewhere the lack of care and attention and the lack of consideration given by this Government, which very clearly is allowing South Australians to fall behind in comparison with those living in other States. It is allowing South Australians to fall behind in the quality of life which you, Sir, have indicated is so very important for our fellow South Australians.

But what do we find in relation to our schools? There would not be a member in this place who has not had representations from schools in his electorate concerning the drastic lack of maintenance undertaken in relation to those public assets. We had the announcement before the last election, by a Government buying its way into office, of a \$90 million special maintenance benefit over a three-year period for the schools system in South Australia. Where is that \$90 million now? The priorities which have been set and offered to the people of South Australia have been lost by other actions taken by the Government to spend money in many instances in a wanton and unnecessary fashion. Whether it be the asphalt on the pavement of the schools, whether it be the lack of paint—and it is the lack of paint which allows the deterioration of the asset—the matter is a real concern to any thinking member of the school community. People of various political persuasion come into my office and the offices of other members indicating not the lack of attention given by officers when provided with funds or the opportunity to undertake the necessary work, but quoting cases where funds have been withdrawn from the school community.

There has been talk of a blow-out at headquarters. The schools are in a drought, yet the headquarters, whether it be of the Education Department or of the Department of Technical and Further Education, as witnessed from recent public statements, are still involved with the wastage of funds in a regionalisation program that has now become completely discredited and has seen a proliferation of members in high places without facilities and without funds being made available at the coalface where they are so important.

I turn now to local government. The failure of the Government to stand up for South Australia has meant that less road funds are available than has been the case for many years, and that reflects back on local government. It also casts a reflection on quality of life and the opportunity for large numbers of people in country areas to safely and effectively move from point A to point B. It is getting worse. Local government is being harassed by the State Government, which is intent on allowing ideologues to continue

with the threat of compulsory voting. The Minister of Local Government has no control of her portfolio. More importantly, she has no control over her Party, which is persisting with the ridiculous stance that the principle of minimum rating should be taken out of the Local Government Act. Local government is speaking out very loudly right across this State, whether it be in the cities, the country or in the developing fringe areas, and is pointing out that the principle of minimum rating is necessary within the Local Government Act because it provides local councils with an option that they can take if they so desire.

I move on to the police. Because of a lack of purpose or direction, officers in the field are overloaded. They are being required to take bigger loads, and much further than previously. Large numbers of police officers who are specifically trained in traffic duties have to sit around in stations twiddling their thumbs while the traffic car, which is designed for traffic purposes, is used on regular police business. My colleague the member for Coles has been told that at Holden Hill Police Station at the moment there are 10 000 incomplete files. There are also 10 000 incomplete files at Darlington. The reason is that there are so many unnecessary claims on the time of the police that they are not able to get on with the work for which they have been trained.

During the early part of 1986, the lack of morale within the Police Force was highlighted. That was toned down to a degree as a result of a review that was undertaken, but it is emerging again. One does not have to walk around blindly. The loss of morale within the Police Force can be seen on the streets and one can read about it in the newspapers. That low morale has been caused by the workload that is being forced upon the officers. Because of that workload, they are unable to complete the investigations that they start, and they cannot provide the service that the community requires.

What of the Motor Registration Division? It has been decided that the office of the Motor Registration Division at Nuriootpa will close on 28 August. People over 70 years of age who are in need of a licence and who come from Robertstown, Blanchetown, Cambrai, Sedan or any one of the Barossa Valley towns will have to present themselves to the office at Elizabeth. The first appointment time available at Elizabeth is well into September. These people never drive in the city (and, in the general sense, Elizabeth is the city), yet they cannot undertake their driving test in the country area in which they always drive. Inspectors from the Motor Registration Division who live in the Barossa Valley and work from the police stations in that area have been told that they will present themselves to Elizabeth and do all of their inspections there. It does not matter that they could have a base office at Elizabeth and still perform the same service for the community as they perform in the country police stations at Tanunda or Nuriootpa.

These matters are affecting the quality of life of the people of this State. South Australia is sliding backwards in what it is offering its people. What is the position with housing? The present Minister is presiding over the biggest breakdown in public or welfare housing in recent times. That is largely because, in 1985, the Government bought itself back into office by foolishly holding down rentals at a time when there was enough fat in the system to allow many of those rentals to be increased. In addition, restrictions were removed on people in Housing Trust homes having to pay for excess water. That completely destroyed the requirement that people take a responsible attitude to the use of water in those places. The additional cost is foisted upon this State and reduces the amount that is currently available for the building of houses. Some may ask, 'What is \$2 million or \$3

million?', which is the amount that the trust pays annually for excess water. If it is divided by, say, \$70 000 per home unit, it represents a lot of homes. That is but one of the effects we are seeing at present.

What about safety in the streets? My comments do not reflect at all upon the police who, as I have already said, are overloaded and in many cases denied the opportunity to patrol the streets because of the recent reduction in the number of motor vehicles available. One police unit, which for years had the use of four vehicles, now has only three. The same number of people are required to use only three vehicles, and that means a reduction in the presence of police on the streets at a time when there is much discussion about community policing. I refer to a particular situation that was reported on 29 July in the *Salisbury, Elizabeth and Gawler Messenger* with the headline, '“I'm prisoner in my home”, says South woman'. The article refers to an Elizabeth South woman and states:

No steel bars cross the windows, nor do padlocks fasten the doors. But an Elizabeth South resident says she is imprisoned in her own home—her shackles are her neighbours. The resident, who did not want to be named, says she is surrounded by hooligans who fight in the street and regularly abuse and rob their neighbours. She said 'gang terrorists' had forced five families living nearby to leave their homes.

That is only one of a series of similar occurrences. I know of a young couple who live in much the same area and, one night, there was a forceful intrusion into their house. The perpetrator of the action used a knife, according to the person who was attacked. The medical officer who stitched his wound indicated that it was consistent with a cut from a knife (he did not say that it was a knife) but, on the police records, there is no mention of a wound. Why? The young fellow was counselled that, if the police stated in the report that he was attacked, the matter would be lost in the system.

When the matter was discussed with members of the force, it was clearly indicated that so frequent are some of these activities in that area that it has become the style not to necessarily write up all the problems that exist as the police would never get around to following them through and would never get enough people to stand up in a court because of the fear placed upon them in the intervening period. That is another matter we can look at on another occasion. That discussion has taken place.

Yet the Labor Party before the last election indicated that it was mindful that the link between unemployment levels and the incidence of crime was so obvious that it could not be ignored. It was stated that, under a Bannon Labor Government committed to job creation, it could be anticipated that the extent of financial and social pressures that lead unemployed persons into criminal activity would be greatly reduced. That was the claim made in the 1982 election campaign in relation to police policy by the present Labor Government. Where is the action? There has been plenty of rhetoric, but where is the action to overcome, for the benefit of the whole community, the sorts of issues raised then?

What about environment and planning? I briefly mentioned in an earlier grievance debate that a constituent of mine between March 1987 and June 1987 was denied access to a letter. The letter was written, and I have the copy of the original letter which my constituent obtained from the office on 17 June 1987, the letter being dated 18 March 1987. After five inquiries, personally at the office and by telephone, he was told that the letter had gone. In a letter that I received yesterday the Minister informed me that the council rates that that person had paid in November 1986 had been submitted to the Native Vegetation Management Branch back in November 1986 and that the Minister of

Lands was assessing how much of the council rates would be paid by the department, notwithstanding that it was the management branch that asked for the account to be forwarded and indicated that the money would be forthcoming within a short time. Yet in July 1987, almost to the time the constituent would be receiving the next council rates, he was still waiting for his just dues—the repayment for that area of land taken over by the Government.

What about the freeze areas? I refer to the five areas around South Australia where people have been told that they may not undertake development. They are virtually under a blanket in relation to the future of their holdings. I refer to Sandy Creek, Roseworthy, Virginia, Aldinga and Mount Barker. People in those areas were told that the freeze would be for six months, the Government would make its decision and they would know where they were going. Eighteen months later they are still waiting in suspended animation wondering what is their future. I wonder what effect that has had, particularly on the livelihood of those approaching retirement and not knowing how best to leave their property.

What about the position of the Minister of Agriculture in regard to the vine pull? People were told that money was available for the vine pull. They made application and were told it would be given consideration. Some people got money without a great deal of question. Suddenly, additional restrictions were put into the system after people were paid who were less seriously affected financially than many who had delayed slightly but had still lodged their application in time. Dozens of people in the Barossa and Clare Valleys and other areas of the Riverland have been wondering and waiting after having the rug pulled out from under their feet part way through the activity.

What about the announcements in recent weeks by the Minister of Agriculture on the reclaiming of DDT without his being prepared to offer payment for that asset? I understand that that was changed this afternoon. I am not positive of the total circumstances. Where else would one find a Government that would move in and take people's property—people who were completely in charge of their own affairs, who had not been transgressing the law, and who were not responsible for any action against the best interests of the State—and tell them that part of their asset would be taken with no compensation. That happened in relation to people's property when the native vegetation regulations were first introduced. Fortunately, that has been changed.

I finish much where I started in relation to the statement made by the member for Adelaide in moving this motion. Yes, we want a better quality of life for our people in South Australia. Yes, we need to do quite a lot to achieve it, but certainly this Government, by a number of the proposals to which I have drawn attention, has been doing anything but giving people such a quality of life.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Before addressing the House in reply to the opening speech by His Excellency the Governor, I also extend my condolences to the families of former members of this Parliament, the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday. Having campaigned with Don Simmons in relation to strong environmental and national parks policies, I know that his commitment, foresight and tenacity in those areas was enormous. That commitment and effort continued beyond his retirement from this Parliament, thus setting high standards for the younger parliamentarians.

I refer also to the speech by the Leader of the Opposition today wherein he again falsely attributed to Abraham Lincoln a number of statements which over the years have repeatedly been attributed to him. The Leader referred to

such statements as, 'You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.' I mention this because it is not the first time that the Leader of the Opposition has attributed those statements to Abraham Lincoln and it is not the first time that that wrong attribution has been pointed out. For example, back in 1980 John Olsen, Liberal MP, used this section of so-called Lincoln phrase in a column in the *News*. The Speaker of this House has on a number of occasions corrected the statement by pointing out that in fact they are the words of a reactionary Pennsylvanian clergyman, the Rev. William J. Boucher, apparently penned in a booklet in 1916.

The Governor in his opening speech to the Parliament highlighted the challenge facing the Government in dealing with difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions ahead because of the significant reductions in Federal funds available to South Australia. The State Government has undertaken to meet that challenge in a way that retains essential services to the community and protects those least able to cope with budgetary restraint. At the same time a series of economic developments such as the new Convention Centre, the Centre for Manufacturing, further expansion at Technology Park and the giant submarine contract will add to and broaden our economic base and the State's employment opportunities. Some easing of the difficult times experienced by the home building industry is also in prospect following slight interest rate falls in the past few weeks. Those new initiatives and improvements will bring gradual results and opportunities rather than overnight transformation of the State's regional economy. Nevertheless, they are certainly important signs of revitalised industry and a brighter future.

In the meantime, the forthcoming budget will see a tightly disciplined allocation of taxpayers' funds. Special interest groups in the community, with further ideas for improved public services and new spending initiatives, will need to set priorities in recognition of the tight financial circumstances facing the State Government. In each and every area of public and community service, opportunities for better value for each dollar spent will need to be grasped, and the emphasis must shift from simplistic judgments about whether a Public Service gets more or less dollars to whether the dollars spent result in top quality, productive and efficient service to the people who need it.

Looking at the State's future development beyond the immediate budget context, it is clear that our community is going to need a highly educated and highly skilled population and work force to make the most of the new local economic opportunities, and to contribute and to compete nationally and internationally. There is a perception that as a community we are not reaching the standards of excellence necessary, or fully equipping young people for a successful, productive contribution to the community.

A number of indicators point to the high priority we must give to effective public policy in public education, secondary and post-secondary, and in training opportunities. First, comprehensive, high quality public education accessible to all young people is under challenge with a drift to private schooling, and talk of privatisation of education facilities and services, and of full fees systems. Secondly, increasing year 12 retention rates notwithstanding, we still lag behind other post-industrial developed nations in the proportion of young people completing senior secondary education. In fact, almost half of those who enter secondary school are leaving before completion. The figure was 48.7 per cent in 1986. We know that some groups in the community have particularly low retention rates.

Thirdly, young people unable to afford to complete secondary education, or ill equipped to fit into its strictures or structures, leave school with few skills or prospects and little in the way of another chance at a good education. Fourthly, thousands of young people miss out on the opportunity for university, CAE, TAFE and other post-secondary education and professional, trade or commerce training as queues lengthen for limited places. Fifthly, we continue to have a highly sex segregated work force, with excessive numbers of young girls not pursuing maths, science and related subjects, exacerbating the other barriers to the full range of work force opportunities. Sixthly, as a nation, we are not well versed in the languages of our northern Pacific neighbours and present and prospective trading partners. Further, employers in local high technology industries anticipate increasing shortages of people skilled to take up new opportunities in expanding industries of this kind, such as submarine related manufacturing and construction industries.

Finally, there seems a growing gulf between those who argue for a broadly based system of comprehensive secondary education and further education and those who want the system to be business or industry driven so that business and industrial needs predominate, even at secondary level. Concurrently, there is much debate between observers, parent communities, school councils and others about the appropriate way to go. While all of those debates take place, those young people who miss out on a full secondary education and full employment experience a sense of alienation, blame, poverty, and so on.

The New Right ideologues offer policies to exacerbate the difficult challenges ahead. The latest solutions of the New Right or anti-government forces envisage a \$1 billion cut to public schooling, radical privatisation of public education infrastructure, sacking of large numbers of public school teachers, the abolition of Austudy student assistance grants, the return of tertiary fees of \$5 000-plus per student and the establishment of a voucher system at school level to privatise education services. Such solutions apply a purely 'economic efficiency' view of the challenges facing public education policy. They fail to address the difficult problems of how to deliver to the whole community effective educational opportunity. They seem in fact to deny education services as a vital responsibility of Government for the substantial proportion of the population which needs or chooses public education for their children. The Liberal and National Party education policies, varying dry versions of the New Right approach, would have left large numbers of students high and dry depending on their family's economic circumstances which, again, is a cop-out in terms of public education policy and a plus for the cult of selfishness and further inequality.

In sharp contrast to these negative approaches, the Commonwealth Schools Commission has produced a most constructive and forward-looking set of proposals in its recent report 'In the National Interest—Secondary Education and Youth Policy in Australia'. I commend the report and its briefer summary document to all educationalists, school council members and parents and youth groups interested in the future needs and directions in public education and youth policy. I am happy to provide the summary report to people in my electorate interested in these important issues. I want to draw on various aspects of the report. The report concludes:

No matter how well education has served us in the past, we will require more and better education in the future if Australians are to deal collectively and successfully with the complexities of contemporary society and the far-reaching effects of information

technology, while preserving and extending the national commitment to democracy and social justice.

The commission wants to see the entitlement of all young Australians to a full secondary education realised. In the short term, it proposes that we aim to eliminate unemployment of young people aged between 15 and 19 years by 1992. It proposes that we increase the retention rate to year 12 from 48.4 per cent to 65 per cent by 1992 and ensure that all school aged young people are gainfully involved in education, training or rewarding employment.

It sees secondary schools as playing a vital role in these goals and in pursuing a comprehensive youth policy. On the question of what constitutes a worthwhile education, the commission comes down in support of a broadly balanced curriculum for all, along with opportunities for elective studies and activities to extend students. The report states:

The commission believes that artificial distinctions between general and vocational education have long outlived their usefulness. A general education can be strongly pre-vocational. Even where a field of study is seen to be directly vocational, for example, commercial studies, there are clear advantages in teaching in such a way that the learning is generalisable, increasing the students' potential to work in other areas should jobs not be available in the particular commercial fields.

I support that view, because so many people now have a variety of different jobs and careers throughout their working lives—and that includes members of Parliament—and future employment opportunities are increasingly difficult to predict far ahead in this rapidly changing world. The Commonwealth Schools Commission makes useful suggestions for improving the quality and relevance of secondary education, for increasing retention rates and for providing a fairer distribution of educational benefits. With growing economic penalties falling on young people who leave school prematurely, we must also take heed of the 'social and economic implications of a large number of young people being excluded from the mainstream labour market and from the educational provision available to their age group'. The social cost of ignoring their disadvantage should not be acceptable in this community. The nine findings and recommendations of the Commonwealth Schools Commission report should be vigorously pursued.

I am encouraged that these views are not confined to educationalists or public policy makers. For example, the Managing Director of the British Petroleum Company, Mr Robert Malpas, in a speech called 'Education and Industry: a Working Partnership' advocates broadening curriculum options for young people and keeping their options open for as long as possible; he argues against early career choices and narrow curricula. He points out that education and training are linked but not the same thing. He supports continuing education and training beyond schooling and tells his industry colleagues that industry has a special responsibility in supporting both throughout people's careers, preferably inside and outside the company. I find those various contributions to important education policy issues a positive encouragement to the discussion taking place here in South Australia.

Meanwhile, locally, the decline in student enrolments in our State secondary schools continues. It has been estimated that by 1990 more than 40 000 fewer students will be attending all State schools compared with enrolment numbers in 1980. Established areas of metropolitan Adelaide show signs of declining enrolments, while some of our outer suburban areas such as Golden Grove, in the north-east, need new school facilities to accommodate sharp projected growth. The changing student numbers and geographical distribution do open up opportunities for restructuring, provided

that Government and the education sector are sufficiently flexible, adaptable and forward looking.

In my own electorate of Newland that flexibility and adaption is already under way, with the cluster schools concept begun by Banksia Park High School, the Heights and Modbury High School. The idea of sharing expertise and resources between the three schools, particularly for senior secondary students, allows the schools with declining student enrolments to continue to offer a wide range of curriculum choice to students in an economical way.

I welcome the Government's commitment outlined in the Governor's speech at the opening of this session of Parliament to offer all primary school children an education in a language other than English. This is a timely commitment, in line with the Federal Labor Government's commitment to develop and implement a national language policy. I am pleased that one of the schools in the area that I represent, the Ridgehaven Primary School, intends to introduce the teaching of the Japanese language in that school in the near future. I certainly support that school's quest to do that. I note the proposal to amend the education regulations to broaden the powers and responsibilities of school councils in their participation in school planning and decision-making and also last week's announcement by the Minister that parent bodies will soon have a say in choosing the local school principal.

I welcome the efforts that our teachers, school councils and Education Department staff are making to address the challenges facing what are, in effect, broad community issues and not simply schooling issues. It would be misconstruing the issues that I have mentioned to suggest that teachers alone are responsible for, or must meet, those challenges. I am very pleased to see that the Australian Teachers Federation has embarked on a significant public campaign to highlight the successes of public education in this country and to dispose of the myths and perceptions put about by those who would undermine the public education system.

I am heartened by the serious debate that is taking place through the State Government's inquiry into post-compulsory education. I hope that that investigation, along with the Commonwealth Schools Commission Report, will lead to more appropriate programs for those who have been called 'disinclined students' and who are over the compulsory schooling age of 15. There are signs also that more effective links between school and TAFE systems are being developed. Initiatives in those two directions offer the prospect of further opportunities for otherwise disinclined students, for mature aged people returning to study and for those more academic students who do not meet the tough entry requirements and quotas for higher education institutions. I was also pleased to note the strengthened links between schools and TAFE under the project 'TAFE and schools co-operation project', announced jointly by the Minister of Education and the Minister of Employment and Further Education last week. I note that the proposal suggests the involvement of young people in the Community Improvement Through Youth project or the Community Youth Support Scheme.

I was delighted to see in today's *News* details of plans to release to year 10, year 11 and year 12 students this week during Senior Students Week a document called 'Unlock your future' as a career guide to help young people plan for their future education and employment. The public education debate and the responses and initiatives which flow from it must be directed at maintaining a first-class public education system and educational opportunity accessible to all our young people.

I now wish to refer to a recent State Government initiative, with the release of a manual on residential street management. The superb booklet 'The Street Where You Live' is one of those rare documents that really touches an issue affecting almost everyone. It suggests solutions to the daily frustration and annoyance which so many suburban residents experience. In each of our electorates, we can identify our very own Jack Brabham Way—our Short Cut Avenue, as the book calls them. The resulting vehicle noise at all hours of day or night, the dangers to the youngsters who seem to have no rights in their very own street, the worry about the visiting grandchildren unaware of the ever present hazards, are all familiar stories.

I am delighted that the State Government's investment of \$105 000 over two years has produced the booklet and an accompanying video which I understand have been very well received by many local councils. The video, I believe, has also been sold to the United States and New Zealand. The Department of Transport, John Hutchinson and his team, deserve congratulations as do Enfield and Unley councils, which are taking part in demonstrations on residential street management. The information gained from the demonstration projects will be available for all councils in South Australia.

It seems to me that we need to change community perceptions about residential streets. After all, it may be legal to do 60 km/h in our own driveway, but we do not. Similarly, the physical design and landscaping solutions in 'The Street Where You Live' to slow traffic and create safe, attractive residential streets will be important in encouraging local councils and local residents alike to create a decent living environment. As the booklet suggests, residents can contribute to residential street management plans by identifying to their local council local street problems, by setting new objectives for the street, by commenting on schemes proposed by council, and by letting the council know after the schemes are introduced how the changes are working.

Children and the elderly will benefit most from the various methods of residential street management because they are the two groups most at risk from accidents in local streets. It may be surprising to some to learn that 70 per cent of accidents involving children under six years of age take place on quiet residential streets; that children under nine years are not capable of dealing with traffic without adult supervision; and that even children in the nine to 13 year age group are also in the high risk category. Elderly pedestrians are also at risk in residential streets with a disproportionate level of death and injury for their age group. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table demonstrating that point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that the table is purely statistical?

Ms GAYLER: I believe so.

Leave granted.

TOTAL POPULATION BY AGE GROUP

UNDER 11	11-15	16-20	21-60	60 and OVER
17%	9%	9%	51%	14%
ROAD CASUALTIES COMPARED TO AGE OF POPULATION				
24%	13%	13%	35%	15%
16%	12%	16%	35%	23%
15%	29%	19%	34%	3%
45%		33%		22%

% of Pedestrian Injuries
% of Pedestrian Deaths
% of Cyclist Injuries
% of Cyclist Deaths

Ms GAYLER: While children and the elderly will be direct beneficiaries of a concerted effort to make residential streets safe, we are all entitled to a real residential street rather than a raceway. I congratulate the Minister of Transport on this important step forward, and urge councils to pursue with vigour the program for safer residential streets.

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

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I support the motion before the House, and offer my condolences to the families and friends of the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday. I did not know the Hon. Ron Loveday, but I did on occasions run into the Hon. Don Simmons, and I must say that he was a person for whom I had a high regard. He put in an extraordinary effort when he was in Parliament and, importantly, when he left the Parliament he maintained his parliamentary interests. On a number of occasions I have attended functions or seminars in relation to crime prevention at which the Hon. Don Simmons was present, and he always showed an avid interest in this area and certainly made a contribution to it during his term in Parliament and while he was Minister.

I wish to canvass two matters during this Address in Reply debate: first, the state of the State and, secondly, the ACTU document 'Australia Reconstructed'. Since being elected to this Parliament in November 1982 I have not heard one contribution from the Government ranks which has demonstrated a fundamental understanding of the difficulties facing this State. Perhaps more importantly, there has been a complete lack of intellectual application to the challenge of reversing the economic slide that we have experienced over the past 10 to 20 years. I call upon everyone in this House to step back from politics for a moment and honestly and critically review the State's fortunes since the late 1960s.

On all performance indicators the State has failed to do justice to the needs and aspirations of its citizens. Just taking a simple indicator such as population growth, the rate of increase is one-third lower than that experienced by the nation as a whole. Rarely have we generated a level of investment commensurate with our size. Employment growth has fallen dramatically, with corresponding rises in unemployment. We have failed to gain an adequate share of tourism. Earnings in this State are well below the national average.

South Australian companies are being taken over and head offices moved interstate. In reports on poverty, South Australia always features prominently as having one of the largest proportions of the population living below the breadline. Our social security dependent population is the highest of any State. Recently, our bankruptcy figures have reached record levels. Everyone in this Parliament should feel ashamed of such a record, but what is the response? We hear excuses about our narrow industrial base, rural crises, distance from interstate and overseas markets and world economic difficulties.

The real problem is that these tired, worn out reasons have been thrust before the people so often and for so long by the Dunstan and Bannon Governments that they have become accepted as part of the prevailing truth by Labor politicians, people and press alike. For 14 of the past 17 years, successive ALP Governments have duped this population into believing that South Australia cannot achieve greater heights because of its structural deficiencies. They have at the same time enticed the citizens of this State to become more and more dependent on Government services: self-reliance has become but a fleeting memory. Through

excessive regulations and burgeoning taxation they have reduced the desire of people to achieve.

They have even made deception an acceptable art form. It is an indictment of our system when members of the press comment on how successful the Premier or one of his Ministers has been in breaking promises with absolute impunity, avoiding giving answers to proper parliamentary questions, tying up Question Time with lengthy explanations—and the list goes on. What we have today and have had for much of the past two decades is a Government more intent on retaining power at any cost than taking those decisions which will enhance the State.

This unhealthy preoccupation with survival and expediency has contributed to the low regard of people for politicians and Parliament. It has reduced the process of democratic government to mediocrity. It has left the people of this State with little semblance of self-respect and quashed that precious commodity of determination to succeed.

Let us reflect briefly on the three years of Tonkin Government in order to demonstrate my point about achievement. When the historians look back in the year 2000 on where we have been, they must draw the inevitable conclusion that Premier Tonkin provided a breath of fresh air to a State which was going nowhere. The Liberal Government acted as a circuit breaker at a time when the Government had become moribund and corrupt. Unfortunately, the impetus and the new beginnings that were a hallmark of those three years were unable to be sustained when the cyclical downturn forced him out of office. In almost all fields of endeavour, Premier Tonkin brought with him new ideas and positive changes. For example, international flights to Adelaide became a reality. The O-Bahn bus system was conceived and construction commenced. Technology Park was established. The Roxby Downs development, with its stringent environmental controls, received the green light.

Land tax on the principal residence and death duties were abolished. State taxation was reduced in real terms. New measures were introduced to achieve greater accountability in the Public Service. The international Hilton was built and a brief prepared for the ASER development. Discussions were held with entrepreneurs in this State to attract the Grand Prix to Adelaide. That was a phenomenal record for a new Government attaining office after almost 10 years in the wilderness.

The submarine project had its beginnings during that time when enthusiasts from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry first canvassed the idea that South Australia was capable of involvement in submarine construction. My purpose for recounting some of the events that took place in this State between 1979 and 1982 is not simply to rehash history but to highlight what can be achieved with a positive mental approach. Indeed, if there were one criticism of Dr Tonkin and his Cabinet it would be of political naivety: they expended all their energy putting South Australia back on the map in a remarkably energetic, honest and creative fashion. A little of that energy should have been saved to cope with the vagaries of cold political winds.

To what can the Bannon Government point when historians analyse its performance? On the plus side, the O-Bahn development has proceeded, albeit at a reduced pace; the Grand Prix has become a reality; and the submarine project will soon be under full sail. On the negative side, the handling of the ASER development has been nothing short of disastrous and State taxation continues to impede growth of small and medium businesses. Has Premier Bannon in any way changed the economic landscape of this State in his 4½ years in office? Unfortunately, the answer

is a resounding 'No!'. Is our State in better shape than it was when he gained office? Again, the answer is 'No'.

Perhaps when one looks back in 10 years' time one will compare Premier Bannon to a marshmallow—good appearance, soft underneath and not doing a whole lot of good deep down. What this State needs is creative energy combined with strength of leadership. The only time that we obtain a glimpse of these qualities is at election time when the Premier is convincing the electorate that his is a Government of achievement. When the going gets tough, he is nowhere to be found. That hardly inspires confidence for our newly won submarine construction contract.

As the Premier has taken great pains to point out, the submarine contract could be significant to the State economy. I contend that it is not the dollars and cents tied up in construction over 10 years that is the most important feature but the fact that the contract offers a unique opportunity to show what this State can achieve with quality workmanship, precision and on time delivery. After the last submarine has sailed out of Adelaide, it will be cold comfort for people to know that the State has had a short-term boost to its economy but that the rest of the world thinks less of us because of our failure to perform.

The union movement is already jockeying for position in an attempt to obtain the cream off the submarine cake. Not once have I heard a commitment from that quarter that it will ensure a peaceful and productive work force with quality control standards to the fore. Even the proposition of a single union work place with all its advantages—and I hasten to add that this does not mean a closed shop—is being resoundingly rejected. The union movement has perceived the submarine contract as a means of increasing wages and not as a vehicle to enhance this State or as a means of providing for an increased number and diversity of work opportunities in the future.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is exactly right. That is not what the chamber is saying; that is what the union movement is saying. Bannon's handling of the ASER project has been pathetic. If history is repeated with the submarines, it will confirm in the minds of the world that South Australia is truly second class, that it cannot be trusted and that it prefers to wallow in mediocrity rather than grasp with both hands the opportunities that have been given to it. South Australia deserves better. We must throw off this defensive mentality and make achievement our hallmark. Instead, I fear that the Bannon Government will put more effort into producing election advertisements of subs sailing up and down the Port River as the State economy continues to slide downwards. Some of the real questions that remain unanswered are as follows:

1. What has the Government done to free up the State's transport systems—air, rail and sea—to enable primary and secondary products to reach their markets on time?

2. What initiatives have been introduced to ensure that the quality of our export products are of international standard?

3. How will the State participate in the information technology revolution which is sweeping the world and which threatens to envelop us if strategies are not put into place now?

4. What effort is being made to control the militant elements within the trade union movement which continually destroy the best endeavours of our entrepreneurs?

5. What has been done to reverse the movement interstate of company head offices?

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: During the Dunstan era.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It started in the Tonkin era.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It started in the Dunstan era. If the honourable member looks back at his records, he will understand that there was a wholesale movement. The member for Elizabeth could recall the number of head offices that opted out of that development. Further questions are:

6. Why does the education system continue to fail to meet the standards of numeracy and literacy so important to the future prospects of our school leavers?

7. Why does the Government continue to increase taxes to sustain its operations rather than institute efficiency reforms?

8. Why is the Government so slow in utilising new technology that will assist such changes?

These are but a few examples from a very long list of failures for which this Government stands condemned. The point that I have been making through this brief address relating to our performance over the last 20 years is that South Australia has failed to perform. It is simply not good enough to accept that the State cannot perform. One hears an enormous amount of rhetoric from the Government side to the effect that the Bannon Government is performing adequately. As the statistics show and as the people of South Australia say, the truth is somewhat different.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: They don't vote that way, do they?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The honourable member opposite suggests that they do not vote that way. I also referred to that in my contribution. The people are conned by a machine without morals and with no feeling for the future of this State. At some stage that machine will fall apart.

The second subject that I wish to address concerns the 72 point plan for reconstructing Australia put forward by the Australian Council of Trade Unions. I am sure that all members opposite have managed to read the plan, which comes from a 1986 mission to Sweden, Austria, Germany, Norway and the United Kingdom. The people who went on that trip came back with renewed fervour to introduce change. The 72-point plan is a very clever document.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The ACTU document is very clever; it hides a great deal more than it says. When the document was presented the union movement was absolutely shocked to find that employers had vehemently rejected many of the items contained in the agenda list. Indeed, they showed their true colours when the document was rejected and said that they would embark on industrial action. That proved to one and all across Australia that this document was nothing but a farce, nothing but a clever mechanism to convince the Australian electorate that the union movement really did have some understanding of what Australia's policies should be.

It was interesting to see the iron fist come from behind the velvet glove when the employers rejected the proposition. The interesting aspect of this document is indeed its origins. The union movement has made no secret of the fact that it has drawn on Sweden for its inspiration. The union movement seems to be enraptured with the prospect of power sharing. This involves a more than equal say in the decisions made by government and by industry. In fact, it is a recipe for takeover.

I will briefly refer to the Swedish situation. When I was in Sweden and talked to members of the embassy I found that they were sick and tired of seeing Australians beating a path to Sweden year in and year out. The Swedish model, as confirmed from discussions with the International Labor Organisation, has no relevance to Australia whatsoever. I

will explain why that is the case. Behind the Swedish model are a number of elements of infrastructure which cannot be repeated here unless we change our directions. First, the Swedish have traditionally had an extraordinarily strong work ethic and a national spirit. It has been generated through a number of avenues, principally that Sweden has always been a country with the potential to be under siege and has therefore developed a national spirit as a means of defence.

The second item worth mentioning is that the quality and intellect of the union leadership is equal to that in the employer bodies. That is not apparent in this country. In Sweden, they are on an equal footing in terms of their financial and economic understanding and their ability to negotiate. The other point is that, in Sweden, Austria, Germany and other countries visited by the delegation, the one thing they do not tolerate is union excesses of the type and nature that we see in this country. They simply do not allow them.

Mr Groom: Who's 'they'?

Mr S.J. BAKER: The union movement within those countries. From my discussions in Sweden and a number of other countries it became quite apparent that all the malaise we have in our trade union movement cannot be solved overnight. It cannot be solved because there is not a willingness on behalf of the trade union movement to address the real questions and challenges that must be faced. Only 10 per cent of our unions today could claim to have a strong financial base. In all those countries visited by the delegation there existed a very strong financial base to the unions because there are very few unions. The leadership of unions in this country has not been determined by ability but through individuals exploiting the apathy of Australians.

In fact, what I am saying is that the best have never come to the top in the union movement because the people who have the skills and even the willingness to do the job properly have never had the inclination to do so, and we do not see any change in this area.

Mr S.G. Evans: Are they well paid?

Mr S.J. BAKER: To my understanding secretaries of unions are not particularly well paid, whereas in all those other countries union secretaries and leaders are just as well paid as company managers. With few exceptions in this country the leadership of trade unions lack intellectual and management skills and commitment to this country. Certainly, I have not seen a commitment to this country by the trade union movement—not once—and even this document is not truly a commitment to this country but simply a bit of dressing.

The point I mentioned previously is that the trade union movement has failed to control its members, and that would not be tolerated in other countries. When I read the document I noted that it did not address any of the questions that I have put before the House tonight. It particularly did not address the problem of how to get rid of people who do not perform within the trade union system, the people who continue to tear this country apart, the people who hold up our exports at wharves and airports, the people on building sites who have destructive inclinations, and the people who are meant to move goods in this country but who then pick off export areas, such as wool. We do not see any commitment to this country by the trade union movement. There are elements within the movement which have a more than positive outlook, but those who have the commitment do not have the skills or the understanding to be able that take the union movement into the 80s rather than keeping it in the 20s.

I now refer to the three hidden agenda items in this ACTU document. The first is greater control and regulation of our lifestyle; the second is control by unions of the human and natural resources within this country; and the third, of course, is a diminution of the cherished freedoms that we hold. There is no guarantee that the formula will work at the end of the day. I will now mention some items, and I will be choosy in selecting those items because there are some relatively good elements in the document—as I said, it is a very clever document. Recommendation 1.6 states:

The Government should establish a national development fund. We know that debate has gone on about how that item will be achieved.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If members opposite use a little control they will find out what our policies are before the next election. Recommendation 2.8 states:

The Government must institute a comprehensive, visible and effective policy of price restraint.

Any basic understanding of economics would suggest to anyone that price restraint is possible only if there is restraint on costs, and those costs are mainly in the labour area and often, of course, in the imported capital area.

They are two items over which we generally seem to have very little control, yet the union movement says that we must exercise price restraint. The best way to exercise price restraint is through a competitive market, and everybody here understands that proposition. If the market is competitive, there will be price restraint because, as soon as prices get too high, people will not sell their goods. Every western country understands that economic proposition, but the union movement does not. Recommendation 2.11 states:

Greater pressure should be brought to bear on pricing/fee setting in the professions. This should include:

- (a) examining the possibility of bringing the professions under the umbrella of both the PSA and the Trade Practices Commission; and
- (b) the Advisory Committee on Prices and Incomes (ACPI) conducting a review of restrictive work practices with a view to their ultimate abolition within the professions, the results of such a review should be published.

If members opposite wish to talk to the medical profession, they will find that their wealth stocks are getting down to rock bottom. If we do not reward the best—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: We have a lawyer opposite. We know how the legal profession operates, but I am talking about people, whether they be dentists or doctors, or further down the line to a number of other professions. Let us deal with dentists and doctors. We will rapidly reach the situation where there is no incentive to provide the level of service for which this country has been renowned over the past 100 years.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would be interested to establish whether the member for Hartley would like to be paid a legal fee of \$20 an hour to go out at night to consult. That is what the Federal Government wants to do to the medicos—\$20 an hour. He would not even let somebody through the door for \$20 an hour. In Australia we have seen what this Government has done to the professions, and real problems are looming for Australia if we fail to reward effort and if we fail to reward excellence. Recommendation 5.3 states:

There should be a national agreement on industrial democracy between the ACTU, peak employer organisations and the Government.

Over the past three years a number of documents on the question of industrial democracy have been circulated. Of course, it is really industrial takeover and I suppose that, for a change, the ACTU has at least come clean. How can

we have industrial democracy in this country when we have hundreds of unions that do not have the quality of leadership, financial expertise and understanding that is needed in a so-called democratic country? The quality is not there and it will not be there for the next 10 years. On that basis, how can there be power sharing? There is no reason to expect that Australia would be capable of coping with that particular change.

This document contains a number of other recommendations but, as I said, it is wrapped up in cotton wool. It is supposed to look like a positive and constructive contribution to the future of this country. I am pleased that the ACTU has actually sat down and thought about it for a change and that it has not reacted as it has previously. I am pleased also that it has recognised some of the problems facing this country, but it has to do a little better than this document because, underneath it all, there is a belief on the part of the trade unions that they have a right to rule this country and to control all forms of enterprise. As the people whom I consulted in the International Labor Organisation suggested, at this stage of Australia's development we cannot allow this change to occur.

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I have pleasure in responding to the motion in support of the Governor's opening address on 6 August 1987. The kind words about Don Simmons and Ron Loveday, who served this Parliament, I am sure will be appreciated by their families, friends and colleagues.

I will now officially record a personal tribute to two people who have passed on recently, each in their own way having contributed unselfishly to the community. I assure Lorraine Hudson, her children and grandchildren, that Bruce is much missed and will continue to be remembered for his involvement with the Australian Labor Party over many years. In the time I knew Bruce Hudson I found his ability to communicate most intriguing. For example, he would always steer debate on a subject to the broadest consideration by playing the devil's advocate. His warmth, personality and loyalty were an example to many of us, and Bruce will be missed for many years to come.

I extend a tribute to the family of Lance Lee. Lance passed away unexpectedly early this year and greatly contributed to the community, particularly in relation to sports and education. I knew Lance Lee in his executive role with the Brighton Hockey Club. His tireless work to establish facilities and social involvement for all associated with the club has ensured a sound foundation for the club to build on over the years to come. I was most involved with Lance in his capacity as Chairman of the Brighton High School Council. In this capacity, and as Chairman of the council's redevelopment committee, his dedication to students and teaching staff, and his determination to have a facility that maintained the standard and quality of education most applicable to ensuring the best educational base was achieved by students preparing for their future careers, were commendable.

While Lance saw the official opening of stage 1 (that being the joint school-community sports complex) unfortunately he is not with us to share the benefits of the \$6.6 million development of stage II, which has to this date seen the 30-odd wooden temporary buildings shifted to another temporary position and the development of the replacement structure begin to take shape. The school community is having discussions to establish a suitable lasting tribute in remembrance of the unselfishness of Lance and his commitment to work for the broader community.

His Excellency's speech referred to the student enrolment decline which, by 1990, would be more than 40 000 fewer

than at the beginning of this decade. The electorate of Hayward contains two State high schools and seven State primary schools which, at the height of enrolment, contained some 10 000 students. This year those same schools have a maximum total enrolment of 3 500 students.

Last year the Southern Area Office of Education produced a number of recommendations and a report known as the South-West Corner Study. When this report was released to the school community for comment, it was followed by the establishment of an independent assessment committee. The committee's brief has been to initiate and encourage discussion, debate and submission of ideas from students, parents, teaching staff and the wider community. The feelings and ideas of the community will thereby be conveyed to the committee, and that will be the base of the committee's report, which the Government will then consider. The Newberry committee has been a most effective mechanism in providing forums that have encouraged school communities in the south-west corner to express their points of view in a most encouraging atmosphere.

The committee, under the chairmanship of Mr Ted Newberry, ex-Mayor and community leader over a number of years, has pursued its agenda of consultation with school councils, parents, students and the broader community in a very open and positive way. Each high school in the area has been invited by the committee to host public meetings. While the initial meetings were not overcrowded, the momentum has built up and we have seen the community take the challenge of participation in a most responsible fashion. I have attended a number of these meetings and I have been pleased to witness the preparation and delivery of a response by parents, students, teachers and interested individuals.

The follow-up by the schools in the area that I represent in preparing written submissions to the committee has been most positive. I compliment the individuals of the school councils who have put in much time and effort in ensuring that parents from these schools have participated and have been kept informed through the process. I wish to refer to an initiative undertaken by the committee. Recently, the committee held a meeting to which two students from each high school were invited for the purpose of putting their own points of view on the future of education resources and facilities. I applaud the committee for having provided the students with their own forum, and I am sure that the input will be helpful. Too often it is presumed that the young people in our community are not responsible enough or that they would not be interested in taking part in decision-making. I look forward to the Newberry Committee's report. Given the community's response to the participation process—which this Government has encouraged—in many aspects of education, I feel confident that present and future students in the education system can only gain facilities and resources that serve their best interests in the pursuit of quality education, equitable to all.

In listening to the responses to the motion that His Excellency's speech be adopted, at times one could not help but be amused. I refer particularly to the speech made by the shadow shadow Minister of Transport, who made a valiant effort to inform the House about what the present Government is not doing to assist commuters from the south. I would like to read into *Hansard* a list of major works undertaken since the present Government came to power in 1982.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: Thank you for your protection, Sir. Major works undertaken and completed for the period 1982-83 to

1986-87 included: Lonsdale Road (Majors Road-Lander Road)—duplication; Lonsdale Road (Lander Road-Sherriffs Road)—dual carriageway, new; Ocean Boulevard (Brighton Road-Majors Road)—duplication; Dyson Road (Sherriffs Road-Refinery Road)—dual carriageway, new; Dyson Road (Refinery Road-Flaxmill Road)—dual carriageway, new; Dyson Road (Flaxmill Road-Beach Road)—duplication; and Darlington (Stage 1)—intersection South Road/Flagstaff Road. Works in progress and to be completed in the 1987-88 program include: Reservoir Drive (Happy Valley Drive)—new road; Darlington (Stage 2)—intersection, South Road/Marion Road/Seacombe Road—improvements; Seaford Road (South Road-Commercial Road)—reconstruction; Aldinga-Willunga Road (Biscay Road extension)—safety; and South Road (Penneys Hill Road-Brodie Road)—median installation—safety.

This list comprises some \$25.5 million. On top of this is the commitment by the Government to construct the third arterial which is fully supported by the members of southern electorates in this House. Perhaps the Government should commence negotiations with the Opposition to purchase the magic wand members opposite seem to have. From listening to them, it seems that apparently, with a wave of this wand, everything appears: no planning, no social consideration and definitely no construction placement study. Responsible and effective management of the construction of the third arterial road as a major project to which this Government has committed itself has major environmental and social components apart from the actual construction and cost to the taxpayer of this State.

The member for Morphett implied that there was some secrecy by the Government in this commitment. The many individuals of my present and previous electorates who have approached me or the Highways Department have received responses to their queries for which they have expressed their appreciation. In addition, an excellent bulletin has been distributed to householders and any interested body by the department as stages of the preparation work have been completed. I believe that this project should continue, as do the residents and commuters of the south, but let us ensure the least disruption to existing developed areas where the construction must intrude to provide an alternative to the section of roadway known as the Darlington bottleneck.

I place on record my best wishes to the retired Federal member for Hawker. Ralph Jacobi served the electorate with dedication, compassion and care. He never missed an opportunity to support effectively any project that would assist the development of the electorate he served. He is held in great respect by all who know him, irrespective of their political persuasion. It was a great pleasure to work in conjunction with Ralph when Federal and State implications arose on issues vital to the constituency of Hayward. However, whatever he decides to pursue in his retirement, I hope that he remains healthy and that his continued involvement will enrich the community. Ralph's successor, Elizabeth Harvey, I am sure will serve the Hawker electorate well and will continue the standard of quality representation.

To Lorraine, Gail and, until recently, Phyllis, I again record my thanks for their work for and on behalf of the constituents of Hayward. The location of the Hayward electorate office makes it extremely accessible to the community and with that comes an excessive workload which is always dealt with efficiently and cheerfully. For that I thank them.

In conclusion, let me say that this third session of the forty-sixth Parliament will bring new and interesting challenges for all members of this Chamber. I trust that you

will continue to guide us, Mr Speaker, and provide the occasional word of humour.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I wish to raise in this grievance debate tonight a matter which is rather depressing. For that, I apologise in advance to members, but there is a very real and very important problem concerning the imminent closure of the Cheltenham cemetery, which I am led to believe will have reached its capacity by Christmas of this year.

There is cause for concern not only to the people in the industry in the area but also the residents of the north-western region of Adelaide. I raised the matter earlier this year at a Woodville council meeting while still a councillor for the City of Woodville and asked that a report on the situation be brought down. Originally the north-western region of the Adelaide metropolitan area was serviced by three cemeteries: at Beverley, Alberton and Cheltenham. The Beverley cemetery was very small, established by the primitive Methodist Church and built on the site adjacent to the church.

This burial ground was opened in 1836 and eventually closed in 1944. Reading the history of the people who were interred in this cemetery is like reading a page of the history of Woodville and surrounding areas. A depressing aspect of this is the number of very, very young people who passed on in those days. It was not so long ago, but things have changed a lot and there were many deaths among young people. Very few people lived to be more than 40-odd years of age.

Over the years, this cemetery became very run down and was vandalised to a great extent, causing considerable damage to headstones and other items with sacred associations. The Woodville council decided to redevelop the area, first, to clean it up and make it presentable, and, secondly, as a Jubilee 150 project. I attended the official opening last year and was most impressed with the result. A careful arrangement of broken headstones and other items plus the sensitive planting and landscaping of the area, together with old established trees, has made the cemetery into a lovely community park for the use of the local residents. I congratulate the Woodville council on its initiative and the sensitive way in which the work was carried out.

The Alberton cemetery, somewhat larger than the Beverley burial ground, was opened in 1852 and had its last burial in 1941, being officially closed in 1968. This old cemetery suffered two similar problems to Beverley cemetery, with neglect and damage from vandals. The Port Adelaide council has removed the headstones and cleaned up the area and, after the eventual shifting out of industrial premises from the area, intends to develop this also into parkland. The Cheltenham cemetery was opened in 1876 and, being much larger than the other two, has continued as a final resting place for thousands of people in the north-western area.

Now that the days of the cemetery are numbered, it is crucial that a new one be established in the same region or as close as possible. The Enfield Cemetery Act, which was passed by this Parliament in the last session, provides for some recycling of cemetery land, but many people—including myself—do not think that this measure is appropriate—

not for most of the Cheltenham cemetery, anyway. There is probably a good argument in favour of recycling land after a suitable length of time if the bodies buried there had been cremated. However, when bodies are buried naturally without being cremated, many people believe that the ground in which these people are buried is sacred and should never be used again for burials. I support that view.

The community has been remarkably well served by these three cemeteries—Cheltenham, in particular—and because the last allocation of land for this use was made in 1876, 111 years ago, it seems that it is not asking too much for another parcel of land to be set aside for this very important use. The matter is very serious and urgent action is required to provide for the continuation of burials in this area. I think the responsibility is a joint one for local government and State Government, in the acquisition and the provision of land.

The provision of a final resting place completes the natural cycle of requirements of people in our community. We provide maternity hospitals for babies to be born; we provide schools for their education; we provide hospitals for health services throughout people's lives; we provide homes for them to live in; and we provide homes for the aged where they can live out the twilight years of their lives and die with dignity. We provide all those things for ourselves, but how important is it to provide the one final thing that we need in our lifetime—a final resting place?

That is an important matter. It could be said that cemeteries such as Enfield and Centennial Park, which have plenty of capacity, can take over when Cheltenham cemetery closes. However, many people in the community want to be laid to rest in an area with which they are familiar—in which they were perhaps born, grew up, worked, were married, had a family, grew old and died. Such people have a close affinity with the area where they spent their life and want to be buried there.

There is, of course, no logical reason why this should be so: once a person has passed on one assumes that they do not know where they are buried. However, I can understand this view, and I think that provision should be made to enable their views to be respected and that people should be laid to rest where they wish. It is true that old style cemeteries such as Cheltenham are outdated and somewhat ugly. I hope that in days to come cemeteries such as the one at Beverley can be redeveloped, made attractive and used for recreational purposes. When one tries to compare old style cemeteries such as Cheltenham, with their rows of headstones, with a cemetery such as that at Centennial Park with its rolling lawns, trees and roses, one finds that there is no comparison. Any new cemetery that is established in this area could be treated similarly and made an attractive place.

Another important use for cemeteries is as a buffer zone between industrial and residential areas, so that land that is set aside for burial purposes need not be wasted: it can be put to good use. Cemeteries can also act as a buffer zone between houses and recreational areas and to cut down on noise. They can also be made attractive so that they can be used by people for recreational purposes. They cannot, of course, be built on. This would also ensure that, in years to come, open space was made available for people to use. Because of escalating land use such open spaces might not otherwise be provided.

This is not a glamorous land use or a popular subject. I guess that none of us likes to talk about these things. We do not like to plan for cemeteries because we tend to push to the back of our minds the fact that we will die. However, one thing is certain: once we are born we will die, and we

cannot escape that. I will approach the appropriate Minister to ensure that suitable land is made available for this purpose.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I will speak briefly tonight about the fact that this is Deafness Awareness Week. I will tonight place on record the difficulties faced by those who are profoundly deaf. There appears to be in our society a feeling that those who are profoundly deaf are deaf, dumb and unintelligent. This is a great shame, and it is a pity that members of our society should think in this way.

To be born profoundly deaf is to face a worse disability than to be born totally blind. Those of us who think about this realise that anyone who is born blind—and I would not like to be born blind—can hear music, learn to speak, develop an accent, and learn to read using braille. People who are born blind never see beauty, and that is a great pity, but one who is born profoundly deaf never hears music and never learns to speak: deaf people know that others move their mouths, and so they try to move theirs, making horrible noises, which cause people who are not deaf to say that they are off beat because they make those unusual noises.

The gurgling sound that they make is unusual because they are trying to imitate the mouth movement, but they cannot hear the sound to develop the ability to speak. Yet, they are highly intelligent in many cases. They can learn to read and write. That is a more difficult process for them than it is for those of us who do not have that disability. It is important that we in Parliament take note of that particular group of disabled people in our society which, until recent years, has been pushed into the background. These people have been ignored; we have tended to infer that they are of lower intelligence, and we have not helped them. They have a language of their own. They can learn to talk with sign language, and those of us who see them talk in this way must feel jealous of their ability to communicate with each other and, through an interpreter, with those who have hearing ability. I say 'thank you' to those teachers who are learning the sign language and to the Government for its contribution, although it is necessary to train more people in order to teach others about life in general.

I have given notice of a motion but I will not talk about that except to say that regulation 26 of the Migration Act provides that people who have deaf mutism (and those people do not like that term because it tends to infer that they are mute, that they are of lower intelligence—profoundly deaf is preferred) are put in the same category as those who have leprosy or syphilis, for example. We say to them, 'You can't come into the country.' I will debate that matter more fully next Thursday.

I would like Parliamentarians to think about the benefit of having captions on film, on television or in the theatre, and the Caption Club is working to encourage producers and television companies to put captions on the screen to give a clue to those who are deaf—not only those who are born profoundly deaf but those who have developed deafness through life because of age or illness—that they may have a better opportunity to enjoy what many of us enjoy.

I referred earlier to music. If one is deaf, one does not have the ability to hear music. People can pick up the beat through their body if the music is loud enough or through the movement of those on the dance floor who have the capacity to hear the music. That is one thing they can enjoy, if the right sort of music is played with the right sort of volume. Some of us might think it is too loud, but at least those people are able to enjoy a dance.

We have gone a long way with communications, especially telephones that will actually print out a message in the homes of the profoundly deaf. We have a 24-hour service which provides help when needed; people know that someone will make contact with them. In this Deafness Awareness Week I hope that we will realise that deafness has been a mainly forgotten disability, particularly, I would stress, in the case of the profoundly deaf, who do not have the ability to speak and communicate. We have pushed those people into the background. We have put them into homes; we have said that we do not want to be near them because we cannot communicate with them and they cannot communicate with us. Quite often an attitude of hostility builds up in those individuals, because we are unable to understand. They may be highly intelligent people. I sit on a board with one gentleman who has very high intelligence. These people are highly intelligent, but they cannot communicate, and we, as Governments and as a society, have not contributed to their cause as much as we have contributed to other areas of disability. I was a member of the board of Guide Dogs for the Blind. There is a greater automatic sympathy within the community towards those people who are born blind or who develop blindness than towards those who are born profoundly deaf.

I am sure that all members would agree that, if one goes out collecting, one notices that there is a greater response to those who are blind than to those who are deaf. Through publicity such as Deafness Awareness Week and the film *Children of a Lesser God*, the community will grow to understand and develop a greater interest in this area.

One other matter to which I will refer is the Mount Barker Road and the way in which the media, particularly, and some members of the community foolishly refer to semitrailers. There could have been no better example in the last few days than the accident on Mount Barker Road in which a person tragically lost his life. In early reports over the air (I will not name the stations) it was stated that a semitrailer had slammed into a motor car and that another semitrailer was also involved. The report in the paper on the same day said that an accident had occurred, a 45-year-old man was killed, that it was another example of an accident involving a semitrailer and that most of the serious accidents on Mount Barker Road involved semitrailers. I point out that virtually all of the serious accidents on that road involve motor cars. Two recent exceptions are the accident involving a motorbike and one in which a semitrailer rolled over. In the vast majority of cases, it is the motor car that has jumped the kerb, gone onto the other side of the road and ploughed into a semitrailer or another car, or, as in a recent case, a van. In the case involving the motorbike, the rider was trying to get between two semitrailers.

Semitrailers certainly are big. I have driven the things, and it is frightening when one pulls up alongside your car or you pull up alongside one of them. It is a natural reaction. However, an attitude is developing within society that, every time there is an accident, it is the fault of the semitrailer driver—he is always in the wrong. In the vast majority of cases, it is the person in the lighter vehicle who is at fault. His car might have jumped the kerb because he was driving too fast or because he has been forced across the road by someone pulling out in another smaller motor vehicle. It may be that the driver has taken a punt, which so many of us do on the roads. I just point out to members of the press that, when they state that most accidents involve semitrailers, they should also point out that the vast majority of accidents involve motor cars before they start to look at who was at fault.

Concrete barriers have been constructed a meagre distance up Mount Barker Road but, if all the sections that need doing are not attended to and the Government waits until the new bit of road is built (and I disagree with that), at least another 10 to 20 people will be killed before the road is finished and another 40 will be seriously injured. That will cost millions of dollars in rehabilitation or to keep people in wheelchairs.

How long will we sit back and wait when we can construct a median strip on Mount Barker Road as far as possible? That will automatically slow people down, because there is a sense of restriction when one drives alongside a one metre high concrete wall. It slows people down. If we do not have the intestinal fortitude to take up the challenge, we are condemning people to death through inaction. It is not always the fault of semitrailers.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): On 17 March of this year an article appeared in the *News* with the heading 'Thirty jobs but nobody wants them'. It went on to say that Geoff and Irene Cawkwell, who own Zanadu Party Plan, were at wits end because they have tried everything to get employees. Somewhat disturbed by this, I had some research carried out by the Parliamentary Library and it was interesting to reflect in part on some of the information that was provided to me by that source. In seeking information from the company Zanadu, it was discovered that Mr Cawkwell 'didn't think people in Parliament were interested in employment and employment policies'. It was reported that he was glad to know that we were. I was told that he would very much like to meet me to discuss his situation, and a telephone number was given. It was also mentioned that he feels 'very strongly' about employment and unemployment. He went on air on 5DN and received some rubbish from some people.

It goes on to talk about his involvement with a service club and the fact that there are often discussions in his branch about the difficulties in obtaining employees. He states:

It is nice to know this thing goes on—

that is, follow up and questions by members of Parliament. I do not know where he has been for the past 10 years, if he has lived in South Australia for that long. If he had taken the time he would know that members of Parliament on both sides of the House are very much interested in seeking opportunities for their constituents. I know that a constant stream of people coming to my electorate office are seeking employment opportunities. The research provided to me further states:

In the last five years the business—

that is, Zanadu—

has grown 30 to 40 per cent in the number of people employed and in turnover.

It further states that the company cannot get enough individuals involved. In regard to conditions of employment and recruiting, it states:

Yes, they have had problems recruiting—turnover is fairly high. Out of 10 they are 'lucky if [they] keep three or four over a long period, for example, 18 months'.

I suggest that the reason is the commission and the conditions laid down. An appointment was made for this gentleman to come in to see me today. That was going back some months ago when Mr Cawkwell was advised that he could see me at 4 o'clock today in Parliament House to address the problem he had in trying to find employees for his business. Unfortunately he failed to bob. He rang my office with the excuse that he was not feeling the best and would welcome the opportunity to contact me later. Over a period

of six months I suggest that he has had opportunity to make representation to me. I welcome the opportunity of discussions with him.

I do not intend to ridicule this man or his company in this Chamber, but I would have thought that he could do a lot better than to simply ring up with only about four hours to go to say that he could not make it. I would have thought that courtesy demanded that he could at least ask to speak to me personally in regard to this problem with his company. I would welcome the opportunity to assist him.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: It is like a party plan selling Tupperware-type products. I can understand why some people do not want to get involved as they have to have their own vehicle and supply petrol, and it has been overdone in the community.

It is easy for people to criticise the unemployed in the community without telling the other side as I would like to do in the six minutes left to me tonight. Going back some years ago when in Opposition I knew a lad living in Green Avenue at Seaton. I will not mention his name as he has asked me not to do so. He made 200 applications in writing for employment in this State. I wanted to give publicity to this fact as there are people who want to kick the unemployed when they are down. Coming from the working class and a poor family I can understand how the unemployed relate to being put down by people in the community. This lad, to his eternal credit, eventually found a job and I wanted to give publicity to that fact. He is a hard worker and has gone on to a number of successes in his employment.

I refer now to another case regarding people who suffer injuries on the job and are compensated out in their late 20s or 30s and cannot find work elsewhere because of a back injury. A constituent of mine, who lives in Royal Park and whose christian name is Richard, came to me some months ago to inform me that he wanted to rehabilitate himself as he wanted to work. I said that I was happy to assist him in any way I could. He said, 'Mr Hamilton, I have already taken that initiative.' I applauded him for his efforts. He told me that he was involved in the Handicapped Employment Training Assistance Scheme (HETA). He had been attending HETA for six weeks and was told of what was necessary to rehabilitate himself, how to lift objects and how to build up his confidence and self-esteem.

Having done that, he now tells me that he is dismayed to find that no employer will take him on, despite the fact that he has gone through this program and is a decent, honest and hard working South Australian. He has tried hard to get a job, but employers will not take him on. Certainly, I can understand the reluctance of some employers not to take him on because he had a previous injury, but he has gone through the Commonwealth Government scheme and surely there is a responsibility on employers, at least, to give such people a go. They should see whether through this program—under a responsible coordinator—such people are a good bet, and whether they have conducted themselves satisfactorily.

Mr Becker: Could HETA get him any work experience?

Mr HAMILTON: It tried, but it failed. I feel for this lad and believe that his case is worth raising in Parliament. He has indicated his willingness to address a sub-branch meeting of my Party next Sunday, and I hope that, as a consequence, we may be able to exert pressure on my Federal and State colleagues in an attempt to get him some work.

Mr Becker: HETA has a very good record.

Mr HAMILTON: Yes. I know of the member for Hanson's involvement and work for disadvantaged people in the community. I have always recognised that in this Parliament. While I do not always agree with the member for Hanson, there are some things that I do recognise, especially his work in this area. I hope that there is some employer in the community who will read of this situation—hopefully the press will pick up the story—and provide an opportunity for Richard to gain employment.

Finally, in the minute remaining, members will recall that in November 1983 I raised in this House the question of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme for South Australia. I

battled for many years to try to get a scheme in my electorate and at long the last forty-first scheme has now been started successfully in my electorate after some four years. I applaud that. It is a step in the right direction, and I look forward to more Neighbourhood Watch programs in my electorate, specifically in Semaphore Park, Royal Park and Seaton areas.

Motion carried.

At 8.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 August 1987

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ANNUAL REPORTS

26. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to the reports of the South Australian Film Corporation, 1985-86, and the Department of Premier and Cabinet, 1985-86:

1. (a) how many copies were printed;
- (b) how many were distributed to State Government departments, agencies or authorities;
- (c) how many copies have not yet been distributed; and
- (d) what was the total cost of production, including photography, writing, typesetting, design and printing?

2. If the report was printed by the Government Printer, were quotations for the work first sought from commercial printers and, if so, what were those quotations and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The replies are as follows: South Australian Film Corporation—

1. (a) 3 000
- (b) 133
- (c) 906
- (d) \$6 515

2. Report was printed by the Government Printer; other quotes were not sought for 1985-86 because the SA Film Corporation found from their experience in 1984-85 that commercial printers approached for quotes were not interested in undertaking this type of work.

Department of Premier and Cabinet—

1. (a) 500
- (b) 320
- (c) 94
- (d) \$6 197.59

2. No quotations were sought from commercial printers as the Government Printer produces the Department's Annual Reports.

POVERTY STUDY

37. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to the poverty study announced by the Premier on 7 January 1985 to 'pinpoint key needs of families and individuals and urge new ways to overcome their difficulties', has the Committee appointed to undertake the study completed its work and, if so, what findings has it reported to the Government on:

- (a) the extent and location of poverty in South Australia;
- (b) action needed to either prevent or alleviate poverty; and
- (c) the consistency or otherwise between Government and non-government agencies in their response to people who are disadvantaged economically, and what action is the Government taking as a result of the Committee's work?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The work begun by the Poverty Task Force was subsumed by the Social Justice Consultative Committee in March 1986. The role of the task force appointed in 1985 was to recommend proposals for action and not to provide a traditional report. Much of

their work is now reflected in the Government's policy on social welfare.

It became clear that the work of the task force should focus on the causes and not the symptoms of the poverty. The development of a broader plan was approved in Cabinet in March 1986, and the committee was transformed into a Social Justice Consultative Committee, with representation from a wide range of Government and non-government organisations, reflecting the original composition of the Poverty Task Force.

This committee continued the work of the task force developing a policy framework which would enable all Government agencies to address equity concerns and assistance for those who are economically disadvantaged. The Poverty Task Force also worked with the Australian Bureau of Statistics to produce a 'Profile of Low Income Households in South Australia', the first of its kind in Australia.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

38. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: How many officers in the following departments have a 'permanent' or 'regular' allocation of a Government vehicle for travel between home and the office under the criteria detailed in Circular Number 30 dated 16 June 1987 from the Commissioner for Public Employment:

- Department of Premier and Cabinet;
- Office of the Government Management Board;
- Treasury Department; and
- Department for the Arts?

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

- Department of the Premier and Cabinet—5
- Office of the Government Management Board—1
- Treasury Department—2
- Department for the Arts—3.

48. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism: How many officers in the following departments have a 'permanent' or 'regular' allocation of a Government vehicle for travel between home and the office under the criteria detailed in Circular Number 30 dated 16 June 1987 from the Commissioner for Public Employment:

- Department of Tourism; and
- Department of Local Government?

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: The reply is as follows:

- Department of Tourism—4
- Department of Local Government—4.

PARKLANDS BUILDINGS

63. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Following his announcement on 10 February 1985 of a minor inquiry into how excess Government buildings can be removed from the Adelaide parklands—

- (a) what is the location of each building and the area of parklands it covers;
- (b) how many buildings have been defined as 'excess'; and
- (c) what action has been or will be taken to remove each of the excess buildings?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: In a series of reports to Government, Commissioner Tomkinson of the Planning Appeal Tribunal examined opportunities and the cost of removal of buildings from the Adelaide parklands. Public

announcement has been made in respect of four areas which can be returned to parklands. The current situation with each of them is as follows:

- (1) Hackney Bus Depot (5.24 hectares). The alternative site for the depot has been purchased. However, relocation is subject to the availability of funds. An area of 1 hectare is already available as part of the Botanic Gardens Conservatory project.
- (2) Post-Tel, West Terrace (0.83 hectares). This has been formally handed over to the Adelaide City Council for its care and control.
- (3) Adelaide Gaol (3.212 hectares). The gaol will be available as 'excess'; it is no longer required as a prison.
- (4) Railway land adjacent to Morphett Street Bridge (4.004 hectares). This will be handed over as redevelopment of railway lines and station are completed.

BORDER COMMITTEE

82. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: In relation to the costing committee to examine and recommend ways of dealing with anomalies which affect the border areas of South Australia and Victoria announced in a joint statement by the respective Premiers on 13 August 1984, has this committee reported to the South Australian Government and, if so, what action has been taken as a result of the committee's work?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The Victorian/South Australian Border Anomalies Committee was set up in 1984 with a charter to examine situations which arise or have arisen where inconsistencies between Victorian and South Australian laws, practices or policies have a detrimental effect on the residents of either State principally because they live near or move across the border. The committee was to coordinate and initiate such action as it considered appropriate with a view to elimination or amelioration of detrimental effects of the border.

The committee has found in many cases both Victorian and South Australian departments have been willing to alter practices or raise possible legislative changes with their Ministers when anomalies have been referred to them. In other cases, special consultative committees already in place have accepted responsibility for carrying matters through the solution.

Chairmanship and secretarial services were to alternate annually, beginning with Victoria. An annual report has not been furnished, but Victoria has last week dispatched a final draft for the period of their tenure. The committee has held meetings at Portland (10.12.86), Mount Gambier (15.4.86), and Kaniva (11.11.86). That set down for Pinnaroo on 2.7.87 was postponed due to their being insufficient business.

SGIC STAFF

104. **Mr S. J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer—

1. What was the staff complement of the workers compensation section of SGIC two years ago and what are the current numbers?

2. What is the estimated full year wage and other administration costs for this section?

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

1. August 1985—37 full-time employees

August 1987—46 full-time employees and one part-time employee.

2. The estimated full year wage and other administration costs for this section for 1987-88 is \$1.7 million.

REDUNDANCIES

111. **Mr S. J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: Prior to supporting the UTLC test case on termination change and redundancy in the State Industrial Court, what estimates were prepared by the Department of Labour of the additional cost per annum to industry resulting from such changes?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Due to a lack of comprehensive statistical data all parties including the Department of Labour were unable to develop adequate costings to determine the estimated number of future redundancies. The SA Government is pleased that as a result of the SAIC decision on this matter, employers now advise the CES of pending redundancies thereby assisting in the collection of new data from which future statistics can be developed.

WORKSAFE

112. **Mr S. J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: What input in the form of a written submission did the Government provide to Worksafe in respect of the Codes of Practice for Safe Handling?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: A working party comprising representatives of employers, union and Government was established by the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board to prepare a State response to Worksafe on the draft Code of Practice for Safe Manual Handling. The comments which were submitted to Worksafe in April 1987 were supportive of the non discriminatory approach to manual handling which was based on the principle of prevention of injury and which recognised the need for a multi-factorial approach. The draft code whilst going a long way towards meeting the needs of this State contains a number of unacceptable provisions, and substantial comment was submitted on issues of principle and detail.

COLAC HOTEL

118. **Mr S. J. BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: What is the current valuation of the land sold by the Department of Marine and Harbors to the Colac Hotel?

The Hon. R. K. ABBOTT: The Valuer-General has advised that the current value of the land in question, for rating and taxing purposes, is \$120 000. In October 1985 the land was transferred from the Department of Marine and Harbors to Mallens Colac Hotels Pty Ltd for \$75 000, which was the valuation at the time.

FERROSTOOL

165. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of State Development and Technology: Since April 1985, what investment, if any, has been made in South Australia by the company, Ferrostool, based at Essen in West Germany?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Ferrostool has made no investment in South Australia to date but is currently looking at a number of projects.