HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 16 September 1981

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

A petition signed by 498 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose the implementation of increased Housing Trust rentals, as announced, was presented by Mr Hemmings.

Petition received.

PETITION: GYMNASIUM

A petition signed by 263 residents of South Australia praying that the House call upon the Minister of Education to exercise his authority to retain the gymnasium at the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education for multiple use was presented by Mr Slater.

Petition received.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman for the year 1980-81.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROL RATIONING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to report further to the House on the situation with regard to petrol supplies, following the Government's decision to invoke the Petroleum Shortages Act to provide for restrictions on sales from midnight last night. I have been informed that, despite meetings this morning of members of the Australian Institute of Marine and Power Engineers, there is still no resolution to their industrial dispute which has closed the Port Stanvac refinery and prevented further shipments of petroleum to South Australia. I understand that the dispute will again come before the Arbitration Commission on Friday.

In these circumstances, the Government intends to maintain the current restrictions on sales based on the odds and evens system, for the time being. The duration of these restrictions will depend, initially, on an indication of how long the industrial dispute is likely to last, and this should become clearer on Friday. At the same time, however, the situation in South Australia is more complicated than elsewhere, because the dispute has already forced the closure of the Port Stanvac refinery and, once the refinery is able to reopen, it will take five days before normal operations are resumed.

The availability of petrol at service stations and company terminals at present is such that, provided that the public keeps purchases only to the minimum required to meet basic requirements, substantial inconvenience to the public can be avoided, provided that there is a resolution to the industrial dispute by the weekend.

I have been advised that, so far, the public has in fact adopted a very responsible and co-operative attitude to the need for the restrictions. The Government hopes that this attitude will continue, and that there will be a resolution of the dispute in the very near future, so that any further inconvenience to the public can be avoided. The House has the Government's assurance that its actions in this matter are aimed at ensuring that remaining supplies of petrol are available for the maintenance of essential services and to the public on an equitable basis for as long as possible.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute:

1. South Australian Land Commission—Report, 1980-81.

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

Pursuant to Statute:

1. Betting Control Board—Report, 1980-81.

QUESTION TIME

BUDGET

Mr BANNON: Can the Premier say whether it is the Government's policy to continue deficit budgeting until such time as sufficient royalty income is generated to enable the State's accounts to once again achieve balance and, if so, when does the Premier expect that revenue from royalties will match the amounts he is currently transferring from capital works?

In a feature article in this morning's *Advertiser,* which incidentally, Mr Speaker, described the Premier as the head janitor (as you would be aware, the definition of a janitor is a caretaker)—

The SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable Leader not to comment.

Mr Millhouse: There was a funny picture of him there, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: The Premier expressed the hope that he would not have to keep transferring large sums of money into deficit budgeting. He said:

> But the point is that until we get our royalty incomes and our self-generating revenue taxes coming in from an expanded economy then we have just got to do that to make the books balance. In other words we have got to go into overdraft for a year or two till we can see plain sailing ahead.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader's approach to deficit budgeting is well known and it reminds me very much of a story which Sir Charles Court told me whereby his Opposition also for a long time urged him to go into deficit budgeting to provide additional services and to expand the size of the Public Service and the Opposition did so for a number of years and then when last year he went to a deficit Budget the Opposition immediately turned around completely and berated Sir Charles Court and the Western Australian Government for having a deficit. The Leader of the Opposition is in much the same position here; when things are different they are not the same, according to him.

The point is that deficit budgeting has been necessary. We hope that we will not have to spend all of the $44 000 000 which it is proposed will be set aside to be transferred to the Revenue Fund but it will depend entirely on whether or not there are excessive wage claims that have to be met by this Government during the year. That is the clear message which I am quite certain is getting across to the people of South Australia. Certainly we look forward

to the day when we will be getting increased income from royalties. That day is probably about two years off, although—

An honourable member: Like Mr Pickwick—waiting for something to turn up.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do think the honourable member should get his quotations and sources correct. He is not too good on those literary matters. The royalty income will increase with the bringing into operation of the Cooper Basin liquids pipeline scheme and the l.p.g. exports that will be expected within two years. Roxby Downs will begin to show some royalty income in the latter half of this decade, and that is something that we can look forward to. If that was all we were doing, then we would have cause for concern. However, as the Leader should know (I think he was in the House yesterday when I delivered the Budget) the Government has adopted a stringent policy of restriction and restraint. It is governing its own spending and cutting it back by a considerable amount, $22 000 000 of which has been taken off by the activities of the Budget Review Committee.

By adopting this very strong control over Government expenditure I have no doubt at all that the need to go into deficit will be very much reduced by this time next year, and the suggestion that the Leader makes that we will have to go on into the deficit budgeting until the middle of the decade is quite ridiculous.

BANKRUPTCIES

Dr BILLARD: Can the Premier provide details of the number of bankruptcies in South Australia compared with the Australian total and the impact of those bankruptcies on the State economy? My question is prompted by two recent events. The first one was a reference made in the birthday advertisement placed in the *Advertiser* yesterday by the A.L.P., and the second one was a reference in the Federal Parliament by the Labor member for Adelaide, Mr Chris Hurford, who referred to Adelaide as being the bankruptcy capital. It has been put to me that the extremely negative statements of this type are designed to destroy business confidence and the future of the State economy, thereby limiting the number of jobs that will be created in the private enterprise sector and, in particular, in the small business sector.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am delighted to give the honourable member the information he desires. Yes, I certainly did notice the birthday advertisement, which was slighly premature as the actual birthday of the swearing in of this Government into office comes on Friday. I am delighted to give the correct picture and to correct the untruths which appeared in the advertisement which was inserted by the Opposition. It is, of course, part of the doom and gloom policy to which we have become accustomed, the doom and gloom policy of putting down South Australia which the Opposition has been indulging in for the last two years.

The official figures for bankruptcy in South Australia are indeed illuminating. I am very surprised that the Opposition was not more honest in what it advertised. I refer to the number of bankruptcies in respect to 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81. I shall quote figures for Australia first of all. They are 3 134 in 1977-78, 3 857 in 1978-79, 4 979 in 1979-80, and 5 515 in 1980-81—a steady increase in the number of bankruptcies throughout Australia. As a contrast to that steady increase, I refer to the figures in South Australia in those years: 655 in 1977-78, 816 in 1978-79, 964 in 1979-80 and 940 in 1980-81. In other words, the situation, in stark contrast to the Australian position, indicates that there has been a reversal. In South Australia the percentage of the total in those years is as follows: 20.9 per cent in 1977-78, 21.2 per cent in 1978-79, 19.4 per cent in 1979-80 and 18.2 per cent in 1980-81. The 1980-81 figures are based on information which has been provided up until now, but it should be noted that, while the overall number of bankruptcies is a concern, the South Australian percentage has fallen from 21.2 per cent in 1978-79 (the last year of the Labor Government) to 19.4 per cent in 1979-80, and to 18.2 per cent in 1980-81. In other words, there has been an improvement in the situation during the two years that the Liberal Government has been in office—a marked improvement—and it gives the lie to what was said in the advertisement in the *Advertiser*.

There is another factor which must be taken into account and which the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts have not taken into account, I suspect quite deliberately. If we look at the excess of liabilities over assets in bankruptcies, the figures, in millions of dollars, are: in 1977-78, for Australia 45.3; 67.8 in 1978-79; 73.4 in 1979-80. In South Australia the figures are: 4.5 in 1977-78, 8.8 in 1978-79, 7.6 in 1979-80. In other words, a quite definite reversal of form again. The South Australian percentages of total for those years were 9.9 per cent in 1977-78, 13 per cent in 1978-79, back to 10.3 per cent in 1979-80, and the figures are not yet available for 1980-81.

The picture changes considerably: although South Australia had 19.4 per cent of bankruptcies in Australia in 1979-80, the financial cost in terms of total excess liability over assets in South Australia was 10.3 per cent, and it clearly shows that, although the overall number of individual bankruptcies is still far too high in South Australia, the average financial loss is much lower than the national average. The figures from the Registrar of Companies are quite clear and positive in indicating a reversal of the trend of 1978 and 1979 and show that we are very clearly on the road to recovery in South Australia.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Premier say whether the specific allocation for the much publicised pay-roll tax rebate scheme for youth employment has again been cut back? Can he explain why the allocation for this scheme was under-spent two years running? The Premier will be aware that I am referring to the scheme that was described at the last election as his 'bold new initiative' which would create thousands of jobs. In his first Budget, the Premier allocated $2 000 000 for the scheme, yet only $129 000 of that was actually spent. In his second Budget the allocation was halved to $1 000 000 for a full year and only $371 000 was spent. Yesterday's Budget, for some reason, doesn't spell out how much has been allocated specifically for this scheme for the coming financial year. However, I have been informed that the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment recommended that the scheme be dropped because it was a total flop. Government documents from that department prove that fact. However, it seems that the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a member of the Government's razor gang, chose to avoid the embarrassment of scrapping the scheme. I am also informed that the scheme that was designed—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader should remain with factual details explaining his question, and not make comments.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Sir, for directing me in the proper course. I am also informed that the scheme that was designed to create 10 000 jobs on the Premier's say-so, has in fact assisted the employment of between 400

and 600 people. I would like an explanation of where it went wrong.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition seems to ask a great number of questions, the answers to many of which he can find by reference to the Budget documents when they come in. The specific allocation for that scheme has been reduced slightly in the Budget, but it is expected that the expenditure in this coming financial year will be about the same as it was last financial year. However, this gives me the opportunity to say to the Deputy Leader that it is no earthly good his continuing on with the dishonest course of action which has been taken by the Opposition over the past two years.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. The Premier has just made an allegation that I am on a dishonest course. I have asked a question, and I want an answer to those facts; that is not being dishonest.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable Deputy Leader can take action in relation to a insinuation or an inference in a manner other than by a point of order.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am very happy to tell members what dishonest action I now believe the Opposition is following. Ever since the election when it was said that we would be able to create some 7 000 new jobs—

Mr Langley: How many?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Some 7 000 new jobs; since then, the figure has been inflated by various Opposition spokesmen to 10 000 and indeed, I read in, I think the Naracoorte *Herald* only a few months ago, that the Hon. Mr Sumner had said that the Government had promised before the last election to create 17 000 new jobs.

An honourable member: A misprint.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Perhaps it was a misprint; I will assume it was a misprint. The problem Opposition members face is that they have fallen flat on their faces because they did not believe such a result could be achieved. The figures were quoted at some length in this House yesterday, and I am perfectly happy to quote them again.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Well, why is unemployment increasing?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am perfectly happy to quote the figures that I gave yesterday, which show quite clearly that there are some 12 000 more people employed in South Australia than there were in August 1979. The figures are there, and they can be quoted. The fact is that the 12 000 people now in additional employment more than cover the 7 000 mentioned, the 10 000 mentioned—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It's got nothing to do with you, though.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —and, indeed, although it does not go up to the 17 000—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: He says it's got nothing to do with us.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If it has nothing to do with us, as the Deputy Leader now says, who is he trying to blame? It simply goes to show what we are dealing with; it really does. The Deputy Leader cannot have it both ways. Either we are to blame for the situation and we can take credit for correcting it, or we cannot take credit for correcting it because we are not to blame. He cannot have it both ways. The fact is that this was summed up by Mr Schrape in a speech to the Adelaide Rotary Club earlier this year, when he said:

> It is a measurable fact, by counting heads, that there are a lot more people in work today in the State than were in work 18 months ago; and that is employment. It is also true that there are a lot more people offering for work than there are jobs to offer them; and that is unemployment. The latter situation, and most particularly as it affects young people, is greatly to be regretted, but it does not negate the first point, that there are more jobs filled this year than last, or the year before last.

Unemployment for young people, those who are looking for full-time jobs, has risen in South Australia between June and August 1981, but it is markedly down over a 12-month comparison from 16 300 to 14 200. As a share of the available youth work force, the fall was from 26.1 per cent to 24.1 per cent. It is still much higher than the figure in other States and the Australian average of 14.7 per cent, but it is on the way down. We will continue with our schemes and any other scheme which will create positive and permanent employment for any members of the community, particularly young people.

PORT BROUGHTON AREA SCHOOL

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Education indicate whether there will be any alteration to the building programme for the Port Broughton Area School as a result of yesterday's Budget? Following media interviews on the Budget, concern has been expressed in relation to the proposed building programme at Port Broughton. Since 1973, it has been acknowledged that the unsatisfactory corrugated iron buildings and their lay-out have contributed to difficulties in controlling children, and the buildings possibly represent a fire hazard. Their concern is that the programme of completion in 1983 will be maintained.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I know the honourable member does not have a vested interest in this school, despite the fact that he is to be congratulated on the birth of a son as recently as yesterday or the day before. He is also to be congratulated on the way in which he has pressed the educational interests of his electorate, and I am sure that he will be delighted to tell his school council members and the school staff that papers are being prepared for the new school and that the plans will be going to the Public Works Standing Commmittee in October or November this year. Once that matter has been considered by the committee and has received approval, it is planned to make a tender call and commence construction in mid-1982. I can inform the House that this is one school among more than 100 that I have seen this year, and I can assure honourable members that it is in a sorely dilapidated condition. For something like a decade, promises or indications have been made that progress will be put in train towards providing a new school. This is one of those overdue constructions.

ROYALTIES

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: My question is directed to the Premier, although the Minister of Mines and Energy may choose to answer it, if he is allowed. Will the Premier give the House more detail of the $40 000 000 annual boost for South Australia from royalties that he announced recently? An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 9 August, headed '$40 000 000 annual boost for South Australia on way', states:

> South Australia can expect resource development royalties of about $40 000 000 a year by the middle of the 1980s, the Premier, Mr Tonkin, said yesterday. This would be nearly 10 times more than the State is getting now. Mr Tonkin was addressing the Whyalla Regional Convention of the Liberal Party. He said the royalties would come from current and foreshadowed developments, including the development of the Cooper Basin liquids and the mining of uranium in the Lake Frome area.

It has been reported in the press recently that Beverly, which is one of the uranium prospects concerned in that area, is not to proceed at present. Additionally, from infor-

mation I have been given by the principals involved in the Honeymoon project, that project will be on a pilot operation basis only for some time, and for a number of years will be set up to produce only a uranium slurry, without any of the drying operations required to produce a marketable product.

Those are two of the uranium prospects which, presumably, would be listed as being in the Lake Frome area. In addition, information I have obtained from Santos projects that royalty incomes (those are the payments Santos projects it will pay in the years concerned that were mentioned in the statement made by the Premier) are as follows: for the year 1981, the royalty will be of the order of $6 000 000. Members will understand that that is associated with payment of royalties on gas. In 1982, it is projected that the royalty figure will be approximately $6 500 000, and in 1984 (which is the projection which has been done so far), at the most the royalty concerned will be of the order of $26 000 000, taking into account the royalty payable on gas, that for oil, which may then be delivered, and condensate concerned. From the information I have presented to the House, it seems as though there is a considerable shortfall in the figure quoted by the Premier to the press. Will the Premier produce additional detail to show how the amount of $40 000 000 was conjured up?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no difficulty with that. I am prepared to get the honourable member a breakdown of the projections. There is no difficulty, with the l.p.g. contract building up and, as the honourable member has said, with liquids to start flowing down the line and the commencement of the export of l.p.g. within two years (those are the plans), together with Roxby Downs coming on stream in the middle of the decade, as it will, the pilot plants at Beverley and Honeymoon, and the royalties which are already obtained and which are in excess of $5 000 000 at present (and they will increase as the price of gas goes up), in seeing that sort of income in money terms in 1984-85.

Why on earth members of the Opposition take some pleasure in trying to deny that that is so and trying to write down South Australia again, I just do not know. It seems to me a peculiarly warped attitude but, nevertheless, if that is what the Opposition wants to do, let it do it. I shall be happy to provide the honourable member with a list of projected royalty incomes as perceived.

NOARLUNGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Education say whether consideration has been given to the appointment of senior administrative staff and to the formation of a college council for the Noarlunga Community College, which it is proposed will open late next year? Will the building programme continue in the light of the recent Budget? The Noarlunga Community College has been progressing at quite a rapid rate, and it is fairly evident that it is getting closer to conclusion; hence, members of the community are interested to see the conclusion of that college, particularly the building programme. More importantly, the request has come from various bodies that a community council be set up so that input may be gained from local residents and the community as to the types of programme offered by that council so that those programmes will be in tune with community needs.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am quite sure that the member for Mawson would have been delighted with the budgetary news yesterday which indicated that a further $6 000 000 had been allocated towards completion of that handsome community college complex which serves the southern electorates. I have further pleasing news for him in that interviews have been terminated for the position of Principal of the new college and that, in fact, the nominee has been decided upon. An announcement will be made soon. After that, I am quite certain that appropriate steps will be taken to establish the new college council so that things can be well under way for the opening of the complex in 1982.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

Mr ABBOTT: I ask the Premier to say who is the Minister referred to on page 16 of the Ombudsman's Report (tabled today), as follows:

> Unfortunately, my relationship with the Ministry failed in one area. The Minister concerned seemed to have some misunderstanding of the statutory responsibility and function of the office of the Ombudsman. This particular Minister appeared to believe the Ombudsman had a function akin to Consumer Affairs—as part and parcel of the Government administration—rather than appreciating his independence, as a representative of Parliament.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have not the slightest idea.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Are you going to find out?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I haven't looked at the report yet.

NATURAL GAS

Mr RANDALL: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, following statements made in the annual report of the Electricity Trust tabled yesterday, say what action the Government is taking regarding future supplies of natural gas to South Australia? My concern was raised in looking at the report, particularly when I read in it that ETSA warned that if the scheme referred to goes ahead South Australia could face high electricity charges. Another basis of concern is that the report also states:

> In view of the uncertainty of future gas supplies, the trust is investigating conversion of all or some of the boilers at Torrens Island station to burn New South Wales coal.

There will be expense related to that. An article in the *Advertiser* by conservation writer, Kym Tilbrook, under the heading: '$20 000 000 ETSA plan to use New South Wales coal', and subheaded, 'Insufficient gas', states:

> The report says there is insufficient gas proven to date to satisfy the full requirements of the New South Wales commitments. The availability of gas for South Australia beyond 1987 is therefore a matter of considerable concern, it says.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The report I tabled yesterday on behalf of the Electricity Trust contained some statements about which I should tell the House that the Government has taken some action, because I would hate people to believe that the situation is desperate at this moment; it is not. However, the trust rightly points up in its report some of the problems as it sees them and what it is doing to try to solve them. The Government has been acutely aware of this problem from the very first days of its election to office. We have taken a great deal of action to come to grips with this situation. First, I mention the accelerated programme in the Cooper Basin where $31 500 000 was to be spent over three years, and that is to be at an increasing rate.

Discussions have been held with people in the Northern Territory on a couple of occasions. One case was quite recent, when I flew over the Palm Valley, Mereeni hydrocarbon field, then proceeded to Darwin for further discussions with the Northern Territory administration in relation to the possibility of delivery of gas and hydrocarbons and liquids from that field to the South Australian system, in the fullness of time. That field is not very remote from the

Moomba headquarters, and it would be quite feasible to construct a line from the Palm Valley field to link into that system. The Northern Territory administration response was friendly and favourable. We are on cordial terms with that administration. Also, when I was in Queensland I called on the company last year which has the major interest in those leases. I believe that, if hydrocarbons and gas are found in commercial quantities, South Australia will have every chance of securing those.

We have had discussions on the possibility of rationalising the current contracts for the supply of gas to South Australia and New South Wales. I think we are all acutely aware (and the honourable member refers to this matter in his question) of the fact that the contract for gas to South Australia which was finalised by the present Opposition when it was in Government allows for the gas flow to New South Wales until the year 2006 and to terminate here in 1987. In fact, we are spending exploration money now to satisfy the Sydney contract before we even find gas for our own use. This was a particularly shortsighted negotiation, which has led to the position in which we find ourselves at the moment.

Mr Mathwin: It couldn't have been a business man who drew it up, surely.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have commented on that previously, but that is the situation, and the Government is making every effort to come to grips with it. We are negotiating with the Australian Gas Light Co. with the view to rationalising contracts. We have been doing that with some vigor.

The report also referred to the studies of the Electricity Trust into the importation of New South Wales coal to fire the Torrens Island power station. I think the figure mentioned was $200 000 000 for a conversion. It would downgrade the efficiency of the Torrens Island power station. The Government and I think that would be an option we would not want to pursue unless we absolutely have to. I can remember, when I was a boy and we were dependent on New South Wales coal for our power generation, when there was a strike on the coalfields we had a power shortage in South Australia. From my own long memory, I do not believe that is an option which would be particularly attractive. However, because of these contracts which were written by the A.L.P. and the fact that we have to cover all eventualities, that is being done. The Government believes, and I think the trust report indicates, that the first option is to obtain more gas so that we can see out the economic life of the Torrens Island power station.

I was rather interested to hear the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the increases in electricity tariffs, which are also referred to in the report of the Electricity Trust. The Leader was suggesting that the Government was getting money from the trust by way of the levy. He has forgotten the history of the levy. It was his Government, the Government of the poor people, who put the initial impost on to the Electricity Trust of 3 per cent, and then increased it within three or four years to 5 per cent. This Government has not increased it at all; we have not interfered with that levy. It would be one of my ambitions if humanly possible to remove it. This levy on electricity was to help the poor people—they do not use electricity, obviously! This was the nonsense being noised abroad by the Leader of the Opposition, trying to make some cheap political point in relation to the increase in electricity tariffs earlier this year.

Mr Bannon: Your increase is not cheap.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am suggesting that the comment was an attempt by the Leader to gain cheap political capital. The fact is that that increase in tariffs was as a result of a number of factors, one being that the price of gas went up by about 16 per cent under terms which were negotiated by the Labor Party when in office; the arbitration system was set up by it for fixing gas prices.

The other very significant factor in relation to electricity tariffs was the cost of their wages bill, and it was the Labor Government when in office that encouraged (in fact, told) the trust that it had to introduce a 37½-hour week instead of a 40-hour week. In these circumstances, it ill-behoves the Opposition to criticise the Government for what we are trying to do to come to grips with a difficult situation (not serious yet) which we inherited from the Labor Government.

I have outlined to the House a number of initiatives. There have also been discussions in relation to getting gas from Bass Strait. A line is being built to Albury which is then to link to the A.G.L. pipeline in Sydney, and there is a strong possibility that the Gas Company may be able to satisfy some of Sydney's needs following arrangements made as a result of that extra gas flowing into New South Wales.

I can assure members that the Government is pursuing this with great vigor. The Government set up the Natural Gas Advisory Committee on which are representatives of the Gas Company, the Electricity Trust and industry, and that committee under the chairmanship of Sir Norman Young has been particularly active in pursuing, together with the Government, the initiatives which I have outlined to the House.

RAID

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Does the Minister of Education accept the demands relating to education made by the Campaign for Rights to Assistance for Intellectually Disadvataged People, known as RAID, that they require urgent action by the Government, and, in so doing, does he accept the view that disadvantaged children have a right to adequate education and that they should not have to regard it as a privilege?

This afternoon there was a rally on the steps of Parliament House addressed by, among others, the Leader of the Opposition, at which rally I was also present. We heard the demands that were being put by that organisation in regard to a number of areas, specifically with regard to education. I shall read the demands that were put, which were as follows:

> Additional supports in regular schools together with broad based teacher training courses with practical experience in special education. Supports to include provision of additional trained personnel as well as teacher aides.
>
> Increased liaison within the Special Education system as children moved from pre-school to special school to senior school.

A number of parents have contacted me over recent times complaining about the lack of education opportunities available for their children, the children in question being those suffering from intellectual disadvantages. One parent pointed out to me that her child will not be able to be catered for by the primary school he is at present attending from the end of this year. He has been told that he must find another school. In this mother's search for another school, she went to three high schools. The best that she was told was that one school said that it would take it up as a challenge, which she did not regard as satisfactory from the child's education point of view. The next high school said that it would make an assessment of the child and that, if he passed, he would be admitted. The third school said that it would admit him but that there were no suitable classes into which he could be placed. Therefore, the mother rightly concluded that there seemed to be no option for her son's continuing his education.

Another parent who has had her child integrated into a normal situation feels that her child is being more allowed to drown rather than to survive educationally because there is no adequate support within that school to cater for children who have special education needs due to intellectual impairment. She told me that her child had been allowed to wander for five hours in the community, walking even into town from the Kilburn area and that the child's absence from school had not been noted. On another occasion at the same school the child had been attacked by other children and had his hearing aid damaged, and there had been no adequate support there to stop such a thing happening.

The RAID group made the point in their report that it felt that the Government has not acted promptly enough on the matter, that the Government has not indicated that the Bright Committee recommendations should be put into effect urgently as a matter of priority for the present children in the education system. The organisation states:

> While the Government digests the very commendable 'Bright Report' and continues its investigations through the intellectually retarded person's project, our children progress to old age, and do not receive the support they require to function normally within our society. Changes must be made now.

I endorse the comment that changes must be made now, if such education is to be a right and not a privilege.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It does surprise me that the honourable member should have the temerity to stand up and be critical of the Government, and of the Education Department in general, and to quote a few specific instances when surely those parents would have been far more happily guided by taking their complaints either to the Minister or to the Director of Education.

Mr Lynn Arnold: They have done.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Let me point out that those parents who have consulted me in the last two or three months have been quite happy to be attended to by Education Department officers. I have not had anyone coming back and saying that they have not been satisfactorily placed. If the honourable member can make details of those specific cases available to me I will be delighted to ensure that they are looked into with the utmost of care.

There are a number of other issues that are relevant. One was the criticism of the policy of integration, again a specific—

Mr Lynn Arnold: I didn't criticise that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It was certainly a criticism of the policy of integration in so far as one youngster was allegedly being allowed to wander around out of school, instead of being in an integrated and well looked after class. Surely that is a criticism of a policy. Let me point out that this policy of integration is one which the South Australian Government has been following for quite some years and which the Federal Government, too, is encouraging through the Schools Commission on the basis that youngsters who are integrated along with their peers progress more happily and more satisfactorily than if they are educated in separate establishments. I subscribe to that policy. I am not speaking in ignorance; I have attended some seven or eight schools recently which have been integrating youngsters, and I am more than delighted to see that the integration is working on several planes.

The parents of normal youngsters (I say normal, whether they be intellectually or physically normal by our standards) were in fact a little apprehensive when the ideas of integration were mooted. They are now delighted to see their own youngsters working happily, in many cases with music, craft and other subjects being taken together, and with the more difficult academic subjects taken separately. The integration is also succeeding on the staff and student planes, where I saw youngsters in wheelchairs being wheeled about happily by other youngsters who were giving them the greatest encouragement to take part in school games, and also being wheeled from classroom to classroom at the turn of lessons. This was a salutary experience for me, as I was a little apprehensive personally as to what I might find. In my own electorate we have a broad cross-section of services for handicapped, which are probably unparalleled in any other district in South Australia.

In answer to this question I raise the point of the apparent dishonesty, or was it simply that the Leader of the Opposition was uninformed and had not read the Budget papers or did not comprehend them, when he made his statement about educational cuts having an adverse effect upon handicapped education in South Australia. What is the real situation? I will quote from a press release of today highlighting the fact that instead of $290 000-odd, which was allocated last year t.. non-Government handicapped schools—I will deal with Government schools separately—we have allocated $420 000-odd, a very substantial increase. These include the St Ann's School for Handicapped Children in Finniss Street, Marion, which was granted $37 800 to cater for 39 handicapped children; the South Australian Oral School in Gilberton, which was granted $154 000 to provide education for hearing impaired children; the Pembroke School Speech and Hearing Centre, given a small grant of $5 700 toward running costs; and St Patrick's School for Handicapped Children in Dulwich, the grant for which was increased very substantially to $42 000 (they had a deficit, and we recognised the sound work that they were doing and greatly increased their running costs, which were not met by the Schools Commission or the Federal Government funding). The Autistic Children's Association President came to me before Christmas of last year, looking for a vast increase.

What has the Government done? It has made available more than $122 000 this year to help meet the operating deficit incurred, without the encouragement of the Government—and so it goes on. The Suneden School, at Mitchell Park, received $61 000—all part of a substantial increase. But that is not the end of the story. In addition, there are the normal allocations which we have made to Townsend House, to the Association of Better Hearing, to SPELD—and that list is not exhaustive.

Quite apart from that, we have ignored the most important sector probably from the numerical point of view, and that is the Education Department's contribution; Ted Lascock and his special branch—nothing that I invented, but certainly an organisation and a part of the Education Department to which we have given every encouragement. We have increased the number of speech pathologists, for example, from 14 to 19 since we have come to Government, and even then there are complaints that that is not enough. Obviously, there are never enough in an area as troubled as this, but we are taking very positive steps to bring in remedies.

The South Australian Government's initiatives towards integration are being encouraged by the Federal Government. The Federal body, the Schools Commission, recommended to the Federal Government that all States which are not integrating be given substantial grants to encourage them to get young people out of special schools and into the normal school situation. What does South Australia get from that? Unfortunately, it gets nothing, because the Schools Commission omitted to make available a sum of money to South Australia—no encouragement for success, the very success which led to the Schools Commission's saying, 'Look what South Australia is doing. We should be

emulating that.' That will not happen next year. The Schools Commission will have to make money available to South Australia in recognition of achievement.

In case the people who were on the steps of Parliament House today were in any way critical of what the Education Department is doing, let me point out that, beyond dispute, South Australia's education system is considered to be in the forefront, in the vanguard, of services to handicapped children; that is beyond dispute. We are doing extremely well. We are establishing the precedents that the rest of Australia follows; that is the case in many parts of our education programmes. I suppose it would be appropriate, while we have had a spate of criticism outside of Parliament House, and I understand a very small but polite delegation trying to meet me in my electorate office, that we should express our thanks to the Education Department officers and all of those in South Australia who were sorely criticised today. They certainly were not recognised by the Leader of the Opposition or by any of the other speakers, who were all too eager to say what a rotten job South Australia is doing. Those people should be thanked for the sterling work they are doing—in particular, Ted Lasscock and his special education branch, under the Director-General.

I hope that gives the lie to any of the criticisms that were addressed to the Education Department, for what it is doing either inside or outside the Government school systems, during the rally earlier today. Those improvements will continue, because the Attorney-General, as Chairman of the Cabinet Committee for the International Year of the Disabled, has already discussed with me, immediately upon the cessation of the rally, a number of issues which we consider we might take up to improve the co-ordination and distribution of services to parents and students, the handicapped in South Australia.

CARDIAC ARREST

Mr ASHENDEN: Would the Minister of Health please inform the House as to the steps being taken to ensure that adequate treatment is available to persons living in the north-eastern suburbs who may require medical attention or emergency first aid following cardiac arrest? There has recently been criticism levelled in the north-east areas at what are alleged to be inadequate arrangements and facilities for the treatment of persons requiring cardio-pulmonary resuscitation. Constituents who have approached me believe that it is essential that there be adequate facilities for protection and that these be available to all residents of north-eastern suburbs, as corrective immediate treatment can mean the difference between life and death.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that steps are being taken, and they have been initiated within the voluntary health organisations, with the full support of the Health Commission, of me as Minister, and of the board of the Modbury Hospital.

The proposed cardio-pulmonary resuscitation programme being planned for the north-eastern suburbs will, I think, be a trail-blazer in Australia as one of the most ambitious health education programmes ever undertaken in this country at a community level. Its aim is nothing less than to provide universal education among the community in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation. That aim, of course, is an ideal which it is unlikely will be achieved on a universal basis, but the aim is there, nevertheless. Those trying to achieve that aim will be the Red Cross Service, St John, Modbury Hospital and the local service clubs, which are getting together to form a working group under the chairmanship of the Mayor of Tea Tree Gully, Mr Tilley. Those groups are going to plan for all citizens to be instructed in the technique of cardio-pulmonary resuscitation. To my knowledge, there has never before been such a comprehensive programme planned to educate a specific community.

The programme is being undertaken in the belief that this is a community responsibility. It is not a responsibility that can be accepted solely by hospitals or the health services. As the member for Todd pointed out, it is one in which every person in the community can play a part. The working party has sought a deputation to me in an effort to find out what funds could be made available to assist in the education campaign. I have indicated that I fully support, in principle, what they are trying to do. I know that the member for Todd and the member for Newland lend their full support to this programme. I foresee that a programme preparation similar to that undertaken for the immunisation campaign will be conducted in the north-eastern suburbs.

I hope that full publicity will be given to this programme, because it is only by making people aware that we can list their co-operation. I should add that cardiac arrest due to heart attack, drowning, electrocution or poisoning rarely occurs within close range of a hospital—it occurs where ordinary people are going about their business. Those people can, we know, be trained in the technique of basic resuscitation, and if we are able to achieve that we may be able to save lives and improve the quality of life. I commend the honourable member for his interest, and hope that all members who are given the opportunity to lend support to this campaign will do so and that it may be regarded as a pilot which can eventually be emulated throughout the State.

LICENCE FEES

Mr PETERSON: Will the Premier, in his capacity as Treasurer, say why the Government has decided to increase the liquor licence fee on full strength wines? It is pleasing to see, following my suggestion last January, that the Government has seen its way clear to reduce licence fees on low alcohol beer and wine from 8 per cent to 2 per cent. However, the licence fee on full strength brews has been increased by 12½ per cent, from 8 per cent to 9 per cent.

Documents issued to the media by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet yesterday stated that the increased licence fees on liquor would result in only a marginal increase in the cost of a bottle of beer. No mention of increases in licence fees on full strength wine was made in that statement. Only a few weeks ago the Premier was predicting dire results for the wine industry if the Federal Government imposed a wine tax. It appears to me that, through increased licence fees, an additional tax has been imposed on full strength wine. I concede that tax on low alcohol wine has been reduced. However, that comprises a minimal percentage of wine sales in this State. Will this action increase the licence fee on full strength wine? If it does, that can only adversely affect our wine industry and wine sales in this State.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the honourable member for his question, because I may be able to clear up a misconception in other people's minds, too, by the answer I give him. A licence fee is charged on turnover in relation to beer, wines, spirits and all forms of liquor. It relates to an average based on a particular antecedent period of 12 months, and is paid as a turnover tax, virtually. It is not a direct tax on wine, spirits or beer. Basically, a 15 per cent Federal excise on wine would have made a considerable significant difference to its cost. For a bottle, I think the

increase would have been 30c to 40c, which would have been quite disastrous for the wine industry and, therefore, particularly disastrous for South Australia. The increase from 8 per cent to 9 per cent is simply to bring charges in South Australia more into line with charges made in other States. As well as putting only about 1c a bottle on to the price of beer, the increase is very likely to put only 2c or, at the very most, 3c on a bottle of wine. That is a considerable difference. The increase is negligible, and it is simply to bring fees in South Australia into line with licence fees charged elsewhere.

ETSA COAL USE

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say why the use of South Australian coal was not proposed for use by ETSA? Secondly, if it is not intended to use South Australian coal for domestic purposes, has the Government given consideration to the sale and export of coal on the overseas market? Further, should the export of coal be an option of future development, will the Government consider the development of the Lock coal deposit for this purpose?

In response to a question I asked earlier this session, the Minister said that the location was a problem for development of the Lock coal deposit for domestic consumption. My constituents believe, however, that, should the Government allow the export of coal, the Lock deposit would be ideally situated. With a railway line through the centre of the deposit leading to a deep sea port, the proposal would provide a further much needed industrial development for Eyre Peninsula and South Australia.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The general question of the use of South Australian coal can be referred to in a couple of ways. First, I commented earlier today on the use of coal if Torrens Island was converted to burn coal. South Australian coal is of such a grade that it would not be suitable for that conversion. We would need good quality anthracite if that was to be effective. None of the coals available in South Australia would be suitable for use there.

The reason for pursuing this Torrens Island option is that it could burn either oil or gas, but it could not burn anything else without about $200 000 000 being spent. The best decision is to see that the economic life of Torrens Island is assured, because building a new power station is enormously expensive. It is not a very attractive option: by far the best option is to get further gas supplies to see out the economic life of Torrens Island, but the conversion at a cost of $200 000 000 is an option, whereas to build a new power station, depending on the size, would cost up to $1 billion. That is why that option as a back-up is being pursued.

The next option, I would think further down the track economically, would be a power station built to burn one of those lower-grade coals. The difficulty is that boilers have not yet been designed capable of using this coal, because of extreme fouling properties. The Electricity Trust has been pursuing an evaluation of this coal at Port Wakefield and Kingston, first, with a view to seeing whether boilers can be designed to burn them. I am quite confident that these coals will be suitable for combustion for power generation, but the cost of building a new power station to burn them would be very high. If that had to be done in the short term before the economic life of Torrens Island had been accommodated, that would be reflected in a very high increase in electricity tariffs in South Australia.

At the moment, the quality of known coals in South Australia is not such that it would attract export orders. Coal of higher quality is available on the eastern seaboard of Australia in vast quantities, which is far more attractive for coking and steaming purposes. I am referring to the eastern seaboard of New South Wales and, particularly, Queensland, and that a far more attractive proposition for people wanting to buy coal from this country. None of the South Australian coals are attractive to people overseas who want to buy coal. Coals in South Australia are hydrocarbons, and although they are low grade I am quite sure that they will be of considerable economic significance as other forms of fuel around the world become more expensive. The time will surely come when the vast coal deposit at Port Wakefield and other deposits will be utilised one way or another, possibly (or probably) for power generation, possibly for gasification. The reasons, in answer to the member's question, are that no coal in South Australia is suitable for Torrens Island use and none of the coals are attractive for export purposes at the moment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: INTELLECTUALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: In answer to a question I asked of the Minister of Education today, he said that I did not support integration of intellectually disadvantaged children into ordinary schools. I state now that that is incorrect. I do support it, provided that adequate resources are made available to support the child's participation in an ordinary school. My criticism in my question related to instances I have had reported to me where insufficient support had been made available where a child was integrated into an ordinary school situation. Integration with adequate support is an intellectually disadvantaged child's best option. Integration without adequate support could be his or her worst option.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

A.L.P. CONVENTION

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I move:

That this House condemns the resolution passed by the Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party which reads: 'That this convention endorses the 35-hour work campaign being conducted by the A.C.T.U. and calls for the State Parliamentary Labor Party and endorsed Labor candidates to conduct a supportive campaign throughout the community.'

In so doing, I ask that this matter be dealt with on a non-partisan basis and that Labor Party members give this motion all the attention that it deserves. Indeed, they would realise the folly of the motion passed at the convention which, of course, as we well know, ties the Labor Party hand and foot to it. I bring this matter before the House with the hope that Opposition members will have the opportunity to give a fair assessment of their own personal beliefs about its effects on the State in general and Australia in particular. Members opposite must know of the problems that this resolution of their conference would bring to this State in particular. Do they really want to support increased unemployment? In this House we all know that unemployment figures in this State are improving. Why spoil that? We are creating more jobs.

Do members opposite really believe that the economy can stand a reduction in the number of working hours at this time? They must know what the reduction would mean generally throughout the community, and they must also know that the reduction of hours would further jeopardise the economic growth which this State is now enjoying. In the two years since this Government has been in office at least 65 companies have either expanded their activities in this State or have established themselves as industrialists in South Australia. Investment has increased dramatically. Members who were in this House during the 10 long, weary years of the previous Government's reign would know that increased investment in this State was then a rare event. In fact, it was almost a non-event under the previous Labor Government.

Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited is to invest more than $100 000 000 in steelworks at Whyalla. This will be a boom to that city, which has problems which were brought on in the shipbuilding industry under the previous Federal Government of Mr Whitlam which caused a lot of damage to the ship building industry in Australia generally. One of the main sufferers of that was one of our own cities, Whyalla, which relied heavily on shipbuilding. Eglo Engineering is to spend an extra $10 000 000 at its Port Adelaide works. Increased investment in the State of course means an increase in employment within the State. An increased investment of $10 000 000 by an engineering company will mean a great increase in the number of jobs it can offer. Simpson Limited has invested a further $6 000 000 into its activities in this State, and this has already provided 160 jobs in South Australia.

Members who have been in this House for some time and watched the antics of the previous Premier heard him promise from time to time the building of a hotel on Victoria square land. Many submissions were made and many promises were made by that particular gentleman as to what was to be built on the land in Victoria Square.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What about the efforts of our colleague the member for Rocky River; have you heard about that?

Mr MATHWIN: The jockey from Rocky, no.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Carry on, have a little private conversation there, don't worry about a speech!

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: $15 000 000 in two years by C.B.H.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: It is a good effort by a past member of Parliament who was a member of the Liberal Party. We had about eight years of promises by the previous Labor Government and particularly from the previous Premier, Mr Dunstan—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Sir. I cannot find anything in the motion about the hotel in Victoria Square, and I wonder whether the honourable member is speaking to the motion he is moving.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable Deputy Leader will appreciate that the subject matter is far ranging and involves all manner of employment.

Mr Millhouse: You might be more careful though in what you say.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Sir, and I thank the member for Mitcham for helping me the way he is doing. When the hotel was first mooted we were told that it would have specially shaped baths because we were going to have tourists from Japan, but at last now under this Government, and only under this Government, the Hilton Hotel is well under way at a cost of $40 000 000. This will provide jobs in Adelaide.

The Roxby Downs project has doubled the number of its employees to more than 200 since this Government came into office. Expenditure in relation to natural resources has increased from $6 300 000 to $31 100 000. I believe that is proof that this Government is encouraging people to invest in this State and, by so doing, it is increasing the number of jobs available.

I ask all members, particularly members opposite, whether they really believe that the introduction of a 35-hour week will not have a drastic effect on inflation. We all know the effect of high inflation on the community, and the community is my concern. We all know who suffers the most from inflation. In this country, we tend to forget that our inflation is much lower than that of other countries. Some countries have inflation rates of 150 per cent to 200 per cent. The drastic effects of inflation on the poor people, the aged and people on fixed incomes is shocking, and that should be enough to make members conscious of the effects a 35-hour week will have on inflation. None of us would wish that to happen to people, particularly the aged and the poorer people of this State.

There is no doubt we have been through a recession, and I believe that we are well on the path of recovery and all the indications are there. According to the consumer price index for the June quarter 1981, the national inflation rate in the 12 months to June 1981 was 8.8 per cent, which is lower than many observers had expected. More importantly, Adelaide's annual rate of 8.8 per cent was lower than the Sydney and Melbourne levels of 8.9 per cent and the Brisbane level of 9.1 per cent. In the three months from April to June, increases in the petrol cost accounted for 29 per cent of South Australia's total c.p.i. movement compared with 23 per cent nationally. This differential in petrol price increases between the States accounts almost entirely for South Australia's marginally higher c.p.i. in the June quarter. However, despite the higher petrol prices which obtained in South Australia for some time, this State's annual rate of inflation is still lower than that of most other States. Now that petrol prices have been reduced in South Australia, we would expect in the September c.p.i. a result which is even more to this State's advantage. No member of this House would want to halt that particular trend by the early introduction of a 35-hour week.

The effect of the introduction of this type of condition is considerable, when one thinks about what will happen, particularly in the labour intensive industries. Indeed, the effects there will be critical on businesses. It will cause, without any doubt at all, reduced investment, and that in turn will affect new jobs to be created from investment. It will increase the price of products, and, indeed, increase inflation. We all know that the metal trades industries are pushing this barrow. We all know that in that area of industry there is a shortage of tradesmen. We also know that, because of the lack of tradesmen, the industries will be forced to work overtime, and I should imagine that that is one of the main reasons behind the push in relation to the metal trades areas.

The working of overtime would mean that there would be penalty rates. In this State and in Australia generally, the rates of pay are such that penalty rates come into operation very early when overtime starts; very soon the area of double pay is reached. The proposal for a 35-hour week is causing very great concern within industries and within the community generally. In many cases, it could cause some type of hardship. It must increase the price of whatever is being produced. This situation affects people who wish to buy particular articles and who must pay more for them, and so the circle widens. If we add overtime to the cost of production, one asks 'Who will pay?', and we know that the cost will be passed on.

The most unfortunate part of the whole aspect is that the small businesses will go out of business, because the higher cost will decrease the market. Firms and organisations will not be able to employ people, and more unemployment will thus be created. The introduction of a 35-hour week will prejudice the fight against inflation, which, as mentioned earlier, is a very important factor in any country. It will also prejudice the fight against unemployment, an area in which I believe we are making gains.

I want to bring to the attention of members the recent figures concerning the employment situation. Let me remind members that, during the past two years of the Labor Government in this State, there was a reduction in the number of employed people of 20 600. The figures from 1978 to 1981 are as follows: in August 1977, under the Labor Government, 568 000 people were employed; in August 1979, again still under the Labor Government 547 400 people were employed, a reduction in the number of people employed of 20 600. In August 1980, 540 400 people were employed, and in July 1981, under the Liberal Government, 558 100 people were employed, an increase of 10 700 on the figure for August 1979. It can be seen that under the Liberal Government the situation improved.

With regard to the unemployment situation, the figures are as follows: for the last three years of the Labor Government, in August 1977, 38 500 people were unemployed; in August 1978, 44 200 people were unemployed; in August 1979, 45 300 were unemployed, an increase over that period of unemployed people of 6 800. From the time the Liberal Party came into power the figures are as follows: in 1980, 47 700 people were unemployed, and in 1981 there were 48 800. The latest figure is that 48 700 are unemployed. That is an increase in unemployed (which no Government should be proud of) of 3 400 people, but when that figure is compared with the increase in the number of unemployed people during the time of the previous Government over that same period it can be seen that it has been almost halved. Since August 1979 jobs have been created. The increase in the number of employed persons has increased by 10 700 in the period from August 1979 to July 1981. These are the latest published figures. The number of unemployed is still unacceptably high as far as the Liberal Party is concerned (and I am sure as far as every member of this House is concerned) with a figure of 48 700 as at August 1981, but as the number of persons employed has increased the rate of increase of unemployment has been dramatically reduced. There was a 6 800 increase in two years from August 1977 to August 1979 under the Labor Government, and an increase of 3 400 from August 1979 to August 1981. Those figures prove that there are more people employed during the time of the Liberal Government than were employed during the previous Government. If we bear those figures in mind, we can see that the introduction of a 35-hour week would certainly cause great problems in Australia and certainly in this State generally.

Let us have a look at what people are saying in some areas of the press. An article appeared in the *News* of 6 April 1981 headed 'Comalco attacks 35-hour week move'. The article stated in part:

In the aluminium group's printed annual report for the year 31 December, the chairman, Mr J. T. Ralph, says the campaign 'threatens to erode further the international competitiveness of many Australian manufacturing industries.

'Unless we are able to make productivity gains to offset increasing costs, the competitiveness of our industries will be impaired and this nation will not realise its full potential.'

Mr Ralph says it is in this context the 35-hour week campaign threatens to do the most harm 'by boosting the total costs of labour per unit of output'.

To me, that is common sense. On a similar line in relation to the 35-hour week argument, an article appeared in the *News* of 24 February 1981, headed 'The folly of the 35-hour week'. This article by Randall Ashbourne stated in part:

But, according to the authoritative Productivity Promotion Council which compiled the forecast, they also believe the push for shorter working hours will help bankrupt 10 per cent of the nation's manufacturers by 1985. Australians already enjoy one of the world's shortest working weeks.

There should be no argument about this. I am sure that the Deputy Leader would agree that that is so. The article continues:

Taking annual leave, sick days and public holidays into account, we work an average of 34.1 hours per week. Most European workers average more than 41 hours per week—up to 44.5 hours in Switzerland and up to 44 hours in Britain.

Mr Lewis: And they work in Switzerland.

Mr MATHWIN: Indeed they do. A referendum was held to see whether they wanted to work a 40-hour week, and they decided that they would work longer because they believed that was to the benefit of their country. Continuing:

Can Australia afford the shorter week in so short a time? According to most business leaders and Governments—Liberal or Labor—the answer is a resounding 'No'. The Confederation of Industry estimates the change will add $10 000 000 000 to the nation's yearly wage bill and set back productivity by seven years. It also anticipates: higher unemployment and inflation, severe setbacks to the recent emerging economic growth, a drop in the buying power of the family pay packet.

This puts it in nutshell. That is what it is all about. When we talk about benefiting the workers, we ought to give them some sort of backing in this situation. I point out to the House that in *Opinion* of 23 July 1981, under the heading 'Working out the hours', it says:

This week an Adelaide survey showed a large percentage of the population did not want a 35 hour week. However, few people appear to know how many hours each week are worked in different occupations—Bureau of Statistics figures of November 1980 show only 18 per cent of Australia's full-time workers work less than 40 hours and 40 per cent in fact work more than 40 hours. One million Australians—small businessmen, senior executives and politicians are reported to work more than 50 hours each week. For example, the local bank manager and the corner service station manager are unlikely ever to work less than 50, and in an interesting sidelight, the report containing those figures points out that 'almost all those' who regularly work more than 45 hours each week receive no overtime, no time off in lieu and no penalty rates for their trouble.

That again puts it in a nutshell for the Deputy Leader, who has said that we do not really know what is going on in this area. I also draw to the attention of the Deputy Leader, who is a straight-thinking man, who is well versed in this area, who is no doubt an honest gentleman and who will agree with what I am saying, that the warehousemen rejected the 35-hour bid. The *News* of 20 March 1981 states:

A group of warehouse workers today rejected an immediate push for a 35-hour week. The workers, employed at the Coles New World Supermarkets warehouse at Underdale, said they wanted shorter working hours—but not at this stage.

No doubt the Deputy Leader has read that. People in favour of the 35-hour week say that the move is well on the way and that it is causing no problems, and they quote figures to show that 44 per cent of the workers already work those hours. No doubt the Deputy Leader will try to show that 44 per cent of the workers already work less than the 40-hour norm. Perhaps the Deputy Leader will note that these figures are arrived at by including the nation's part-time workers in those calculations. This is admitted by the proponents of the shorter working week. If you are going to include in those figures the people who are part-time workers, then your argument loses its thump completely. The 35-hour week is being sought on behalf of full-time workers, so part-time employees should be regarded as irrelevant in this matter.

I ask the house to look at this problem rationally and fully understand the effects on the economy of the country—indeed, not only this country.

Mr Abbott interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: As the honourable member will know, we have the best country in the world. My friend is agreeing. He knows that in Australia we have the best country in the world. Of that there is no doubt. We have the best working conditions and the best conditions generally in the world. Therefore, I ask members opposite to bear that in mind when people are trying to incite workers to strike, say that we are lagging behind the world and that we in this country are working too hard and should be working only 30 hours or whatever. I asks them to reflect on what is happening in other parts of the world. In socialist countries behind the Iron Curtain, which some people believe are the very principles we should work to, employees work 44 hours, or 48 hours. When I was in Romania, the May day celebration was to occur on a Friday. It was suggested to the people that, if they worked on the preceding Sunday, they could have the Friday off. They did not argue about that, because they could not: that was the direction they were given. There is no such thing as a 35-hour week behind the Iron Curtain. The Deputy Leader has been behind the Iron Curtain and spent some time in Yugoslavia. That was probably why I never obtained a visa to go there. The honourable member probably warned them that I should not be accepted in that country. This seems a shame, as I could have helped the situation by going.

Mr Abbott: He goes to church on Sundays, too.

Mr MATHWIN: Does he? He goes to church in Yugoslavia? Well, that is far away from my 35-hour week. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, would not allow me to go on with that line of argument. As a Parliament, let us look at the whole situation and fully understand the effects, not only on the economy of the State but also on the workers and on their families. Having taken all those things into consideration, let us then look at the effects on the community in general. With that in mind, I ask all members to support the motion.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CASINO BILL

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the granting of a licence authorising the establishment and operation of a casino; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mr PETERSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In presenting this Bill to Parliament, I realise that the issue to hand is a controversial one and that our community has divided opinions upon whether we should permit legal casinos to operate in this State. Opinion polls have indicated growing support for the concept in this State, and I believe the majority of South Australians now want a casino.

The path of legislation of this type has never been an easy one, and the fear of electorate backlash has apparently created a reluctance among members of the major Parties to present a casino Bill, but I believe the issue should be faced by members of this House as elected representatives, and a decision made.

I see no need at all for a referendum on this matter, as has been suggested; the choice is well within the capacity of this Parliament and each member should make a public decision and not hide behind a call for a referendum. We were all elected to this House to represent and vote on behalf of the people we represent, and we should do just that.

It has been suggested that the issue has been revived by interests whose concern is only for the financial reward that is possible to them from such a venture. That may be so, but the casino issue is one that has once again caught the public interest and should be properly debated in this House. It should also be apparent to all of us that any potential return to private interests is also available to an enterprising Government and if it were within my power to write into the legislation for it to be operated by the Government I would have done so. Perhaps an amendment from the Government to give the State equity may be presented at a later stage.

In any debate upon casinos, Hobart's Wrest Point is always used as an example. The beneficial effect that it has had upon Tasmania is unquestionable; for example, in the period February 1973 to December 1980, $16 649 000 has been received by the Tasmanian Government in casino tax and licence fees; $46 225 000 in wages and salaries paid to employees; and $23 980 000 paid for goods and services in Tasmania.

I will state at this stage of the proceedings that I do not see a casino in this State having the same degree of effect, but I do believe that there are benefits and that they should be properly considered; similarly there are risks and it is certain that there will be those who will lose money, as is the case with every form of gambling ever conceived by mankind.

The Parliament and people of Tasmania obviously believe that the benefits outweigh the risks as their second casino is currently under construction in Launceston.

The Northern Territory has two casinos and recently in a national newspaper the Townsville City Council advertised for developers stating:

> The City Council is anxious to see a casino project proceed and has declared its public support for such an enterprise.

While Victoria recently unsuccessfully proposed a casino development, it has been suggested that a large number of gamblers at Wrest Point are from Victoria, and a recent report stated that Victorian licensed clubs are about to campaign for legalising poker machines in that State.

New South Wales, of course, has many types of gambling, much of it illegal, bùt operating with the full knowledge of the authorities, and it has recently been reported that Mr Wran has stated he will legislate to legalise casinos after the State election in that State.

In a recent book *Drug Traffic, Narcotics and Organised Crime in Australia,* Alfred W. McCoy quoted figures for illegal gambling turnover in New South Wales for 1976-77, as follows:

> S.P. bookmaking, $1 420 000 000; illegal casino gambling, $650 000 000; poker machine 'skimming', $90 000 000;

(that refers to skimming only, the taking off, cheating the machines) and all profits going into the pockets of organised crime. That was from illegal casinos.

In the Australian Capital Territory the Minister for the Federal Capital Territory has stated he is determined to establish a casino in Canberra. In Western Australia, according to a recent radio report, illegal casino gambling is booming in Perth. In South Australia a Bill was presented unsuccessfully in 1973 by the then Premier, Mr Don Dunstan. So, here we are in 1981 preparing to debate this issue once again.

I have tried to analyse the effects of a casino upon our community from existing data and reports, most of which relate to the Hobart experience, and I do not see this creating any particularly misguided assumptions. As it has been in operation since 1973 any detrimental effects should be apparent by now.

Tourism is a word that has been bandied around quite a lot recently; in 1980 tourism earned this State $219 000 000 and in a recent report the Director of Tourism was quoted as saying 'Tourism, key to more jobs—directly and indirectly tourism sustains about 35 000 jobs in the South Australian economy.' But the industry has been in decline for some time with the growth of only 2.5 per cent per annum, the lowest in Australia.

It has been reported that we are the only State to have suffered, in the past two years, both a large decrease in the number of visitors from elsewhere and a big increase in the number of local residents travelling to other States. This decrease is also reflected in the occupancy rate of tourist accommodation in South Australia. Official statistics state that, in the three months to June this year, $123 000 000 was spent in Australia on hotel and motel accommodation, only $8 600 000 of it in South Australia. Once again we received the lowest rating in a survey where international visitors placed us lowest on the scale of places they would like to re-visit. Only 11.3 per cent said they might come back to South Australia. Sir Phillip Lynch recently stated that a million overseas visitors were expected in Australia this year. One can only ask with the ratings we receive how many can we expect in South Australia.

The most recent survey by the Tasmanian Tourist Bureau shows that 69.2 per cent of all adult visitors in Hobart visit Wrest Point, and it must not be overlooked that our Minister of Tourism has stated that 'every $1 spent by the tourist in South Australia generates the movement of about $2.62 throughout the community and the effects of increased tourist activity are obvious'. I do not with any person to imagine that I am suggesting that the tide will turn dramatically if we have a casino, but it will definitely add another facet to what the State can offer and the establishment of such an establishment will certainly not drive any tourists away.

The Director of Tourism has been quoted as saying, 'We have relied too much on our Victor Harbors and Barossa Valleys, which in themselves are important components of our tourist resort areas, but we have to think wider than this.' He is also quoted as saying, 'There has to be a big promotion push to the north; South Australia and the Northern Territory have good reasons to sell the two areas to the South-East Asian markets.'

I believe that the tourist potential in South-East Asia is a market we could attract with a casino and it would link into the Adelaide-Darwin-Singapore-London route that the Minister of Transport has quoted as being of significance for tourist development. If such a link was established it would help in our campaign for an international airport in Adelaide. Western Australia and Victoria are other sources of potential visitors because of the obvious geographical advantage we would have over other casinos. To any person who doubts the tourist draw of gambling casinos I would refer them to Ansett's *The Four Aces* promotional pamphlet which highlights their operations in Australia.

One aspect of the establishment of a gambling casino in our fair city that has caused much debate and comment is the issue of social disruption. Comment has been made by some that it will destroy the fabric of our society, and others have said that it will have no effect.

I have spent some time canvassing this area of concern and can find no evidence to indicate that there will be any rash of bankruptcies, family breakdowns or any other manifestation of a social or moral breakdown. What could happen, however, is exactly what happens to individuals in our community now—some of us cannot control our gambling urges and some will risk more than they can afford to lose, exactly as happens today with horse and dog racing and other existing forms of gambling. There is no way to remove this risk when gambling in any form is permitted. No-one at the moment has attempted to protect gamblers from the risks that exist now.

It is of interest to read the report of the 1949-51 British Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries and Gaming, where it was stated:

> We are left with the impression that it is extremely difficult to establish by abstract argument that all gambling is inherently immoral, without adopting views as to the nature of good and evil which would not find general acceptance among moralists. Our concern with the ethical significance of gambling is confined to the effect which it may have on the character of the gambler as a member of society. If we are convinced that, whatever the degree of gambling, this effect must be harmful, we should be inclined to think that it was the duty of the State to restrict gambling to the greatest extent possible. This point of view was put to us by some witnesses but we do not think it can be established either by abstract argument or by an appeal to experience. It would be out of place to discuss here the abstract arguments, but from our general observation and from the evidence which we have heard we can find no support for the belief that gambling, provided it is kept within reasonable bounds, does serious harm either to the character of those who take part in it, or to their family circle and to the community in general.

The attitude of Governments to gambling was also considered by the New Zealand Royal Commission of 1946-48, and the view of that Commission was as follows:

> We conclude therefore that the proper function of the State is to impose restraints and restrictions only in respect of gambling which is, or is likely to be, productive of detrimental social consequences. That does not, of course, mean detrimental consequences in sporadic instances, but consequences on a scale more widespread and more general.

To assess the effects that a casino might have upon compulsive gamblers, I contacted the Adelaide Branch of Gamblers Anonymous. I spoke to a representative who had visited Hobart and the casino and has had long experience as a compulsive gambler and with Gamblers Anonymous. I will quote his exact words:

> The casino will not make any difference; a compulsive gambler will find a way to gamble by whatever method is available.

He also said that he personally believed that poker machines presented a different picture; most forms of gambling have some element of involvement through calculating the odds for success, but poker machines present a mindless, automatic method of operation that is hypnotic, and it attracts a different type of person, an opinion that I agree with.

Radio station 5DN recently ran a series by Leigh Hatcher in which he quoted four cases of people who had ruined their lives through gambling at Wrest Point—one of them where it may have brought about a suicide. It is significant that, in all of the cases quoted, only in one instance was it stated that the casino was the only source of gambling for the person involved, and it must be considered that over 8 000 000 people have passed through the doors at Wrest Point since it opened in 1973.

In May 1978, the Tasmanian newspaper, the *Examiner*, had a feature by reporter Andrew Tilt in the form of an inquiry into casinos. In that article, which was written with the assistance of the Hobart Branch of Gamblers Anonymous, the following statements were made:

> 1. There is evidence that 500 chronic, compulsive gamblers have been or are addicted to the various games offered at the Wrest Point Casino.
> 2. A large majority have switched to Wrest Point from another form of compulsive gambling.
> 3. In nearly all cases this previous addiction was horse racing.
> 4. Only a small number had come from non-chronic gambling habits to being addicted at the casino.
> 5. Gamblers Anonymous estimate that 85 per cent of all chronic gamblers are attracted to horse racing.

Mr Tilt is quoted as stating:

> There are very few previous non-gamblers who have been attracted to, and then hooked by casino gambling.

And, further:

> We concluded the hotel casino was not generating a chronic gambling habit that did not already exist. We were surprised these figures were not worse.

The experience of the telephone *Lifeline* service in Hobart also indicates that attitude and, when interviewed, stated that it has no specific records on contact with chronic gamblers.

In a submission to the inter-departmental committee on gambling that was set up by the Tasmanian Government

to advise upon the social and economic effects of gambling, the Catholic Family Welfare Organisation, Centacare, stated:

As a family welfare agency, Centacare has no valid statistical data to offer the inquiry about the direct effect of gambling on family life. Many cases can be cited where excessive gambling has been a factor in family breakdown. But it is usually one cause among many contributing to the problem, and it would be irresponsible to isolate gambling as the major cause when personality disorders, poor quality of relationships, alcohol and drug dependency, and the current economic and social conditions are also significant factors in creating stress within family life.

Further, Mr Harry Holgate, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services in Tasmania, has stated in a reply to me:

It appears that the operations of the casino have not created any significant changes in community attitudes or in lowering of social or moral standards. Neither has there been any marked effect on community life.

It seems to me that any objection based upon the risk of creating chronic gamblers should be backed up by a move to prohibit all gambling, or at least betting on horses, for there are many more people hooked on, and consequently suffering from, that form of gambling, than will ever be affected by a single casino in this State. The attitudes and opinions of the other enterprises in our community that generate and depend upon gambling are, of course, very important, and to allow them a voice in this debate I wrote to the major organisations asking for their comments. The response was, not surprisingly, largely against the provision of casino gambling in this State, but it is significant that the representative body of the largest code in the State, the South Australian Jockey Club, replied:

The committee of this club is not opposed to the introduction of casinos in South Australia.

Also, the South Australian Trotting Club expressed interest in the siting of a casino as 'the establishment of a casino in our community may become a reality'. The concern expressed by the majority of racing codes is understandable in the light of the report by the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry, which stated:

The committee's firm conclusion is that the financial position of the three codes is critical.

It is a fact that in each year since 1973-74 the percentage increase over the previous year in the total amount of legal gambling in those codes has reduced. Many reasons could be given for this occurring, but despite this it is also a fact that the total turnover for TAB, on-course totalizator, bookmakers, lotteries, X-Lotto, Instant Money and small lotteries has increased from $187 000 000 in 1973-74 to $389 300 000 in 1979-80.

I would suggest that the problem is more one of increased costs to conduct these activities than one of decreasing turnover, and that the attitude is not one of moral or social concern, but one of trying to retain all that they can out of the gambling public, and of fear that, if gambling parameters are extended, they will not be an attractive method of gambling. They would prefer to maintain the restricted system that we now have in the hope that they will attract the gambler who prefers another form of gambling but does not have access to it in this State. Let us make no mistake—there are many people in this State who do not find gambling upon horse and dog racing to their liking and who would welcome an opportunity to participate in much more sophisticated gambling systems.

Obviously, the public of South Australia wants to gamble. Their acceptance of the horse and dog racing codes needs no comment, and their acceptance of other forms of gambling was clarified in a recent survey where lotteries and X-Lotto received a 95 per cent approval and the Instant Money Game 90 per cent approval from those surveyed. In this day of relatively easy and inexpensive travel, many South Australians have visited gambling casinos. They are now an accepted feature in many cities around the world; even ocean cruises have a casino for the convenience of passengers. Singapore Airlines was reported as planning to put poker machines on a passenger jet.

An honourable member: On the first flight.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, they will be there. A recent edition of the *Sunday Mail* had a story about a new South Australian enterprise, Presidential Jet Services Pty. Ltd., a company that intends to put together special travel packages for small groups and fly them to Hobart and Alice Springs for a night's gambling. The cost per head to Wrest Point and return is some $450.

While this type of service appears to cater only for the wealthy, it is interesting to have a look at statistics relating to the income of the interstate visitors at Wrest Point. In the 1978 visitor survey the following was revealed:

Of interstate visitors questioned 33.4 per cent were low income earners (under $9 000 per annum); 48.4 per cent could be classed as middle income earners ($9 000 to $17 999 per annum); and 18.2 per cent were in the high income bracket ($18 000 and over).

That indicated an appeal to the broad range of income earners, just as we have in South Australia and as we can expect to visit this State.

Another fear that has been raised is the involvement of organsed crime in casino operations. Where illegal casinos exist in Australia, there is indisputable proof that persons with criminal records and involvement in all facets of vice, gambling and drugs control these operations. This, in effect, means that illegal gambling money is used to expand the drug and vice trade in Australia. Where the legal casinos operate there is no evidence of criminal involvement. In reply to my requests for information, the Commissioner of Police for the Northern Territory, Mr R. McAulay replied:

The Don Casino has extremely well controlled security—wise and similar security arrangements are proposed for the proposed casino in Alice Springs.

In reply to my letter, the Minister for Police in Tasmania had this to say:

It has been suggested from time to time that the Wrest Point Casino has become a 'laundry for money', i.e. marked money from crimes being converted into chips and the chips subsequently being cashed in for safe money. There have also been suggestions that some businessmen with a surplus of money in their business invest cash in casino chips and then obtain a cheque for the chips and declare the money as being acquired through gambling at the casino. There is no factual evidence to support these theories although such practices may occur on a small scale. Certain safeguards have been implemented within the security system to combat this type of operation, with security members at the casino working closely with the police to guard against improper dealings.

He goes on to say:

The casino has been accepted by the Tasmanian Police Force and no objections have been raised concerning its operations by the Police Association of Tasmania. It is generally regarded as a sophisticated hotel, providing entertainment for those wishing to attend.

And in conclusion, he said:

The Government has been satisfied with the casino operations, and approval has been given to the establishment of a second casino in the northern part of the State.

All of this defines the Tasmanian Government's attitude to casinos, and reveals that it does not believe any criminal involvement has occurred. Why, then, should a casino in South Australia be any different, especially if the example of control that has been set elsewhere is followed?

We have, in our lifestyle, the factors that condition us to accept gambling. Nearly every club or organised group in our community is forced to run some form of mini-tatts or lottery to raise funds. Shopping centres have forms of bingo cards, and newspapers run a numbers game competition. Bingo is played regularly by many thousands of people, of all religious and political beliefs. Newspapers in certain editions carry more information about the odds for dog and

horse racing than on world events. From school raffles to the Melbourne Cup we are conditioned to have a bet. I believe that a single gambling casino in this State will not present any danger to the vast majority who wish to gamble at the games available. If the Hobart experience is any guideline, there are obvious benefits to be gained in employment and trade, as well as a direct financial return to the State.

I turn now to the Bill. Clause 1 is formal and gives the short title, 'Casino Act, 1981'. Clause 2 sets out the interpretation of names used in the Bill. Clause 3 provides for the establishment of a Casino Licence Advisory Committee. A fear that has been expressed is in relation to who will set the guidelines and conditions for the operation of a gambling casino in this State. I believe that those decisions should be made by a committee comprising elected representatives, the very people entrusted with the welfare of the people of this State. The provision for making the Speaker of the House of Assembly the Chairman is in line with that reasoning and, although I am informed it is a novel approach, the position is one of non-bias and cannot but add to the standing of the committee.

Clause 4 covers the procedures of the committee. Clause 5 defines the functions of the committee. Clause 5 *(a)* provides for the calling of applications. Clause 5 *(b)* recommends an applicant for the licence. I would draw the attention of the House to the proviso 'if any'. If the committee is not satisfied that a casino licence should be issued, whether because of evidence received from the submissions or because of unsuitability of the application or applicants, it can refuse to recommend the issue of a licence.

Clause 5 *(c)* is a most important provision. Under this line the committee is given the entire responsibility for deciding the what, where and how of any gambling casino to be established. As I stated previously, there is some concern over how the casino is to be run, and what forms of gambling will be available. For example, there is, I believe, a strong anti-poker machine feeling in this State. If this is proven to be so, the committee will have the power to recommend they not be allowed.

The system of committees is a proven acceptable practice, and is most applicable to the task of setting conditions of operation and safeguards for the protection of the public. There is considerable information regarding existing legal casinos to hand, and it is a matter of assessing what is suitable for application in this State in conjunction with public submissions.

Clauses 6 and 7 provide for the granting of a single licence, and the privileges and responsibilties attaching to the licence. Penalties are prescribed for breaches of the law and, as can be seen, the licence can be cancelled if the committee considers it necessary. In relation to clause 8, while the advisory committee has the power to set terms and conditions, I believe it is fair that the licence fee should be clearly established at the point of passing this legislation. Gambling casinos have proven to be a profitable venture and, although it is not known at this stage what the returns will be, under this provision 30 per cent of all or any profits will be channelled into the Hospitals Fund, as are the Lotteries Commission moneys now. The Hospitals Fund is recommended, as it is an area of funding that has been seriously restricted by State and Federal policies. Clause 9 needs to be included to establish the right to audit the accounts of the casino.

Clause 10 covers prompt action in the case of any offence by casino operators. Clause 11 provides for establishing regulations for the purpose of this Act. Therefore, the Bill simply provides for the granting of a single casino licence, if an acceptable proposal is forthcoming, and for the establishment of an advisory committee to protect the interests of the people of South Australia when the licence is to be issued. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I move:

That this House affirms that small business in this State would be irrevocably harmed if the policies of the Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch, were effected, with particular reference to the introduction of—

(a) a 35-hour week;
(b) *pro rata* long service leave after five years of service;
(c) full quarterly cost of living adjustments based on the c.p.i. which is inconsistent with Australia's centralised wage fixation system and an attack on eminent members of successive national and State wage trubunals who have rejected the proposals;
(d) annual productivity cases; and
(e) manadatory severance pay for redundancies.

If these policies were implemented, the necessity to provide loan funds to small business operators would become irrelevant, as they would have been forced our of business.

In speaking in the Address in Reply debate the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to a call made by the Opposition for a Select Committee to inquire into the financial support services to the small business community. In part, he said:

Small business provides a range of products and specialist services catering for a discerning public, rather than a mass market that has little or no choice but to buy a brand name.

He went on to indicate that, on a conservative estimate, some 370 000-odd small businessmen in Australia now employ nearly 40 per cent of the private work force, or 1 600 000 employees.

Broader definitions have expanded that to 2 000 000 to 2 500 000 employees. He also related in that speech the importance of the small business sector in both wholesale and retail industry. He said:

Of paramount importance is the fact that small business is a sector of our economy that creates jobs because there is greater emphasis on labour rather than on machines.

I find it quite inconsistent to see a proposal such as that before the House in the Address in Reply speech on behalf of the Opposition on that occasion, and yet we see the pacesetter recommendations adopted at the recent annual State conference of the Australian Labor Party. It is pace-setter legislation in that it sets a pace by which in selected industries and selected sections of commerce the various aspects to which I have referred in my motion are implemented. For example, the 35-hour week is undertaken in a section of commerce or industry, and by stealth it will then travel in a cancerous way through other sections of commerce and industry until it becomes the norm. It horrifies me to think of what the implications of that will be on the small business sector in South Australia and indeed in Australia should we ever get to the stage of having the resolutions passed by the Australian Labor Party put into effect.

The problems encountered by small business in raising finance and the possibility of easier access to equity and debt financing is important, and I agree with the Deputy Leader in that respect. Indeed, I agree with the majority of comments he made in relation to small business, dealing with its importance within the community, the effect it can have on employment and thus on unemployment, and its need to have access to a basis of finance so that it can maintain liquidity. This is critical and important. Yet we have this contradiction in terms of cost pressure suggested to be put into effect by the platform of the Australian Labor Party. There is an inconsistency between the public approach here, and what is done on South Terrace.

Interestingly, one of the resolutions of the annual conference was that the Australian Labor Party industrial base

be given, at all times, total rather than piecemeal support by the political wing of the Party. I take that to mean that the resolutions that were passed at its convention need total support by the Parliamentary wing down here, and not a piecemeal approach. The effects of them on small business would be devastating, and the effects on employment opportunities in the small business area would be equally devastating. The Opposition argues that it would introduce a 35-hour week only into selected industries that could afford it but, as I have already commented, it will be the introduction of a 35-hour week by stealth. The resolution stated:

> That the State Labor Government will, on return to office, implement its existing Public Service policy which requires the abolition of all forms of discrimination in the conditions of employment between Public Service employees, by bringing about a reduction in the ordinary hours of work of all Government employees who work a 40-hour week down to 37½ hours per week. Further, a committee of Government and unions shall be established to monitor and advise the Government of the effects of reduced working hours, with the aim of reducing the working week to 35 hours per week consistent with current Labor Party policy.

One resolution indicated that members of the Opposition have to adopt a Party policy in total and not a piecemeal approach. Another resolution indicated that, through the Government service, it will set the pace by reducing working hours from 40 hours to 37½ hours and removing 'discrimination'. That resolution also calls for a Government committee to be set up to achieve the objective of the A.L.P. as dictated by its union masters on South Terrace, for the implementation of a 35-hour week across the board. South Australian small business men just cannot afford that.

What have been the comments of sections of industry in relation to the implementation of a 35-hour week? It is interesting to note that the Australian Hotels Association said recently that, as the push for a 35-hour week intensifies in industries, the Australian tourist industry has reiterated its fears of a 35-hour week. An article in its journal recently stated:

> The accommodation industry, and its attendant catering operations, have been pushed to the limit, and any attempt to stretch resources further could spell disaster. A 35-hour week would increase costs by 25 per cent.

It was interesting to note recently that the Australian Tourist Industry Association calculated, based, incidentally, on statistics of the Bureau of Industry Economics, that real growth prospects for the tourist industry were between 40 per cent and 44 per cent between now and the middle of this decade, that with tourist expenditure rising from $3.5 billion in 1979 to $4.9 billion in 1985, at constant prices that was expected to increase employment by 50 000 to 60 000 to cater for the extra visitors mooted by that extra spending power of the tourist dollar. Lower inflation, more stability with labour costs, cheaper local and overseas tourist fares and greater promotion contributed towards Australia's improved performance in relation to the increase in its tourist industry. That improvement will be placed in jeopardy by the introduction of the 35-hour week in the tourist industry. Australia's tourism has been established on a competitive base with the rest of the world. Our capacity to increase our competitiveness as a tourist destination against aggressive marketing techniques by other countries (and we would all recognise those), and our growth opportunities will depend on containing inflation and containing cost pressures placed on those particular businesses. We all know that in the tourist industry labour costs are a big component.

The last general reduction in working hours was introduced against a background of inflation of about 3.8 per cent, of full employment, and strong and consistent of economic growth, with the expectation that that situation would continue for some time. That situation certainly does not exist today, as I am sure members on both sides of the House will be prepared to acknowledge. The introduction of a 35-hour week would raise labour costs in a whole range of service industries to which I have referred. Overtime paid, for example, to hotel employees working a 40-hour week would rise by a minimum of 21 per cent.

In looking at cost factors in relation to the hotel/motel industry, I was interested to note in the report of two international authorities on hotel and motel costs that the average cost per employee for all countries in 1979 was $US6 034. The cost per Australian employee, $US11 782, was the highest of all countries surveyed. We cannot allow a situation to develop where we will increase our lack of competitiveness by allowing our cost disadvantage to escalate even further than it is at present. In conjunction with that cost factor, the same survey showed that productivity levels of Australian employees fell rather than rose from 1978 to 1979 by 12.1 per cent. The implication quite clearly in relation to a 35-hour week, its introduction, coupled with hourly rates of pay and other penalties that Australian workers enjoy, would place an impediment on the growth of the tourist industry, which we should not allow to happen, condone or give encouragement to, unlike our counterparts, the members of the Opposition, who it appears are only too willing, as dictated by Trades Hall, to proceed with the introduction of a 35-hour week.

I might say, as one who was involved in a small business operation prior to becoming a member of Parliament, that I am very concerned about what effect a 35-hour week would have on industries such as that in which I was involved. It would be disastrous on a number of counts. There is not the base of liquidity available and financing and debt servicing for small business operators in this country that would allow them to accept extra cost factors, those cost burdens that the resolutions put forward by the A.L.P. State Convention indicate. As I have said, it is quite inconsistent to argue that we should establish a Select Committee to inquire into the availability of finance and yet impose cost factors and burdens upon them to soak up any availability of finance that might be forthcoming. The direction that the Deputy Leader took in his Address in Reply speech, that we need to take a very serious look at the finance of small business operators, is one that I support, because it touches on the hub of the problem. The 35-hour week will do nothing for industry; it makes a mockery of the establishment of such a committee to have resolutions such as this endorsed by our opponents. The Arbitration Commission, for example, earlier this year rejected a 35-hour week Australia-wide, in effect, by rejecting the claim in relation to the metal industries. It is interesting to note some of the comments in an article reporting that rejection by the commission as follows:

> Employers had claimed in their case that the 35-hour working week would lift labour costs by only 21 per cent, making Australian metal industries uncompetitive and leading to widespread retrenchment. On the basis of the information before us [the Full Bench], we are satisfied a case has been made out for the retention of a 40- hour week, at least for the immediate future.

The Full Bench went on to say:

> Claims in union literature that the shorter working week would provide more jobs were indeed problematical. The substantial cost increases from a shorter working week inevitably would weaken the competitiveness of many companies and thus lead to a reduction rather than gain in employment opportunities.

The independent arbitrator made that pronouncement from the bench, and went on to say:

> Furthermore, to award a 35-hour week in a large and diverse industry such as that before us would inevitably be seen as a precedent for industry generally.

The bench said that employers had been subject to serious industrial pressure in support of union claims for shorter working hours. Indeed, the bench acknowledged that where there was a campaign for the introduction of a 35-hour week it was by stealth, by selecting industries that can afford it now and having the flow-over effects in a cancerous way, attacking other sections of the industry and commerce that can ill-afford it.

An article written by Tony Baker in recent months in relation to a 35-hour week I believe really touches the heart of the problem, particularly as it affects small business operators. The headlines stated 'Consumer will foot the bill'. There is no way that it will be other than the consumer footing the bill for the introduction of a 35-hour week, which means reduced purchasing power and reduced sales of products, so the cycle in reverse is undertaken.

The Association of Independent Businesses in Australia is concerned about these cost factors and pressures. It is interesting to note that Mr Baker, using a case example, reports that this particular business has become and has kept competitive by hard work and relentless concentration, thus keeping costs down. He acknowledges that, whilst this business man is concerned about a 35-hour week, he is unprepared to speak out against a 35-hour week, because, he says, some of his customers are for it and some are against it, and his concern is keeping the customers happy and keeping them coming back. Incidentally, it was estimated that that man would put in something like 83 hours in conjunction with his wife, who did the books for the family business, putting in something like 50 hours. There is no doubt that the introduction of cost pressures, such as those to which I have referred in the motion, would take away that keen competitive edge that has given the capacity to that man to maintain his business and to allow expansion of that business in the market place. He is able to employ a number of casual employees, and in doing so he gives some fillip to job opportunities within that area. There are no perks for management in that type of small business—there just are not any, and one cannot logically place any further cost pressure on small business men in this country. To do so would send many small business men to the wall.

It is pleasing to note the comments of the Premier in reply to a question during Question Time today when he indicated that there has been a reversal of the trend of bankruptcies in South Australia. I think one of the most significant policy decisions this Government has made is in relation to pay-roll tax, about which I have spoken before in this House, when I indicated that one of the most iniquitous taxes that can be placed on any section of the community is pay-roll tax. I have spoken about its cancerous growth and cost pressures and of its soaking up of liquidity of the small business community. The Tonkin Government has taken initiatives to reduce that pressure. We have seen over past years pay-roll tax growing by stealth: as wages have increased, so has pay-roll tax increased.

Mr Russack: They increased it in New South Wales.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, as the member for Goyder has pointed out, in the recent Budget brought down in New South Wales by a Labor Government it chose to increase the income from pay-roll tax—a tax placed on business for the privilege of paying somebody else a wage. If we are serious about reducing unemployment, if we are serious about creating more job opportunities in this State, then we must tackle the heart of the problem, and take off the cost factors, the disadvantage and the disincentive that is placed on business men to create job opportunities, and there is no greater disincentive than the pay-roll tax disincentive.

As the South Australian Opposition sent some of its 'senior advisers' to look at the campaign that was being waged in New South Wales for the State election, I take it that the Opposition would adopt similar policies here. Does that mean that they would remove some of the incentives the Government has given to small business in relation to the reduction of pay-roll tax increases? If we created the economic climate and incentive by which each small business man was able to create one extra job, we would solve a lot of the unemployment difficulties in the State and in the country. Unemployment will not be solved by putting cost factors, cost burdens and pressures on small business. The State Convention of the A.L.P. has called on their Parliamentary wing to do this. Fortunately for South Australia, small business and job opportunities, they shall not get that opportunity in the near future.

I have referred to the fact that many small business proprietors work far in excess of a 40-hour week, and they have to do this to maintain their competitive edge. Imagine what the cost of a 35-hour week would be in relation to the Government sector, and the extra burden placed on taxes. Would we have to reduce the capital works programme further to pay public servants because of the extra cost burden that would be put right across the board with the reduction to a shorter working week in the Government sector? That is the first step the Opposition would take in Government in relation to the introduction of a 35-hour week. They would work towards that objective by reducing from 40 hours to 37½ hours, and then to 35 hours. As a State, logically we cannot afford that.

I fail to see how members opposite cannot convince their colleagues—comrades, I should say—on South Terrace that these policies would have nothing but a devastating effect on the financial resources of the State. We have seen the effect of wage increases across the board in South Australia over the last year. We have seen what it has cost in capital works programmes. We cannot allow this to continue. The introduction of a 35-hour week will have that devastating effect.

In relation to the talk the Opposition put forward about bankruptcies, of depressing the business community, of creating an attitude within the community that there are enormous difficulties by repeatedly talking about the gloom of the business sector by relating it to bankruptcies, I do not think that that is doing us any good at all for consumer confidence, spending power or job opportunities. There is no doubt that job opportunities and the creation of consumer spending are related to consumer confidence or business confidence and in attaining from businessmen funds to invest and expand, giving them confidence in their business so they can take that course of action. Resolutions such as the A.L.P. State convention resolution about the 35-hour week, about long service leave, about full quarterly cost of living adjustments, about annual productivity cases and mandatory severance pay for redundancies, do nothing but destroy confidence. What business man would go out forcefully and determinedly promoting and expanding his business with that sort of talk put forward officially by the Opposition? Caution then comes to the fore. This State needs confidence, direction, and encouragement in meaningful ways in financial terms through removing such disincentives as pay-roll tax, which it is getting from this Government.

Mr Max Brown interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The member for Whyalla is, I am sure, interested in country areas of South Australia.

Mr Max Brown interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): Order! The member for Whyalla is out of order.

Mr OLSEN: This Government has allocated to its regional development programme $5 500 000 for the rebate of pay-roll and land tax which is designed to maintain employment in decentralised areas of South Australia, of which the Iron Triangle is one. Another incentive the Government has undertaken—

Mr Max Brown: Can you tell me—

Mr OLSEN: The member for Whyalla would do well to do a round of businesses currently in Whyalla and find out how many job opportunities have been saved by the removal

of the cost factor, of the pay-roll tax rebates to which I have just referred. He may get a surprise about the businesses in Whyalla and find they are grateful that the cost burden has been removed from their shoulders by the Tonkin Government.

One other aspect that the A.L.P. State convention endorsed was that of pro rata long service leave after five years of service. In addition, it also indicated that it deplored the practice of some employers in dismissing workers so as to avoid long service leave commitments. It is interesting to note that section 5 (1) *(d)* of the Long Service Leave Act provides that service will be deemed to have been continuous notwithstanding any 'interruption of termination of the worker's service by any act or omission of the employer with the intention of avoiding any obligations imposed on him by this Act, the repealed Act, or any long service leave award, agreement or scheme in operation'. Section 40 of the Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, provides that 'no employers shall dismiss any employee with intention to avoid any obligation to make a contribution in respect of that employee to Fund under this Act'.

Those provisions have been generally considered right across the community to be adequate. Indeed, in October 1973 Federal and State Ministers of Labor discussed the possibility of achieving a greater degree of uniformity in long service leave provisions throughout Australia. It was agreed that existing differences in Federal and State Government schemes and between different groups of workers should not be widened. That agreement, as I understand it, was reviewed in September 1976, when it was agreed that it would be desirable to maintain the agreement, and that proposed changes to long service leave benefits, especially those that would widen disparities, not be finalised without prior consultation with other Ministers. In 1976 we had an A.L.P. Minister of Labor who had agreed, no doubt, to that resolution. I wonder whether he put that point of view to the convention or whether he would explain to the convention upon resuming office (if that ever be the case in the next two decades at some unfortunate time), that he would have to consult his interstate Ministerial colleagues to obtain a consensus in that regard before its implementation.

Interestingly, since September 1976, no State has made any significant changes to benefit the provider in relation to long service leave. South Australia has had the most favourable long service leave entitlements since the 10-year qualifying period was introduced in 1972. In all States and Territories, with the exception of South Australia, long service leave falls due after 15 years of employment. As a general rule, pro rata long service leave in respect of the first entitlement becomes payable after 10 years of completed service, except in South Australia and Tasmania, where it is available after seven years. Once a worker has accrued a full long service leave entitlement, pro rata long service leave is usually paid on the basis of completed years of service. In specified instances, however, pro rata leave may be payable after five years initial service. In New South Wales this arises where an adult employee dies or retires through age or illness or pressing necessity. Once again, we see the pacesetter State, under a New South Wales Labor Government, coming to the fore in that regard.

Interestingly, in the South Australian Public Service, long service leave is payable after five years service where an officer dies, is compulsorily retired, or retires through age or a number of other factors. In South Australia, the Long Service Leave Act has been interpreted to extend to all classes of employees except where the true word 'casual' employee is appropriate. In most States it has been considered administratively difficult, if not impossible, to extend long service leave to other areas of casual employment to which I have referred, but indeed there is no doubt that we in South Australia have a very attractive, lucrative, better than in any other State in Australia long service leave entitlement, and to push ahead with the introduction of any further diminution of the qualifying period in relation to long service leave entitlement would again put a cost factor, a cost burden, on business operators, and particularly on the small business sector about whose future I am more significantly concerned. It would put on them a cost burden that they cannot afford to bear. Therefore, the convention's resolution pays little regard to and does not heed the plight of the small business community in that regard. It is contradictory to the direction and the call enunciated by the Deputy Leader, which I indicated earlier that I support in relation to the need for financing and debt servicing for the small business community. We are talking about putting on cost factors with the introduction of the resolutions agreed to by the A.L.P. State convention this year.

Several other resolutions were passed by the South Australian branch of the A.L.P., all of which put significant burdens on the business community. The basis of the former centralised wage fixation process was consensus, and at the time of framing the resolution prior to 26 August we were looking at the consumer price index and full quarterly cost of living adjustments based on it. It is well to look, even at this time, at the issue of quarterly cost of living adjustments based on the consumer price index; indeed, they have been canvassed by successive national wage cases since 1975, and such a system was in operation until 1979, but from the evidence placed before the tribunal by all parties, including the A.C.T.U., it has been decided that in recent years a full quarterly wage indexation is inconsistent with the desirable national achievement of a return to full employment and a substantial reduction in the inflation rate.

It is a matter of getting our priorities right. What is the first objective we should achieve? I believe that it is to reduce the unemployment levels in this State and this country, and to increase employment levels. As has been pointed out, one of the inhibiting factors has been the quarterly cost of living adjustments that were operative prior to 1979. A return to that situation would not enhance employment prospects across Australia. For that reason, the proposal put forward by the A.L.P. is basically a selfish one, paying no regard to the plight of the unemployed in that respect, but seeking more and more money for those who are fortunate enough to have jobs. I believe that it is also an attack on the eminent members of successive national and State wage benches who have consistently rejected that proposal. In respect of annual productivity cases, there is provision in the current wage indexation guidelines for that to occur.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There is no wage indexation.

Mr OLSEN: I have put the qualifying factor in that, when the resolution was put forward, indeed that did apply, and it is as well to indicate what the situation was then and what it would be in the future should we return to a centralised wage fixation system such as that which applied at the time the resolution was put forward.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I support a centralised system. Do you?

Mr OLSEN: As a personal opinion, yes, I do support centralised wage fixation systems. I do not support full indexation being applicable, nor do I support quarterly adjustments in relation to it, and I have given the reasons why I do not support those two aspects of the centralised wage fixation system. I believe that was a far better system than the current turmoil applying within the community.

Returning to the annual productivity cases to which I have referred, the A.C.T.U. has had an opportunity to mount a productivity based national wage case, but has

chosen not to do so. There are considerable problems in determining an appropriate measurement of productivity and applying that measurement to increasing wages. These problems, discussed with the Commonwealth Commission following the inquiry into wage fixing principles, are totally ignored by the A.L.P. in terms of the resolution put forward by the convention, accepted, and adopted, one of the resolutions being that they accept in total the resolutions of South Terrace and that the political wing should not introduce it on a piecemeal basis.

The other aspect is mandatory severance pay for redundancies. One would only have to have regard to the factors outlined by the Full Commission in the Amscol case to readily understand—and agree, I believe—that that is a matter that really has to be determined on individual cases as circumstances dictate. There has been no attempt to establish a formula for general application in this State, and neither there should be. Severance pay has been seen to be a matter for negotiation between the parties concerned, depending on the circumstances of each case, and I think those factors have been outlined adequately by the Full Commission in the Amscol case. That should be the basis upon which it is left in future.

During my comments, I have referred to various initiatives that the Government has undertaken to assist the small business sector. It has in fact put its money where its mouth is in supporting the small business sector, supporting regional and decentralised policies to the extent of $5 500 000 in rebates of pay-roll tax and land tax schemes.

In addition, the allocation in this year's Budget is doubled in relation to assistance in the small business area—from $80 000 to $176 000. I hope that further initiatives will be undertaken by the Government in the form of looking at the capacity for borrowing by small businesses for either short-term financial debt servicing needs, or long-term capital works programmes in the small business community. I believe it is an essential problem, and something that we will have to face in the future. However, it would be no good looking at loan funds for small business operators if we saw the introduction of the resolutions of the A.L.P. State convention, because they would be irrelevant. The cost factors they would impose would have forced small business out of the business community of this State.

I have indicated that small business is one of the largest employers in this country. It has the capacity to take on further employees, provided it is given the confidence and financial incentives so to do. To place any financial restriction, burden or cost pressure on the small business community will not achieve the principal objective that every member of this Parliament ought to be attaining—an increase in employment and a decrease in unemployment in this State, and in this country. I believe that the direction of the Government is the right direction in solving that problem in the long term. We have to, in a single-minded determination, head towards that direction and give the capacity to small business to expand by giving it the finance to expand, and rather than placing burdens on it, removing or reducing those burdens or cost factors. I therefore commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I move:

That this House encourage, by way of legislation or by other means, the dissemination of information which will enable individuals to make informed choices about the nature and extent of professional health services which are available to them.

I am particularly concerned about those people who live in outlying metropolitan areas where, due to the deficiency in services, when people shift into those sorts of areas, over a number of years they do not always have available to them the information necessary to find necessary services, particularly those relating to health care. Too often, when a new resident shifts into a dormant suburban area, or out into a metropolitan area, he has to rely on word of mouth to ascertain where various medical services are located or where he can get dental services, or other services. That is a somewhat unsatisfactory way in which residents new to an area find out this information. In moving this motion, I think it quite important that we look at some other means by which we can make available to residents in these new outlying areas particulars about where they can go to get the information necessary to get the health care that they require. Before speaking about this matter, I wish to quote briefly from a book by Ronald Mendelsohn called *The Condition of The People*. The book is basically about social welfare in Australia from 1900 to 1975. Mendelsohn states:

Fluctuations in the level of prosperity are an important source of calls on the welfare structure. For example, a high unemployment rate increases the need for social security measures and also places strains on the education and health services.

Mendelsohn had earlier spoken about definitions of welfare. He said that welfare as initially perceived was a system whereby one was going out to help somebody, but that, through this sort of help over the years, welfare has now tended to become institutionalised and, in some circumstances, regrettably, people have taken the care aspect to now mean that it is their right to expect it. He then develops various theories of welfare.

Too often we tend to assume, as soon as we apply the word 'welfare' that we are speaking of Social Welfare, but he talks about welfare in a far broader sense, namely, that if somebody is seeking to find some form of health care this, in itself, is a welfare process because it involves the welfare of that person that is at stake, so they should be able to find that information very quickly.

He continues, later, to say that throughout this whole process of determining welfare the rationalisation of hospital services may result in lowered expenditure. That follows a previous comment, where he said that an improvement in teaching methods did not necessarily involve additional expenditure. So, again, he was expounding the theory that what we have to be cognisant of is that we must ensure that any money spent is wisely spent. He concludes those comments by saying that a careful study must be made and that a need for constant running order of the welfare services must be maintained. What he is getting at is that throughout any sort of welfare system we must keep a close tab on running costs, so that any expenditure made in the welfare area is maximised and of maximum benefit to the consumer. We spoke about this on a previous occasion.

I find that, whilst it is necessary for Governments from time to time to look very carefully at their expenditure and their provision of various care, particularly in the health care area, this health care aspect is usually supplemented by the private sector, namely, the private practitioner. If one reads the bylaws referred to as the ethical matters under which the A.M.A. operates, under the heading 'Advertisements', No. 16 *(a)* states:

No member shall be a party to the appearance of a notice of his life in the public press if this notice could be construed by his colleagues as appearing specifically for professional gain.

That is stating that it is unethical for a doctor to advertise. Para *(b)* states:

(b) It is unethical for a member to issue any card or circular in relation to his profession or practice thereof, except in the following circumstances:

It then gives a list of exceptions where a doctor can do some form of advertising—on commencing a practice; on changing address; on temporary absence from the practice of not less than four weeks; on resumption of practice; on succeeding to another practice; on entering into or retiring from a partnership; and having received prior approval from the council to the form of the card or circular. In other words, a doctor is restricted in the way he can advertise the service he is providing in an area. As I said earlier, when one is in a newly developing area (and people tend to move through these areas rapidly), it sometimes takes many years before one gets some adequate form of private practitioner service in that area.

I know that in the area in which I live at Morphett Vale, when I first shifted there it was hard to find a doctor. The provision of medical care has been the gripe of many people for many years in that area. This applies even more so to after-hours care where people have to rely on a locum service. Too often one hears the complaint that someone rang and it took hours before a doctor came to a house to service a call. It was sometimes found that the doctor travelled all the way to Salisbury, and then whipped down to Noarlunga to attend to someone there. This sort of situation tends to exacerbate the medical problem because it generates a higher anxiety level on the part of the caller, particularly if it is the parent of a child who has suddenly taken ill during the night. This anxiety level is not compensated for quickly enough.

One could well understand the case of a mother with a very sick child who appears anxious, as this sort of problem does very little to help subdue the child's anxiety. It is a common fact that one can easily transfer one's feelings to another party. If a mother is anxious she may find it more difficult to quieten down the child, who is also anxious through whatever illness may be present.

Alternatively, if a spouse were suddenly to take ill with a heart attack, or something like this, one can imagine the anxiety level for other members of the family if it takes a long time for a medical service to get to the area. The A.M.A. laws prescribe ways in which doctors can advertise. A doctor can only advertise if he has just taken up or resumed a practice or changed address, and in that case he can advertise for only a short period in the local newspaper. That is very limited. The only advertising he can do is to issue a card or circular, or newsletter, as many doctors now use, but this can be issued only to *bona fide* patients. Again, he is only dealing with a restricted clientele.

Returning to my earlier point, I reiterate that anyone else can find out what service is being provided by that medical practitioner only by word of mouth. No doubt anyone else living in the metropolitan area would know that one relies upon a neighbour to say where medical care is available. In 1975, there was consternation in Noarlunga about provision of adequate medical services. It is interesting that in the House on 11 October 1979 the member for Baudin presented a petition from some 4 771 electors of South Australia praying that the House immediately implement the promised emergency helicopter ambulance service announced by the Premier, Mr Dunstan, in August 1977, and provide the necessary additional M-care plus ambulance complete with the latest life-supporting equipment announced by members of the Government in April 1978, for the new St John ambulance centre at Christie Downs.

The former Premier, Mr Dunstan, had promised people in the southern area that an emergency rescue helicopter would be provided. That was promised at the 1977 election, and also at the 1979 election, by the now Opposition. It was to be a rather elaborate helicopter system estimated to cost about $300 000, provided on a one-year trial basis to be used for three months by the ambulance people, three months by the police, and three months by the fire services. Really, the effectiveness of the rescue helicopter service was nothing but a band-aid treatment to woo the electorate into thinking that such a service would be provided.

Fortunately, the Government changed hands and we came into office in September 1979. During the following Christmas break, we contracted a helicopter to be used to do an adequate feasibility study of the requirement for a rescue helicopter. Part of the reason behind the request from those 4 771 petitioners was that, in the southern area, there was a long standing anxiety factor through being so isolated, and having only one access road to the city, and that, if ever a disaster should occur, people in that area would be cut off from getting to hospital or other adequate medical services in the greater metropolitan area.

In the south there has been a long waged campaign for these medical services. The helicopter was put into operation over the Christmas holidays. On 12 May, the Premier, Mr Tonkin, officially opened the Lloyd helicopter facilities at West Beach. We all know that since then this Government has utilised, in conjunction with private enterprise (which is again a good example of how the Government and private enterprise can work hand-in-hand), this rescue helicopter service.

I do not have to expound on the matter again in this House, because everyone would be aware of the magnificent work done by Rescue 1. It is highly acclaimed by surf life saving clubs which have used it. I have had the opportunity to go out in the helicopter during the surveillance period of the feasibility study, when we were called out on a case. Watching it in operation was a experience. Much of the anxiety level in the south has been somewhat reduced because people know that, if a call is put out, it is estimated to take only about 11 minutes for the helicopter to leave West Beach, stop at Flinders Medical Centre, pick up a retrieval team and get to any of those southern areas within 11 to 15 minutes; that is a great compensating factor in itself.

Most people down there would agree that it is reassuring to know that, if anything disastrous happens, or if there is a serious accident, such as a cliff or surfing tragedy, the retrieval team can get there in a short time. The most important aspect of any medical care is to rescue the patient first, then one can take as long as it needs to move him to whatever service is required, whether hospital or other care. That, in itself, was a major step that this Government took in alleviating the anxiety of residents in the south concerning emergency and medical care.

As evidenced in the petition, people have been 'psyched' into thinking a certain way. For too long they have been campaigning for the helicopter and thinking they are short of services in the area. Admittedly, they have received the helicopter, and the ambulance station at Morphett Vale has been upgraded. They have an M-care ambulance, the first of which was donated in 1975 by the Lions Clubs in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Another M-care ambulance was put into service, superseding the previous one.

I was interested to find that M-care ambulances were initially designed in South Australia, and have been widely acclaimed throughout Australia as most worth while. In its design the ambulance enables medical officers to stand up inside whilst it is in transit and care for the patient. I have been to my own ambulance station and looked at the M-care ambulance. I am most impressed with the work of the full-time and voluntary officers there in relation to services provided for the southern area. They are to be commended for that. Output and efficiency have improved with the rescue helicopter and the ambulance car service. Like any other St John service, a comprehsive first-aid course is provided through the Noarlunga ambulance service.

The main purpose of my motion is to inform many people, who are still not fully aware of them, of what other medical services are available to them in the area. I did a quick survey on the number of doctors and surgeries in that area, which also includes the District of the member for Baudin. In a district like this one cannot differentiate clearly between one side of the border and the other. In that sense we must work together. In that area there are now about 27 different surgeries. I am sure many people do not know that so many doctors are available in that area.

People remember the situation when they first went to live in the area, and whilst they accept the fact that the area is growing rapidly they are not always cognisant of the fact that certain services are growing at an acceptable or proportionate rate. The number of doctors in that area has grown at a remarkable rate; in fact, some would go so far as to say that there are now more doctors than are needed. Clients have a variety of choices available to them. On the one hand one can sympathise with the A.M.A.'s problem: if doctors were to start openly advertising to try to attract clientele more problems could be created. What is important is not that they should advertise themselves personally, but the type of service available should be advertised.

Many residents in that area are unaware of the fact that one medical service available by Dr King and partners on Beach Road, Christies Beach, provides an after-hours and weekend service. When they built their surgery, they installed motel-type accommodation so that doctors on call could live on the site overnight and over the weekend so that, if calls came in, a doctor would be on hand to treat patients as they came into the surgery. They also have a qualified nurse on duty at the same time so that, if the doctor is called out to a house, the nurse is available to summon him back to the surgery. That service has become popular, but people in the area have found out about it only by word of mouth.

I believe it is essential that doctors be allowed to make known to the public by some means or other what services, not necessarily personnel, are available, especially in outer metropolitan areas. I think this is something that will have to be worked out between the doctors, in conjunction with the A.M.A. and the Health Commission. We as a Parliament could look more closely at how this could be done whether by means of legislation or some other means. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CASINO

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I move:

That, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a Joint Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the implications of the establishment of a casino in South Australia and what effect and potential a casino may have on the tourist industry in this State.

I believe this is a matter of importance, of public interest and controversy. Much comment has been made in the media about this matter over a considerable period of time. The following press report appeared after the opening of the Morphettville Racecourse grandstand complex by the Premier in May this year:

A referendum may be held if public opinion appears to swing in favour of casinos, the Premier, Mr Tonkin said yesterday.

He said:

I am well aware that there is a school of thought within the community that South Australia should have a casino.

At about the same time an article in the daily press headed 'Corcoran supports move for South Australian casino' stated:

Calls for a gambling casino for Adelaide were supported today by a former Labor Premier, Mr Corcoran.

In the *News* of 8 May 1981, the Acting Opposition Leader, the Deputy Leader of my Party, Mr Wright, said that as an individual he supported a casino for the boost it would give tourism and employment.

Mr Lewis: Do you believe there should be one?

Mr SLATER: Another press article stated that the Leader of the Democrats, Mr Millhouse, formerly an opponent of casinos said that he—

Mr Lewis: You are sitting on the fence, are you?

Mr SLATER: If you could give me the opportunity to continue with my speech you will learn my position as time goes on. I am expressing an opinion of another person; I will come to my opinion on the matter in due course. Mr Millhouse, who was formerly an opponent of the casino, was reported as saying that he was beginning to wonder whether there was any point in continued opposition.

The Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Mr Bowen, was reported as saying that, if a casino was operated on similar lines to the Wrest Point casino in Tasmania, he would support its establishment. When she returned from the opening of the casino in Alice Springs, the Minister of Tourism was quoted as saying that a casino was not the answer. The article quoted Mrs Adamson as saying:

I think in general Australians tend to be slightly unrealistic in their belief that casinos per se are the answer to tourism development.

In an article in the *Sunday Mail* on 28 October, 1979, the member for Fisher is quoted as saying:

Before major changes are made to our natural environment, impact studies are demanded. But changes to our social environment can have even more serious repercussions.

He made the point that people were lobbying strongly to obtain casino licences in this State. All those persons have expressed diverse opinions in regard to the benefits or otherwise of a casino for South Australia. I made a comment that appeared in the press on 19 May 1981 in an article headed 'Slater wary on South Australian casinos'. The article stated:

The Opposition spokesman on Tourism, Mr Slater, said today he had reservations about the likely effects upon South Australia of a gambling casino.—The decision to establish a casino should be decided by logical, factual consideration of the public interest rather than emotion, he said.

Mr Lewis: Are you on the fence.

Mr SLATER: Yes, I am on the fence and that is why I believe we ought to have a Select Committee, so that we can establish firmly all the suggestions and the points made in the press statements I have just read to the House.

A Select Committee will give the opportunity for representatives of both Houses in the most effective way to become fully informed on the matter. They will be able to hear submissions and obtain evidence, and it will give the opportunity to people and representatives of organisations to come to the Select Committee to make verbal or other submissions concerning their points of view. I believe that a Select Committee would listen to those submissions and obtain evidence in an atmosphere conducive to logic and common sense rather than emotion.

Mr Lewis: Waste of money.

Mr SLATER: You are entitled to you point of view, and I respect that. That is the very reason why I say that a Select Committee is the most able and the best way for that point of view to be expressed publicly. Other people in the community as well as members of this House should have the opportunity to express their point of view to a joint Select Committee. All I am asking in this particular exercise is for an opportunity to be given to the public at large for that proposition to be established.

I have listened with interest to the proposition put by the member for Semaphore. I believe he made a very constructive speech, although I do not agree with all the comments he made. I believe that we need more than just a Bill presented to this House to enable us to assess fully the benefits or otherwise of a casino in this State. The member for Semaphore mentioned a number of matters when he spoke about growing support shown in opinion polls for a casino. He mentioned a referendum and whether a casino should be conducted by the Government. He talked about the revenue for Government from a casino, about the spin-off to the tourist operators and other businesses, and about the employment aspect and many other matters. I believe all those matters can be included in the terms of reference for a Select Committee to establish very concisely and firmly all those points raised this afternoon by the member for Semaphore in introducing his Bill.

The question of the establishment of a casino has been with us for some years. We can all remember that, in 1973, the then Premier introduced a Bill for the establishment of a casino. My view at that time is on public record in *Hansard* concerning my not supporting that Bill, for a number of reasons. Some of the matters that I spoke about at that time and some of the criticisms I made concerning the introduction of a casino may now not be justified. That was eight years ago, and times change. However, at least we have the experience of the operation of the Wrest Point casino, and in more recent times, of course, the introduction of the same kind of operation into the Northern Territory at Darwin and Alice Springs. Of course, it is anticipated that in the near future the Queensland Government will give approval for a casino to be established in that State.

Mr Randall: Tasmania is putting in a second one.

Mr SLATER: The member for Henley Beach is quite right: Tasmania is establishing a second casino, at Launceston. The matter of the establishment of a casino in this State needs very deep and very thorough investigation, and a Select Committee is the most appropriate way that such an opportunity can be provided. As I have said, interested groups, individuals and members of the public would have an opportunity to express their points of view, and it would give the opportunity for members of the Select Committee to take heed of submissions made. There has never been a thorough investigation or any research into the benefits or otherwise of a casino in this State and into the effect that it may or may not have on South Australia's tourist industry. I think it is important that that should be done, and the best method would be by the appointment of a Select Committee. A Select Committee would be greatly preferable to a referendum. A referendum does not examine any of the details. It is nothing more than an opinion poll, with both conflicting sides attempting to take advantage of one another publicly, and a referendum would be conducted in an atmosphere of emotion rather than logic. As I have said, a Select Committee can take submissions in an atmosphere of logic and common sense rather than an atmosphere of emotion, because it is a question of a social nature, and as a consequence emotions are stirred.

It is now eight years since the matter was debated in this House. On that occasion, the Bill was defeated on the second reading. During those eight years, at least we have had the benefit of hindsight, the benefit of experience and the benefit of Wrest Point. The member for Semaphore spoke this afternoon about some of the criticisms or expectations raised when that casino was established, and he mentioned some of the fears that were held concerning organised crime and so on. None of those fears or criticisms has come to fruition. I have been to Wrest Point on a number of occasions, and in recent times I have taken the opportunity to go to the Northern Territory and see the casino at Alice Springs. I mention in passing that my view is a personal one. I believe that a casino does not do a great deal of harm, and I point out that some of the problems we were expecting have not eventuated. It is difficult to make comparisons between casinos in this country and those established overseas, as I think a different atmosphere pervades Australian casinos from that which exists in those that operate overseas. The Federal Pacific Hotel people are conducting casinos quite thoroughly and effectively, and I could not find any fault in the operations that I viewed both in Hobart and in Alice Springs. Many of the criticisms that were made in respect of the casino at Hobart have not been proven.

It is true that this is a conscience matter for members on both sides of the House, and I would expect that it would also be considered on a non-partisan political basis. I do not think we should consider it a political issue. It is a conscience vote for members on this side of the House, and I would expect that it would be a conscience vote for those on the other side of the House.

Mr Randall interjecting:

Mr SLATER: That is something that this House will determine at the time. Before we think about establishing the personnel of that Select Committee, the Bill must be carried in this House. I think the member for Henley Beach is being a little premature in regard to the question of who should be members of the Select Committee. All members of this House would be capable of serving on the committee; they would all be able to play a part and participate. I would not want to comment at this time about who should or should not be on the committee. I do not think that quite matters. The important thing is for the opportunity to be given to have a thorough investigation of the whole matter, for it to be considered by some form of assessment, and I see the best way for this to be carried out would be by a Select Committee of both Houses. As to how many people should be on the Select Committee, who they should be and how many should represent each House can be determined at a future time.

I want to debate this matter in a reasonable atmosphere so that it can be considered reasonably without political implications. I am asking members on both sides of the House to consider it as a non-political matter. I move this today as a private member; I am not moving it as a member of the Labor Party. I know that in my own Party there are people who may or may not support this matter: that is entirely up to them. This is a private member's Bill, and I am asking all members of the House to give it their support. I regret that already some imputations and some unkind remarks had been made in the debate in the other place. The imputation was that this matter had been put on to upstage another member of this House. That is not true. I respect the member for Semaphore's point of view and the fact that he has moved a Bill this afternoon. I do not think we can consider that matter by a simple Bill coming into the House without the opportunity of greater research and a more thorough investigation, and this is one reason why I reject the proposition moved by the member for Semaphore. The member for Semaphore, and also Mr Cameron in the Upper House, commented that the Select Committee may be a protracted operation. That may not necessarily be so: no-one can determine that.

We have many Select Committees of this House, joint committees, and committees of the Upper House, and no-one can say with any degree of certainty just how long the investigations by those Select Committees will take. I do not anticipate that a Select Committee of this nature would necessarily be protracted. That, of course, depends on the members of the committee and on what they themselves want to do; of course, once they are appointed, the matter

is entirely in their hands. I think it is unfair to say that it could be a protracted Select Committee. We recently had a Select Committee of the Upper House that has taken some considerable time to report back to the House and that matter is entirely in the hands of that Select Committee to report back. We had a Select Committee of this House regarding prostitution. That was a protracted exercise that went from one session into another and had to be reintroduced into the House after an election. No-one can say with any degree of certainty that this committee could be of a protracted nature. It is not my intention in moving this motion that it should be a junket for members. I do not think that any comment made in that regard is fair. This question will not go away; we will have to face it one way or another in the near future. If we have to face it, all members should be fully informed, so we should hear submissions and evidence from people within the community who want to give evidence. There are conflicting points of view, and I respect that. On questions of a social nature, people are entitled to their opinions. Sometimes they are not always soundly based, but at least they should have the opportunity to come to a Select Committee and give it the benefit of their point of view and an opportunity to hear those submissions.

I believe it is imperative and necessary for us to examine very carefully this matter of social conscience. The community will have differing points of view, and I respect those points of view. I would like to hear submissions made to a Select Committee in an atmosphere where common sense and logic would prevail, rather than through the press. Comments can be made through the press which can be misconstrued, but I would prefer that, if people wish to express a point of view in the press, they be given the opportunity to come to a Select Committee of this House. We hear comments from both inside and outside Parliament of the benefits of the committee system. This is one opportunity where this committee system can be put to the greatest effect. This is a conscience matter, and I hope that members from both sides will view it in this way. I seek their support in this motion.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I move:

That this House endorses the work of the Aboriginal Community College and calls on the Federal Government to affirm its commitment to the college and the college's positive role in Aboriginal education; and furthermore, is of the opinion that—

(a) the funds be at least maintained in real terms so that the college can continue to provide the type of educational programmes that it has done for the last 7 years;

(b) the autonomy and Aboriginal identity of the college be preserved at all costs;

(c) that Federal funds be allocated to procure decent premises for the college so that it can operate in accommodation that is comparable to other educational institutions; and

(d) no decision be made on the future of the college until all reports, evaluations and recommendations have been thoroughly examined, and after full consultation with Aboriginal people in South Australia and with the college staff.

I gave notice of motion on this matter while it was one of some contention in the community at large. On 5 August, at the time of giving notice of motion, there was uncertainty as to the future of the college itself. There was the suggestion made by the Federal Minister, Senator Baume, that the college should lose its independence, lose its aboriginality, and should be subsumed into other structures of Government, particularly under the State Government. There was also the indication that direct funding for that college would be withdrawn. A great deal of opposition was expressed to that proposal, not the least of which was by the students and staff of the Aboriginal Community College itself and by members of the Aboriginal community within South Australia.

Their opposition to that led them to have a demonstration opposite the grounds of the college at North Adelaide on 5 August, where they invited a number of people to address the meeting on their opinions about this important matter. Indeed, I was given an opportunity to address that meeting. It also resulted in letters to the Editor and various other activities by the Aboriginal community and by members of the community at large to indicate their feelings about it.

In one sense, I suppose, therefore, in a limited sense, we can say that the suggestions Senator Baume brought forward were not entirely negative; they had the positive effect of encouraging the community to identify what it thought of the work of the college, to state publicly the work they thought it contributed not only to Aboriginal education but to education at large. Now we know that the decision has been made to allow the college to continue, and indeed it will continue in a form suggested by the management committee of the college itself on 26 June, when the management committee wrote to the Minister and suggested that one of the options that could be considered was that it could come under the auspices of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia. It is this proposal that appears to be the motive or the operative motion now put into effect.

The other requirement that the management committee of the Aboriginal Community College requested on 26 June was that consultation should take place before any major decisions were undertaken. This whole episode, from the Federal Government's point of view, has been one of very poor consultation indeed. There was no reasonable attempt before the dispute arose to the public arena to debate the issues and to consult with all the people involved. Very restrictive options were handed down from on high with limited opportunities for opinions to be sought about those options and the decisions were to be made without consultation.

The college has survived through that. I hope it will be surviving for a great deal longer. That is why I am proceeding with this motion. I believe it is still necessary for this House to affirm its commitment to the work of the college. I know there are members on both sides of the House who have had experience of the college, who have had the opportunity to visit it, and who have been impressed with the work that goes on there. I know the Minister of Education has on occasion endorsed the work that takes place at the college. I would imagine there would be no opposition to the motion and that it could be carried with the concurrence of the whole House, so that we can affirm our unanimity to the Federal Government as to how important we believe is not only the question of Aboriginal education but also the role of the Aboriginal Community College to the whole area of Aboriginal education.

I have had the opportunity to visit the college on at least three occasions over the past few years to meet with the people who are studying there, and on one occasion to address them on a matter of government. I was invited, as a councillor, to speak on the question of local government and the way in which individuals can participate in local government. I took part in one of the courses, one might say. It is interesting to note that the advisers of Senator Baume have never visited the college; the advisers who made all the grand suggestions and expressed all the restrictive options for the future of the college have never been

there. They have been invited, but they have never been. I have been there, and I was impressed with what I saw.

An evaluation of the college was done through the Monash University. It was one by Mr Colin Bourke, through the Aboriginal Research Centre at Monash, and it made many comments about the Aboriginal Community College, quite a few of which were reasonably derogatory about the work being done there. I have been very interested to read the responses to the derogatory comments made by members of the Aboriginal Community College themselves, and indeed endorsed by all those at the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education who have been associated with the Aboriginal Community College. It is timely to remember that the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education has given very worthwhile and sound support to the Aboriginal Community College over the years and has kept a close interest in what takes place there.

The evaluation that came out of Monash was very short-sighted and failed in many areas. Certain failures were identified. It failed to examine the various ways by which the Aboriginal community influences decision making within the community. It failed to take into account that management decisions can also result in discussions that take place outside of formal meetings. There was no evaluation of participation by students in other Government and community institutions that create and are a valuable part of the programme at the college. There was no analysis of the valuable support role of the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education to the Aboriginal Community College, nor was there any analysis of the legislative changes that would be required if the original option had been proceeded with to incorporate the Aboriginal Community College within the Department of Further Education.

There was strong criticism of the attendance figures used in that report. Likewise, they drew attention to what they interpreted to be conflicting comments on the Aboriginalisation of the community college. I could go through those point by point and analyse the way in which the study did draw attention to those failures, but I think time is not with me at the moment, and my best contribution in that regard would be to draw to the attention of honourable members a paper called *A Summary Critique of the Evaluation Report on the Aboriginal Community College*, prepared by Mr Colin Bourke *et al*, of the Aboriginal Research Centre, Monash. It is a paper that I have and I am sure other members of this House have it. I commend it to them for their study. If they cannot get access to it, I will be more than happy to provide them with a copy.

I would like to go on with some information about the real facts applying to the college, the real facts about just how effective it is in providing for the needs of the students who attend there and the Aboriginal community at large. Comments were made about attendance by the other evaluation—critical comments. It was suggested that the attendance was in fact quite low. The information provided to me is that enrolment at the college averages between 50 and 55 for the principal courses and 16 for the pre-vocational training unit courses undertaken there. That gives an average enrolment varying in total between 66 and 71.

Interestingly enough, the cost per pupil has been analysed, and this was subject to some criticism in the other evaluation. Studies have found that, including administrative costs, the costs are $4 800 overall per student per annum, which breaks down into $5 300 for the adult programmes and $4 300 for the pre-vocational training unit programmes. These figures are more expensive than are the comparative cost figures we see of some other educational institutions. They are not that much more expensive than are many of the courses that take place within the Department of Further Education or the tertiary sector, but they are somewhat more expensive.

However, one needs to analyse what might be the other costs involved if the college did not exist. What other costs would various sections of government be opening themselves up to if they did not pay those amounts of $5 300 or $4 300 per pupil? The suggestion is that the college provides a useful education avenue for members of the Aboriginal community where no avenues existed. Indeed, in their comment on the evaluation they made the following comment:

> The college enrols only applicants who cannot enrol elsewhere with any reasonable chance of success. Consequently, a high proportion of our students come from a background of persistent unemployment and social disruption, including family breakdown, recidivism, and problems with alcohol.

What they are saying there is that, if we do not have the Aboriginal Community College, it is not feasible to think of many who are presently enrolled at the college finding suitable study places in other educational institutions.

That just simply would not happen. With regard to a significant number of these students enrolling, if they were not given that opportunity they would find themselves the victims of many other aspects of the lifestyle within which they may find themselves trapped. The result of that could be very costly for society. The management committee drew attention to what other costs might occur for any of those who, not given these opportunities, found themselves on the wrong side of society and ended up breaking the law. They pointed to the fact, for example, that it costs $44 000 per annum for a juvenile at the South Australian Youth Training Centre, $22 268 per annum for an inmate at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, and $13 180 for an inmate at the Yatala Labour Prison.

That is not to suggest that the absence of the Aboriginal Community College would have seen all of its present students finding their way there; by no manner of means does it suggest that. What it is saying is that some of the students who attend were given an opportunity that is desperately needed in terms of their life development, and that, for that minority of students, life might have taken a turn much for the worse had that college not been there, and that turn for the worse may have ultimately involved society at large in the sort of costs I have just mentioned.

Of course, one can go on to talk about other costs that might have been involved—the costs to such departments as the Department for Community Welfare, and the Department of Social Security, at the Federal level. Of course, it is a digression to concentrate too much on that side when, in fact, the main value of the college is clearly its educational contribution to the Aboriginal community and to the community at large. The college has achieved significant results in this regard, especially if one takes the limited measurement area of education resulting in employment. I have statistics relating to the employment status of students after leaving the college. Those figures are purely statistical and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The SPEAKER: Is it the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

D. EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF STUDENTS AFTER LEAVING COLLEGE

(These figures exclude the Pre-Vocational Training Unit; short-term enrolments of less than one term; and a few for whom we had no information).

Status	No. of Students	Percentage
Students Employed	109	38.4
Students Unemployed	36	12.0
Further Full-Time Education	18	6.3

Status	No. of Students	Percentage
Still at College	14	4.9
E.S.L. Students	35	12.3
Home Duties	42	14.8
No Follow-Up Information	29	10.2
Deceased	3	1.1
Total	284	100.0

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: This table analyses the status of 284 students who have graduated from the Aboriginal Community College, and breaks down into various categories what they did on leaving the college or what they are presently doing. The table reveals that some 109 of the 284 students have been employed. A further 35 have been attached to various community councils and, in fact, for the purposes of this report they regard that as meaning employment as well, so one can take that figure to 144. The number of students who specifically describe themselves as unemployed is only 36, or 12 per cent of the total. For the purposes of proper comparison, the people who have drawn up the statistics also include a couple of other categories in the table and take the percentage of unemployed to 44 per cent. Those figures compare favourably with unemployment rates pertaining to Aboriginal students from other schools or educational situations throughout this State. They also compare reasonably favourably with the percentage of unemployed people from schools in general. I have another table of statistics from the South Australian Education Department school leavers project, published in 1979, which is purely statistical, and I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EMPLOYMENT PERCENTAGE OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL LEAVERS IN 1977-1978

	Percent Employed	Percent Unemployed
School 1 Highest Socio-Economic Status	71	29
School 2	68	32
School 3	64	36
School 4	69	31
School 5	64	36
School 6 *Lowest Socio-Economic Status	56	44

*Aboriginal people live in areas with people of the lowest socio-economic status rating so comparison with School 6 is most valid.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: That table outlines the employment percentage of South Australian school leavers in the years 1977 and 1978 in six categories of schools. The first of those is labelled 'Highest socio-economic status', where 71 per cent of those graduates obtained employment. Category 6, the lowest socio-economic status, shows that only 56 per cent of students obtained employment. If one compares that with the Aboriginal Community College figure of just over 50 per cent of students obtaining employment, the comparison is favourable indeed, given for the purposes of direct comparison that the community college, by virtue of its entry requirements, compares more closely with category 6 than with any other category in that table.

However, it is more positive than that, again—positive to the extent of the number of graduates from that community college who participate in employment that relates to Aboriginal communities. In other words, many of the people who have taken jobs there go out to find employment within the Aboriginal community, and the figure supplied to me suggests that 52.3 per cent find such employment. That, of course, must be regarded as very positive, because the Aboriginal community for years has been wanting a higher percentage of those people who work with them in various areas to come from their own community. Here we see the Aboriginal Community College assisting in that regard. It is a sad commentary, however, that those figures I have just quoted refer to the period up to 1979. In 1980 there was a relative decline in that percentage figure as a result of cuts undertaken by the Federal Government in Aboriginal self-help programmes, and in other areas that impinge upon the Aboriginal community.

We know that there were some serious cut-backs at that time, cut-backs that still have not been made good. Likewise, the situation is also very positive with the pre-vocational training unit of the Aboriginal Community College. Figures suggest that 42 Aboriginal teenagers have been enrolled for some time at that unit. Of that 42, 17 have obtained apprenticeships and 18 have obtained positions as trade assistants or some other employment, or have gone on to further study. I think we need to remember that that ought to be compared to the 1976 figure. At that stage, in South Australia only one Aboriginal person was holding an apprenticeship, so a vast improvement has resulted from the existance of the Aboriginal Community College.

One can go on and quote from a great many other figures. One can also draw attention to the way in which the models have been developed for management at the Aboriginal Community College and have been successful in ensuring wide-ranging participation in what takes place at that college. One of the problems one often finds, not just in the Aboriginal community but in the community at large, is that opinion gathering models we have tend, by their very rigidity, to cut many people out from giving an opinion or, exclude many people because those people feel that their opinion will not be listened to. I made that comment last night regarding community welfare forums, hoping that, indeed, they will show flexibility of structure so as to not similarly preclude people. The comment was made by the management committee that the actual management committee is very often not the main source of generation of ideas about how that college will be run, because it is too structured, too rigid, and many of the ideas come up for informal discussion outside the confines of the management committee. The results of that have shown themselves in the way in which the college is able to operate.

One of the ideas that has been considered for some time is that the college needs a better campus; it needs a better site. It has been operating next door to the Hotel Oberoi in Brougham Place, North Adelaide. They have made very good use of the facilities they have, which have been cramped. There have been, I might add, no complaints from the community about the existence of an educational facility right there. People accepted that very well, but the conditions, from the college's point of view, have been very cramped and they have sought to move. I regret the fact that one of the areas they have sought to move to, one of the suggestions that they were considering, appears for the moment to have been closed to them; that is, the former Largs Bay orphanage. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 September. Page 881).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): Last night, as we concluded the debate on the second reading, I was referring to the fact that, whilst members

on both sides had supported the Bill, there had been some negative comments from the Opposition and a general failure to recognise the basic principles and concepts of the Bill, which is a trail blazer in so far as it introduces the concept of responsiveness to consumer needs, involvement by consumers in determination of services, and accountability by the Minister and the department to consumers in a way which has not been experienced before in this State or indeed in Australia in legislative form. Those points were certainly very well grasped by the member for Newland and I commend him for his thoughtful and valuable contribution to the debate.

The new Bill focuses on developing an Act which satisfies the legislative as well as the operational requirements of the Government and the department, and I certainly commend the Minister and his officers for the care and thought that have gone into the drafting of this Bill, and, like other members who have spoken, congratulate the members of the Brown and Mann Committees for the immensely valuable work they did progressively over a period of years. The Bill certainly captures the sensitivities of the community today, of people in various forms of need, with special emphasis on women, children, migrants and the handicapped. It reflects that the views of clients are important and the appropriateness of involving them in planned feedback on services.

The Bill reinforces that the Minister and department are in partnership with the community in the delivery of community welfare services and the principle of self help, which is one that the Government most formally and firmly endorses as the philosophical concept is reinforced. The Bill also reflects the latest community welfare principles and practices. Above all, it reflects the need to maintain sensitivity towards clients with particular needs. Where this involves a child there is also sensitivity towards the needs of parents.

I commend the member for Spence for his contribution, although I must disagree with some of the things he said. As a former Minister, he obviously speaks with a depth of knowledge, albeit gained over a short period, but at least an understanding which it would be difficult to acquire in any other way, of the way in which the dpeartment administers the services. The member for Spence said that, because of the Government's own economic policies and lack of job creation programmes, it seems that it now wants everybody to drop other responsibilities, to volunteer to help others in need, and donate any spare money that they might have to welfare organisations, because the days have gone when people can expect the Government alone to deal with social problems. Surely, the member for Spence said, that is a Government responsibility.

I reject those assertions. It is true the Government does have a responsibility on behalf of the community at large, but it is a responsibility in partnership with the community, and the community is the richer and better for that partnership. The community continually expresses a wish to help itself, and this in fact is the way in which most needs are met. Indeed, it is virtually a self-regulating system when a community helps itself, because a community will never waste time spending resources voluntarily where there is not a need to be met. It will instinctively direct resources to where there is a need to be met, and this is where the community itself and individual and voluntary organisations will always have an edge over government, because of the innate spontaneity of community response to need.

Of course, the Government needs to step in only where it has a particular responsibility or where the situation is difficult. The member for Norwood made reference to the user-pays principle for services such as water, electricity, and, indeed, health. The Government in no way reneges from its commitments to the user-pays principle, which we believe is a principle of responsibility and economic accountability. I should point out to the member for Norwood that, where services are provided by the Department for Community Welfare, the user-pays principle does not apply for those in need and in fact for the majority of the department's services. In areas such as family day care, where the service is widely available within particular communities, those in need are subsidised on a sliding scale; others pay the full rate.

The member for Spence made reference to consultation with the voluntary sector and particularly SACOSS. He said that SACOSS was disappointed that there appears to have been no progress made towards the development of a formal consultancy structure. This is not correct. On 7 August 1981, the Minister wrote to SACOSS saying that he was agreeable for two executive staff members to meet with the SACOSS Chairman and executive officer to discuss issues of mutual concern. The SACOSS secretary was invited to contact the Director-General to arrange appropriate meetings.

The member for Albert Park made a direct quote, without acknowledging it as such, from the Hon. Barbara Wiese's speech in the Legislative Council relating to foster care. He mentioned a growing trend to sort out matters of dispute in court where there is a disagreement between biological and foster parents over the custody of children. This comment appears to relate to a matter in New South Wales. That is certainly not the case in South Australia, where disputes that do arise are sorted out within the department. This Bill also provides for appeal to the Minister if necessary. There was a further inaccuracy in the speech of the member for Albert Park, in which he said that, where a matter is referred to the court, the child would be held on a longer term basis in a foster institution. This is totally untrue in South Australia and brings into question whether the honourable member has a very deep understanding of foster care and of the department.

The member for Salisbury made reference to the rights of foster parents concerning the placement of a child. Whilst his statement was not incorrect, it should be noted that this Bill reinforces the need to consult with the biological parents. Parents are also able to attend review boards to consider those matters further. The House is aware of the very great interest of the member for Glenelg in community welfare matters, and his references to the need to support the family as a unit and to ensure that it can fulfil its primary functions of care and nurture were noted and indeed his general thoughts are in sympathy with the concepts that are expressed in the Bill in relation to support for the family.

Despite some negative comments and failure to grasp the broad concepts of the Bill, the Opposition has supported it in broad terms, and I believe that the approach of the Government has been recognised and commended. The Opposition and the Government in fact are not widely at odds on the goals and aims of this Bill and that is an indication that there is, as one member opposite put it (I think the member for Peake), a consensus in Parliament about the way in which these matters should be approached. I believe that this debate in broad terms has expressed that consensus.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Repeal of Parts II, III and IV and substitution of new Parts.'

Mr ABBOTT: I move:

Page 5, lines 28 to 46—Leave out all words in these lines.
Page 6, lines 1 to 40—Leave out all words in these lines.

The Opposition moves this amendment because we believe that the objectives of the Minister and the department are one thing, but the method of providing them in a variety of ways is another. For that reason we think it is desirable for the two matters to be clearly separated. The Opposition has no argument at all with the objectives or the manner with which they are to be provided; in fact we support them, but I believe that the whole clause is badly set out in its present form. The principal Act has all the aims and objectives of the Minister and the department together, but the achievement and the provisions of those objectives are spelt out in the various divisions which, in the Opposition's view, is more desirable.

If it was the intention of the Government to put all the objectives together, and the Minister of Community Welfare said when opposing this amendment in another place that they were all objectives, then perhaps they would not have included the words 'in the following manner' after subclause *(b)*. The objectives in the principal Act commence with the words 'to promote, to assist, to collaborate, to establish', and so on. In this Bill the principle applies, but it reads that the two objectives shall be achieved in the following manner: by providing, by encouraging, by instituting, and by collecting, and so on. In her second reading explanation the Minister supported this argument. The Minister said:

> Division II sets out an amplified and updated set of objectives for the Minister and the department. The two main objectives set out in new section 10 are the provision of the welfare, not only of the community but of individuals, families and groups within the community, and the promotion of the welfare of the family and a comprehensive list of the means by which these objectives are to be pursued is also provided.

I hope that members will support my amendment. I indicate that the remainder of the amendments standing in my name to this clause I spoke about in my second reading speech, together with the amendment that the Minister indicated she will move. I indicated that, if the Government did not move to amend the Bill in such a fashion, the Opposition would be prepared to do so.

Under Standing Orders I am not permitted to move that amendment at this stage. I also point out that the amendment relating to the separation of the objectives and the manner by which they are to be provided is also related to this clause. However, if the amendment that I am now moving is accepted it would be necessary for me to move that amendment standing in my name as a separate motion.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Spence has moved an amendment to page 5, lines 28 to 46, and page 6, lines 1 to 40. However, the Minister has an amendment to line 32, to add certain words. To safeguard the Minister's amendment I intend to put that much of the member for Spence's amendment up to and to including the word 'State' in line 32. If this is successful I will put the remainder of the member for Spence's amendment to lines 32 to 40; if not, I will put the Minister's amendment to line 32. The question before the Chair is that all words in lines 1 to 32 up to the word 'State' be left out.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government opposes the amendment. The member for Spence said he believed the section was badly set out. The Government believes differently: we believe it is well set out. The amendment relates to the order of the objectives of the Minister and the department. What the member for Spence is proposing would not alter the wording in any way, but it would change the position of new section 10 (1) *(c)* to bring it down to the position of new section 10 (1) *(r)* in the Bill. It does nothing important to improve the value of the objectives of the Act in providing a concept of the overall operation of its provisions.

The Government believes that it is necessary to keep these objectives and methods together. This gives a clear cohesive framework, and ensures that the Bill makes sense to lay people, and that, of course, is an absolutely essential element in a Bill of this nature; the law should be clearly understood by those to whom it applies. The objective stated in the Bill is similar to the existing ones. The Government considered it important to maintain the value of this type of provision as a hand book for the department and non-statutory organisations. These provisions have received acclaim from non-statutory organisations, other Governments, and other sources throughout the world, and as a consequence the Government does not propose to accept the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr ABBOTT: Clause 6 is quite a lengthy portion of the Bill. Other members may have questions they would like to ask in relation to certain parts of this clause. In relation to new section 15, I seek clarification from the Minister in relation to the procedure of these programme advisory panels. The clause reads:

> Subject to any direction of the Director-General the procedure of a programme advisory panel shall be such as is determined by the panel.

What exactly is meant by this? What is the Government's policy? Also, in relation to the reports to the Director-General and thence to the Minister on the deliberations of and conclusions reached by the panel, can the Minister say whether these are confidential reports? Will they be made available? Who will they be distributed to? I seek clarification from the Minister.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The reports will be confidential to the Minister. I ask the member for Spence to repeat the first question.

Mr ABBOTT: I would like to know exactly what is meant by new section 15(1). What is the Government's policy in relation to those matters being determined by the panel?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am advised that the panels would consider a wide variety of programmes, and it would depend on the nature of the programme as to how much discretion was exercised. It is difficult at this stage to be any more precise than that. The member for Spence would well know that confidentiality is a prime consideration in all matters and it certainly would be maintained. I move:

> Page 6, line 32—After 'of this State' insert 'with non-government organisations that provide, or support or promote the provision of, community welfare services,'.

This provision is inserted to ensure that the objectives of the Minister and the department are carried out by collaborating and consulting with other departments in this State and with other States and the Commonwealth. The Government is moving this amendment in order to ensure that non-Government organisations that provide community welfare services are consulted. The amendment is sought following recent discussions between the South Australian Council of Social Service and the Minister. It aims to further reinforce the role which non-government organisations have in the consultation process concerning community welfare services. Quite clearly, it is an amendment which is supported by both sides.

Mr ABBOTT: The Opposition supports the amendment. We feel that it is desirable. I will not talk on it at length, but I indicate our support.

Amendment carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Glenelg has on file an amendment which should be moved if he intends to proceed with it.

Mr MATHWIN: I seek leave to withdraw that amendment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:

Page 7, after line 7—Insert new subsection as follows:

(3a) In recognition of the fact that this State has a multicultural community, the Minister and the Department shall, in administering this Act, take into consideration the different customs, attitudes and religious beliefs of the ethnic groups within the community.

Amendment carried.

Mr ABBOTT: I move:

Page 8, Line 34—Leave out 'Director-General' and insert 'Minister'. Line 37—Leave out 'Director-General' and insert 'Minister'.

The Opposition moves this amendment because we believe it is important to establish the principle of Ministerial responsibility and control, as the actions of the whole department, no matter at what level or in what area, are the direct responsibility of the Minister. The Minister is responsible and must be accountable to Parliament. The Minister's explain on behalf of those who make decisions must be accountable to Parliament.

Some sections of the Community Welfare Act give the Minister this responsibility, and other sections place the responsibility upon the Director-General or some other person who may be authorised by the Director-General from time to time. If we look at Division IV, which refers to community aides, for example, the principal Act states that the Director-General may appoint such persons as he thinks fit to act in a voluntary capacity as community aides. However, Division V, under the heading 'Community Welfare Consumer Forums', states that the Minister shall at such intervals as he thinks fit cause a community welfare consumer forum to be held.

In my opinion, and that of the Opposition, there seems to be some inconsistency in relation to this. Many similar examples could be given. Perhaps the Minister can explain why certain responsibility is given to the Minister and other responsibility to the Director-General. As it is, the Minister could quite easily come into the House and say that he did not make a certain decision and that he would, therefore, not be responsible for that decision. That is not being accountable to the Parliament. I indicate that I have a number of similar amendments standing in my name. I have moved this amendment as a test case in relation to those other amendments.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As the honourable member would know, this debate was carried on extensively in another place. The Government has made its position quite clear—it opposes the amendment. I will reiterate the reasons why it does so. There are certain matters that ought to be dealt with by a Minister and certain matters that ought to be dealt with by a Director-General, permanent head or some other officer. Where it is a matter of policy, the Minister is obviously involved. Where it is a matter of an administrative nature, the Director-General or an officer is obviously the one who should be directly responsible.

Having said that, I acknowledge, as of course we all do, the over-riding Ministerial responsibility for the actions of all officers, but when those specific responsibilities are being translated into statutory form it is simply not sensible to give the Minister direct responsibility for administrative acts in which the Minister could not possibly be directly involved. It is better to clarify from the outset where the Director-General or an officer is expected to carry the statutory responsibility, which does not in any way diminish the Minister's over-riding responsibility to Parliament.

The amendment that the honourable member has moved relates to the clauses of the Bill dealing with community aides, and the Committee may be interested to note that, in the case of community aides, there are over 600 registered at over 60 locations around the State. Registration, training and support can be most effectively carried out at local offices, and it would be quite clearly impracticable for the Minister to be involved in administrative matters of this nature. So, in respect of this specific amendment, and recognising that it is a test case, I have tried to explain on a matter of broad principle why the Government is not accepting it. I should add that, in terms of comparison with legislation in other States, this Bill is more conservative than that of any other State in Australia insofar as it attributes more responsibility in a legislative form directly to the Minister than do most other comparable Community Welfare Acts, so the Government stands by the Bill as it is before the Committee and opposes the amendments.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am hardly surprised to hear the Minister claim that this Bill is more conservative than that applying in any other State. With a conservative Government of the nature of the one we have, that is hardly surprising. Do I understand the Minister to be saying that she accepts that this is to be a test case and that she rejects the concept that the Minister should be imported into the legislation in all of the places where the member for Spence has amendments on file?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I do not think that the member for Elizabeth was in the Chamber when the member for Spence said that the Opposition would regard this first amendment as a test case, and that if it was opposed by the Government, I understand, he would not be pursuing consequential amendments, which are virtually identical.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I heard him say that while I was in my room, but I thought the Minister was indicating that, specifically, she thought that the Director-General ought to apply in this particular case. However, apparently that was not the situation. I strongly support the amendment, because I think it is a matter of importance in principle so far as the Parliament is concerned. I think that it is really a matter for the Parliament to determine. I appreciate that in this House the Government has a majority and that whatever the Minister had decided, unfortunately, will apply.

I am not arguing that this is a matter of overwhelming concern in relation to this particular piece of legislation. In fact, I want to make it clear that I regard the Director of this department as a friend and a person I hold in the highest regard. It is not in any way an indication of any concern I have about his particular role that I should support this amendment. In fact, I think he knows that, not only with regard to his particular department but with regard to the Government at large.

It has long been a concern of mine that legislation passed by this Parliament, which after all in effect delegates the power of this Parliament to particular individuals to carry out the will of this Parliament, should delegate the powers to a member of this Parliament; in other words, to a Minister. It is not a matter of an argument over who should actually cross the t's, dot the i's and sign the dockets. The Minister of Health, understandably, argued that point. I can see the logic, to some extent, of what she argued, but she knows perfectly well that in a thousand and one cases where this Parliament makes a delegation to the Minister (in other words, says the Minister shall do this, that, or the other thing) the Minister, in appropriate cases, delegates that power to a public servant to undertake that activity.

There is no reason why, in this case, or in any other case, that principle should not be applied. For the time that I was a Minister of the Crown in this State, and for the time that I had responsibility for bringing Government legislation before this Parliament, I always applied the principle that it should be the Minister who goes away from this place with the responsibility under legislation. It should be the

Minister, and I believe that, in this piece of legislation, as in any other, the Minister ought to be the one named in the legislation as carrying the responsibility. If the Minister chooses then to delegate that responsibility to other persons, so be it; that is the Minister's exercise of responsibility, and I have no argument with that. Of course, if the delegation goes wrong and mistakes are made, then quite clearly, in those circumstances, the Minister carries the can for the mistakes that have been made.

There is no doubt that in legislation such as this, in accordance with proper common law principles, the principles of the British House of Commons and the House of Lords (the British Parliament), the power should go to the Minister initially for him subsequently to delegate authority where he believes it is appropriate. The danger in undertaking the sort of proposals that the Government has put up is that a Minister (and I am sure the Minister of Health, who is on the front bench at present, would be well aware of this difficulty) may well find that an important power has been delegated to a public servant and for one reason or another that public servant decides that he or she will not bow to the wishes of the Minister of the day. There are many examples where this has happened. One that readily comes to mind is the situation in relation to the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs, but I will not go into these details, because that would be inappropriate and improper. However, I can recall circumstances in which the Commissioner had the power pursuant to Statute, and the policy of the Government of the day could not be carried out effectively because of that.

There is no doubt that in these sorts of circumstances it is desirable that the Minister should be the person who, if not exercises the power in the day to day sense, has the responsibility for doing so. For these reasons, the amendment is important. It is not a matter of great consequence: the State will not fall apart tomorrow if this amendment is not carried, but I ask honourable members, not only those who are here at present but also those who may be listening in their rooms, to consider carefully the role of the Parliament in the way in which it delegates and grants powers to people in the Public Service. The whole structure or principle of the Parliamentary system as we know it is that Ministers, members of this Parliament, either in this House or in the other place, are elected by the Parliament to be, in effect, the heads of departments. They are required to carry out the onerous task of being the representatives of this Parliament by carrying out the responsibilities that we place on them.

Mr Mathwin: You are not suggesting that every Minister has that power now?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the member for Glenelg was to look through some quite important pieces of legislation, he would see that in many cases the Minister has been given power, which he delegates. It is done on a quite normal basis. The Minister delegates the power, but the legislation clearly defines the line of responsibility—the Parliament, the Minister, the Public Service head or functionary, if not the head.

Mr Mathwin: You suggest that that provision is in all of the Acts now.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, I do not suggest that: I am saying it is wrong that it is not. I could cite to the honourable member a number of Acts in which that power is given to the Minister initially. I do not want to give a long list, but one example is the State Government Insurance Commission Act. The commission was set up and, as we know, there are commissioners.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It is a commission, not a statutory body or a department, such as the Department for Community Welfare. I think there is a difference.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am surprised to hear the Minister suggest that, because I would have thought, if there was a difference, the onus should be turned the other way round: the Minister should have clear responsibility for a department, and less so for a statutory authority. Would the Minister not agree with that?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I would say your argument has just contradicted itself.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, it has not. The Minister can laugh, chortle, and carry on as she wants: I believe that this is a fundamental and important question, because it goes right to the nub of the power of this Parliament and the way in which we exercise our democratic responsibility on behalf of the citizens of this State. The Minister was only too anxious to come before the Parliament to amend the Health Commission Act to give herself considerably more power in handling her department, because after all—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Have a look at the amendments. The Chairman was given a lot more power.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I would be interested to have a close look at them.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: The Chairman was given a great deal of executive power.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What power was the Chairman given that he did not have before?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: He was given the power to act for the commission, in an executive capacity, between meetings of the commission.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That does not relate to the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: the Committee is discussing a different matter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Indeed we are, and I will not reflect on your ruling, Mr Chairman, in this matter. I conclude my remarks by saying that I have little doubt that the Government will carry the Bill as it stands and defeat the amendment, but I believe that thoughtful members of the Government who show some interest in this Parliament as an institution and as the instrument of democracy in this State would do well to reflect on the comments that I have made tonight about the importance and the responsibilities that we pass to Ministers on our behalf, because, after all, that is what Ministers are doing. One can look at it the other way round and say that this is a monarchy and the Ministers are chosen by the Governor. We know that that is gobbledegook and that it is no longer the case. The Ministers are chosen by the Parliament to go away and exercise responsibilities on behalf of the Parliament.

It is a sad fact that we have strayed so far from the principle to which I have referred. I do not deny the comment of the member for Glenelg that any number of Acts can be cited to show that the power has been placed in the hands of public servants: what I do say is that that has been an error. We have made an unfortunate mistake and, as time goes by and as legislation comes before the House, we should move back to the principle of enshrining Ministerial responsibility in legislation.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I agree with the member for Elizabeth, as I think all honourable members agree, that this question is of fundamental importance. If the honourable member saw me smile, it was certainly not in a fashion that diminished the importance of what he was saying. I agree that it is quite basic to the function of Parliament and a question as to the perspective with which one views this matter. The member for Elizabeth, I believe, was in the House when I said that not for one moment in opposing this amendment do I, or does the Government, resile from the concept of Ministerial responsibility, which is total and all-embracing. We all know that in this place, whatever is done by our departments, the commissions, the

authorities or whatever, the Ministers stand responsible. The Statutes contain many references to permanent heads in terms of defining their functions under the Acts. That is the reality of the situation.

This situation occurred under the Government of which the honourable member was a member, and it has been the practice in appropriate circumstances (and they are the key words) for decades. One can only look at the role of the Police Commissioner, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, or the Director of Fisheries (to name but three) to see this principle applied. It can possibly best be summed up by saying that whether we use the term 'Minister' or 'Director-General' in this Bill is determined by what happens.

Another issue which is fundamental and on which I think the member for Elizabeth would agree with me on this particular point is that the Statute should be clearly intelligble to those to whom it applies and, upon reading it, the general public should understand what happens. That is what this Bill sets out to do. It sets out to define as nearly as possible where the Director-General makes a decision and where the Minister as a matter of policy makes a decision, notwithstanding that the Minister carries the overall responsibility for the administration of the Act.

The Government opposes the amendment and believes that the Bill, as it stands, is the most satisfactory form of expressing the responsibilities of the department and the Minister.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Does the Minister suggest that, if the Director-General exercises his discretion under this legislation and that, for example, the Minister does not agree, first, the Minister could do nothing about that? Secondly, does the Minister suggest that that Minister would then be held responsible by this Parliament?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Minister is going to be held responsible by this Parliament for everything that is done in his department, and all members know that. I think it is difficult to conceive, where in this Bill the Director-General has been identified as being responsible for carrying out a particular function, that that function is anything more than an administrative one. The difference between policy decisions, which are at the discretion of the Minister, and administrative actions, which are the responsibility of the Director-General, has been clearly identified.

I believe it would be a rare, if not an extremely rare, case where the Director-General would flout the wishes of his or her Minister in the administration of the department for which the Director-General knows that the Minister carries the ultimate responsibility to Parliament. We are talking here about the relationships which exist in the Westminster system. They cannot always be precisely defined, as the honourable member would know, but this Bill sets out as far as possible to ensure that those who are affected by it know who is going to fulfil a particular function.

I can only reiterate what has been said before, that the Minister should be mentioned when it is a question of policy making and the Director-General should be mentioned when it is an administrative function, and that is precisely what this Bill does.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I conclude my remarks by simply referring to the fact that the Minister suggests that the Bill should be clear and well understood by those who are going to be subjected to it. I do not deny that approach for a moment, but I ask her to refer to new section 8 (2), as follows:

The Director-General may delegate to the Deputy Director-General, or to any officer of the department, any of the powers, duties, responsibilities and functions vested in, or delegated to, the Director-General under this Act.

Quite clearly, that is a facetious point to make. If one was concerned to ensure that the ordinary members of the public who read the legislation understand exactly what it says, then they would understand from reading the legislation generally that the powers are to be exercised by the Director-General. Of course, we know that is not the case. The Director-General delegates the powers just as I am suggesting that the Minister ought to delegate the powers.

There is only one other point I want to make. If one was to look at a number of other Acts in this State, but most particularly if one looks at the Education Act, one finds that a large proportion of the administrative powers under that Act are delegated to the Minister. The sad fact of the matter is that the question whether the powers of this Parliament are delegated to the Minister—

Dr Billard: What about curriculum?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Curriculum powers are not. I think the honourable member who interjects will note the point I am making. If one looks at other Acts, one will see that in my view very unfortunately the question whether the delegation is to the Minister or a Director-General depends largely on two factors, not the determination and decision-making power of this Parliament but the question of whether there is a strong Minister at the time the legislation is being drawn up or a strong Director-General. Time and time again I saw examples when I was in the Cabinet of Bills under our Government—I would be the first to admit—which varied quite significantly in their philosophy on this question according to those two factors.

I do not have much doubt that the Government is putting this legislation before the Parliament with the best intentions. I regret that it is not prepared to see the wisdom in what I am saying. I suspect some of its back-benchers can see the fairness and validity in what I am saying (that we should apply this principle), but unfortunately the decision has already been made, and in this instance the powers are going to be exercised as set out in the legislation.

I think that is an unfortunate thing. As I say, it is almost an application of fadism rather than principle, and that is a very sad thing. However, in Opposition it is one's role to be frustrated in the application of these principles.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Some more than others. Far from being an application of fadism, it is a very sensible application of the practical administration of this Act. I was intrigued to hear the honourable member's references to legislation reflecting the nature of the strength of character of the respective Ministers and permanent heads at the time legislation was drawn up, and I cannot help but reflect that with a very strong and able Minister and a very strong and able Director-General, as we have in these circumstances, we have an Act which has a balanced approach to the respective roles of the Minister and the Director-General. It is an approach which I believe is ideal and which is, of course, supported by the Government and its back-benchers.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott (teller), L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran and Peterson. Noes—Messrs Becker and Wilson.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the member for Spence will not proceed with his other amendments, which are consequential.

Mr ABBOTT: That is correct. I indicated that earlier. I refer to proposed new section 26, concerning the Children's Interests Bureau. I would appreciate further information with regard to the relationship the bureau will have with the department. I would like to know whether this will be a body independent of the department, and I would appreciate information as to whether there will be a children's advocate, and whether it will be a full-time operation. The new section sets out quite clearly the functions of the bureau and new subsection (4) states:

The Minister shall establish a community welfare advisory committee for the purposes of providing the bureau with consultative, supportive and advisory services.

I would like the Minister to clarify those three points: will it be an independent body, is it a full-time operation, and will there be a children's advocate?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes; the Children's Interests Bureau will be independent of the department, although it will have a departmental officer on it and it will be supported by departmental staff. As the honourable member would know the establishment of this bureau is widely supported, for a variety of reasons. They are areas in which questions of parental rights, living away from home, and things which very much came to light at the time of the Truro axe murders, and issues which arose subsequent to those murders, have meant that there needs to be a body which considers the interests of children and can be seen to be doing so in an objective manner without an administrative involvement that relates to those issues.

There will not be a children's advocate, although perhaps the member for Spence can define what he means by a children's advocate. The bureau itself could be described as being an advocate for children. Is the honourable member thinking of a single individual identified within the bureau? I am not sure what he means because, as I understand it, the bureau itself will exist to protect the interests of children and of course it will have an advocacy role. I hope that that clarifies the situation for the honourable member.

Mr ABBOTT: The Minister has clarified my question to a degree, but will there be a children's advocate to put the bureau's resolutions or recommendations to the department?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The procedure which the honourable member has just described will be undertaken directly by the Chairman of the bureau to the Minister. I suppose, in a general sense, one could describe the Chairman of the bureau as children's advocate, although that is not to be his or her title, but in a sense that will be that person's function because the Chairman of the bureau will relate directly to the Minister in the interests of the child.

Mr ABBOTT: The Bill provides that the bureau shall be comprised of such persons appointed on such terms and conditions as the Minister thinks fit. What qualifications are required? Is it intended that the appointed persons will be professional people? Will these services duplicate any other services?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The staff of the bureau will be Ministerial appointees and the person in charge will report directly to the Minister on the work of the bureau. The actual composition of the bureau is not yet finally determined. I would expect it to be made up of the kind of people the honourable member described; in other words, a cross-section of the community: people who have specific qualifications, and who are recognised as having specific qualifications in relation to the needs of children, would obviously be candidates for consideration. As the honourable member knows, a good lay person endowed with common sense is often worth his or her weight in professional people. I am not aware of exactly who the Minister has in mind, and this is not spelt out in the Bill. I imagine the views of the Minister will be taken into account when the appointments are made, as with most appointments.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to point out to the member for Spence that the Chair is under some difficulty in relation to Standing Order 422, which provides that a member may address himself only three times to any clause. This is a very large clause, and the honourable member has already had three opportunities. He is entitled, of course, to speek to his amendments by moving them, but in general debate on the clause the honourable member has had his three opportunities.

Mr ABBOTT: I appreciate your assistance in this matter, Sir. I pointed out earlier, and you agreed with me when we went into Committee, that clause 6 was a very long clause and there are quite a large number of parts to the clause. I had a few questions that I would like to ask in relation to a number of those sections, and the specific sections are quite different. The Children's Interests Bureau is completely different to the establishment of consumer forums, for example. Maybe we will have to look at Standing Orders in such situations. However, I will be guided by your ruling. In relation to new section 26 I have one further question on the Children's Interests Bureau, which will be three questions on the section.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair understands the predicament the honourable member finds himself in. Neither the Chairman, nor the Committee, has any authority to allow the honourable member to proceed beyond what is permitted by Standing Orders. I realise that the honourable member is in some difficulty, but I do not have any discretion, therefore I cannot allow him to proceed except by way of discussion of an amendment. The honourable member may seek the assistance of a colleague.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In the Minister's second reading speech it was stated that this bureau will support the welfare, interests and rights of children. It said it will ensure that issues relating to the well-being of children are studied carefully and the results of the studies are distributed and understood. This is backed up in the second reading explanation by the comment that it was consistent with the Government's policy of supporting families and ensuring that Government decisions and proposals do not adversely affect family life. Will the results of these studies be in the form of family impact statements, with which we are familiar, and will they be forwarded to Cabinet and understood? I use the last term advisedly, 'understood', because that is the very word that was used in the second reading speech.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I understand it, they are not documents for Cabinet; they will be reports made in accordance with the Act, and they will go to the Minister.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Is the Minister telling me and the Committee that, in relation to the statement in support of the Bill, the bureau would support the welfare, interest and rights of children? Is the Minister saying that as a bureau it would be looking at those aspects of children's welfare and putting forward any principles which evolved from any study of that nature in the way the Minister described earlier, that is, by way of the Chairman and the contact of the Chairman with the Minister and/or officers of the department? Is that what is really being put to the Committee?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The procedure would be the one with which the honourable member would be familiar in terms of other bodies. The reports would go to

the Minister; the Minister may be able to act upon them administratively. Alternatively, there may be action which is required as a matter of Government policy or there may be legislative action which is desirable as a result of the report. In those cases obviously the Minister would take the submission to Cabinet, supported by the reports of the Children's Interests Bureau. The best way to describe it is to describe it as a normal policy development procedure, which is initiated in the first instance by the deliberations of the Children's Interests Bureau.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I appreciate the Ministers efforts in explaining what I asked, and I appreciate the difficulty that can occur when a Minister in this House is really caretaking a Bill, having been in the position myself on many occasions. Does the Minister realise that she appears to have described an extremely bureaucratic arrangement with many people forwarding reports to one another on a fairly vital matter, when we are supposedly trying to do something about it in this State, that is, the interests of children? The Opposition fully supports what is continued in this part of the Bill, that we ought to be seen to be taking a more positive role in respect of the rights of children, an area that has probably been neglected over a long period of time in this State.

As it has been outlined to the Committee, I must admit I am not very impressed: I do not know whether my colleague is. I do not expect him to be impressed by what appears to be an extremely bureaucratic arrangement where lots of airy-fairy thoughts might be put down on paper. My colleague was seeking information initially, which I put forward on his behalf, as to whether the information would go to Cabinet. He was really asking whether there is going to be some action or movement, or whether it is to be a long drawn-out matter. It may be that the bureau might come across issues quickly which it would see as being very important and for which, at the present time, there is no legislative background. The Opposition would not have been unhappy if there were to be a procedure such as the family impact statements. We are optimists on this side, and up to now we have not seen much result of the family impact statements which were vaunted by the Government. At the same time, we are prepared to accept also that a period of time is necessary in which such an idea is tried and settles down, and subsequently we might see some results.

It would seem that we are now to have some other sort of scheme, largely undefined. I accept the fact that the Minister has pointed out that she is not really in a position to say exactly what will happen, but she has indicated that it is hoped something will happen. I hope that the Minister will be able to pass on to her colleagues in another place the feelings of Opposition members about this matter. We welcome this part of the legislation and would very much like to see something positive happening. We hope it does not degenerate into some sort of bureaucratic miasma. I now have a similar problem to that of my colleague—three innings and you are out! I have had my three innings, so I hope that the Minister will take to heart and pass on to her colleagues the Opposition's views on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member for Spence now wish to move his other admendments?

Mr ABBOTT: Before doing so, Mr Chairman, I ask your ruling as to whether I am in order in asking a question relating to new section 27, which refers to the care of children?

The CHAIRMAN: The unfortunate situation is that the honourable member would not be in order. I appreciate his difficulty. Unfortunately, the Chair has no discretion. I have to rule that he can now address himself only to the amendments he has on file.

Mr HEMMINGS: My question relates to page 12, new section 27 (3) *(a)*, which refers to the care of children. Concern has been expressed about the latter part of new section 27 (3) *(a)* and the possibility of undue interference by social workers. What criteria will be used to determine when the child's physical, mental or emotional development is in jeopardy? When does the Minister envisage that a social worker would intervene in this emotional development aspect? Perhaps the Minister can explain the meaning of 'emotional development'.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As always, these judgments are of a sensitive nature and a matter of balance. I understand that the welfare of the child, or the extent to which the child's physical, mental or emotional development is in jeopardy, would be determined by a range of people qualified to do so. If, for example, we are talking about emotional development, presumably a psychologist would be a key professional involved in that judgment. If we are talking about the physical development of the child, for example in circumstances where the child was suffering from malnutrition, obviously the judgement of a doctor would be sought. If we are talking about the mental and emotional development of a child a psychologist or psychiatrist would be consulted. A teacher could be involved. A range of professionals would be involved. I think that any fear that a single profession might be exercising undue influence would be unfounded, because the interests of the child are paramount and the Minister and the department, in implementing the provisions of the legislation, envisage that a range of professionals would be involved in the assessment of the child. As the honourable member will readily recognise, the Minister has to be satisfied that the child's development, of whatever nature, is in jeopardy, and there would have to be very solid evidence to back up that judgment that the child was in jeopardy. The Minister would be looking at a range of supportive professional opinion to do this.

Mr HEMMINGS: Who will decide who the relevant expert will be? Who will be there to determine whether the child has a problem dealing with its emotional or physical development? I feel that in this case, and because of the way the Bill is presented to us tonight, it is the Minister who is going to decide and determine the extent of the problem in dealing with the care of children rather than an independent body.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That is not correct. The Bill states:

> Where the Minister is satisfied that the child the subject of an application is in need of care—

for various reasons outlined in the Bill—

> the Minister may, by order in writing—

and so on. It is quite obviously nonsensical to suggest that a Minister personally will make that judgment.

Mr Hemmings: I did not mean it in that way.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The procedure would be that a panel would first look at the situation and the assessment would go from that panel to an executive staff member who would determine the nature of professional judgment required to provide the Minister with satisfactory evidence as to the child's being in jeopardy or not. That is the procedure: a panel, executive staff members to organise a range of professionals who would assess the child.

Mr HEMMINGS: I know that in some areas of community welfare, perhaps because of over-zealousness of social workers, the rights of parents and guardians are sometimes overlooked. How will the rights of parents and guardians be protected against any action by the department relating to this provision? Also, will they have the right of appeal?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The parents are very much involved, as one can see from the identification of the new section. The application for the child to be placed under guardianship of the Minister could come from a parent. Alternatively, it might come from a court, which would be unlikely to make a judgment of that kind on the basis of what is described by the honourable member as the over-zealous efforts of a social worker. I think that the protection is there. I recognise the point the honourable member is making. It is a very serious thing. Perhaps one of the most serious things that society can do is to take a child away from its parents. I believe that the Bill, as outlined, bearing in mind the Act which it is amending, provides rights which give the parent recourse against any injustice or miscarriage of administrative arrangements.

Mr LANGLEY: I wish to refer to new section 42, which refers to applications for approval as foster parents.

What measures will the Minister take to ensure that potential foster parents are not discriminated against by virtue of their inability to express themselves or cultural traditions different from the mainstreams of Australian culture? There are many and varied ethnic families in South Australia: in my district, 30 per cent of the people come from ethnic families. These people have their own cultural traditions. It could be that ethnic families would be reluctant to seek registration.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The process by which foster parents are chosen extends over a period. The prospective parents are not judged in an afternoon: the judgment takes place over a period. It is the policy of the department to look for varied cultures and certainly not to discriminate against those people who wish to foster a child but who may not be articulate or eloquent in expressing that wish. The record of the department in this area reflects the compassion and sensitivity that it shows and its understanding of the need of all people who wish to foster children to be fairly assessed before a judgment is made as to whether they are fit to do so.

If the honourable member looks at other clauses of this Bill and sections of the Act, particularly the amendment that I moved earlier, which specifies that people of other cultures and nationalities are to be given special regard in respect to the application of the Bill, he will be satisified that his concerns are met not only by this Bill but also by the policy of the department.

Mr LANGLEY: New section 59 (1) refers to the period for which a child may be left in a child care centre. Will the Minister say what is the prescribed time and what is the prescribed number of consecutive hours that a child under the age of six years can be left in a licensed child care centre?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would be happy to obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr ABBOTT: I move:

Page 24, after line 30—Insert new subsection as follows:

(2a) Notwithstanding subsection (2), it shall be a condition of every approval given under this section that no person other than the approved family day care provider may care for children in the terms of the approval—

(a) unless the approved family day-care provider has first obtained the consent of the Minister in respect of that other person;

(b) unless the other person is also an approved family day-care provider;

or

(c) except in the case of an emergency.

This amendment will limit the immunity from liability where a person in charge has deputised responsibility. An approved family day care provider should be able to deputise when necessary, and therefore a definition of 'immunity' is necessary. What would be the position, for example, if, during the absence of the approved family day care provider, whether for a short period or otherwise, the house burnt down? Accidents do happen. This amendment is not intended to prevent someone else caring for the children for short periods while the family day care provider takes a child to a pre-school or goes shopping. Those absences are normal and necessary. The amendment merely seeks to limit the immunity for liability of others.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott (teller), L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran and Peterson. Noes—Messrs Becker and Wilson.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

New section 80a—'Complaints as to the care or control certain children are receiving.'

Mr ABBOTT: I move:

Page 28, after line 24—Insert new section as follows:

80a. (1) A child—

(a) who is under the guardianship of the Minister pursuant to this Act or to Part III of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1980, and who has been placed, or allowed to remain, in the care of any person, or who has been placed in any home (not being a training centre or any other home used for the detention of children charged with, or convicted of, offences);

or

(b) who has, pursuant to the request of a guardian of the child, been placed by the Minister in a children's home established by the Minister, or the care of an approved foster parent,

or any guardian of any such child, may request the Minister to investigate any complaint the child or the guardian may have with respect to the care or control the child is receiving with that person or foster parent, or in that home.

(2) The Minister shall investigate any complaint made under this section.

This amendment provides a right of appeal for children placed in children's homes and foster care situations. It is consistent with the philosophies in other clauses of the Bill to provide for children to have rights of appeal in situations that affect them particularly.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:

Page 33, line 38—After 'examination' insert 'may do so without the consent of a guardian of the child, and'.

New section 93 is a new provision which empowers a departmental officer or a member of the Police Force to take a child to hospital or a doctor when he believes that the child has been maltreated. This has been considered necessary to allow children to be medically examined following situations of apparent child abuse. Under existing provisions there is no such power, and a number of situations have been reported of medical practitioners refusing to examine a child because they claim they lack the authority to do so, or if they do so that they lack legal protection.

Since the presentation of the Bill in the House of Assembly, medical practitioners have advised that the provision as stated in the Bill does not give them sufficient authority to examine a child without the consent of that child's guardians. As new section 93 is an important provision, the Minister has agreed to seek a further amendment.

This will make it quite clear that, if a child is taken by an authorised person to a hospital or medical practitioner,

then that child may be examined and treated without the consent or contrary to the wishes of that child's guardian.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Opposition understands the need for this amendment and supports it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 36) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 August. Page 293).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I think that, in introducing this Bill, the Minister clearly indicated the main import of the amendments it contained, which have come about because of a need created by Western Mining Corporation. Western Mining currently holds an exploration licence in respect of the Olympic Dam area, and an application for a licence to cover the Andamooka opal fields has been lodged, but at this stage, and with the present state of the legislation, it would not be possible for the company to explore for minerals beneath the precious stones field.

The Minister said it was essential that Western Mining Corporation be allowed to drill in this area to determine whether further mineralisation occurs, and the Opposition agrees with that argument. In the main, we support the Bill now before the House.

It was very correct and right of the Minister to point out that the amendments which relate to the access that will be given to Western Mining do just that and no more. The amendments we are asked to consider will allow for exploration to occur; in other words, for a licence to be issued to that effect, but no further activity can take place other than that which is defined within the Act in the term 'exploration' and words which are contiguous to that particular word.

If Western Mining were to discover mineralisation below the precious stones field which it felt warranted production, and the Minister was of a like mind, the Minister does not have the power to allow that activity to occur. I believe that, quite correctly at this stage, a provision is being inserted in the Bill, if we agree to the amendments proposed, that would necessitate, before any production activity, concurrence with that decision by both Houses.

The Minister has pointed out quite correctly that, whilst there were amendments which would allow Western Mining to do exploration work, that does not extend to allowing it to do anything by way of production. This is in the particular area of gemstone fields. That requires activity by both Houses of Parliament. The Minister's own words may refresh his memory. He said:

> It should be noted that the amendment permits only exploration at this stage and that before a production tenement could be granted in respect of the subsurface stratum a further resolution of both Houses of Parliament is required.

I was simply recycling the words the Minister used in the second reading explanation. Perhaps that explains why he did not receive them as clearly as I hoped he would. The amendment also provides for the maximum term of an exploration licence, which is currently two years, to be increased to five years. The explanation given by the Minister that after an initial period of two years he may require a reduction in the area comprised in the licence does not really fully explain why he saw the need to increase the period proposed for such a licence to five years. However, I can surmise that, because of the scale of activity that may now be involved in the application at this present stage of mining technology, it is not unreasonable to allow a longer period for such a licence, while at the same time it is wise to provide for some curb on that time, which would allow the Government to have some control over what might occur during a five-year period.

The Bill makes several modifications to the Act of a more minor nature. One of them provides that companies will not be allowed to hold precious stones prospecting permits if we carry the Bill as it stands, because of an amendment contained within it. The reason given was that many companies have been formed by opal miners in order to circumvent the principle that only one claim may be held by one person. It would seem to be a sensible thing to be doing, and the Opposition would support that amendment. As a matter of interest, I checked on the New South Wales scene and discovered that a very similar provision has now been inserted in the legislation there. I think it is amendment No. 6 of 1981 in the relevant legislation in New South Wales. So, obviously gemstone miners have similar thoughts in different States, and there has been a need to try to curb the activity that was occurring in New South Wales.

Clause 9 of the Bill amends the provisions of the principal Act in relation to royalties. I realise that at this stage I am not allowed to refer to amendments which are on file, but I note that already it is not intended to proceed with the proposition put forward in the second reading explanation two or three weeks ago in respect to the differential arrangement that was proposed to operate in respect of royality. I assume that there have been what are sometimes called rumbles in the mining fraternity, and presumably the Minister has been asked to rethink that matter; I can understand that. The Opposition, while we are not able to talk about it, will indicate at the time when the Minister moves that amendment our feelings on that topic.

Clause 33 reduces from 30 days to 14 days the period within which an application for registration of a precious stones claim must be made, and it provides for certain other requirements about which I am not concerned. During any summing up that the Minister may make, I would appreciate it if he could explain why he sees a need to reduce the period from 30 days to 14 days. There may be a very good reason, but it is not apparent to me at this stage. That provision seems to be a little bit tough, perhaps on the surface, and the Minister may be able to explain the reason why that has occurred.

I mentioned earlier in my remarks that the Bill is concerned very greatly with the proposed activity of Western Mining. In order to satisfy myself, on behalf of the Opposition, that what the Bill actually does what it sets out to do, I contacted personnel from the Western Mining Company and also personnel from Roxby Management Services to ascertain their feelings about the legislation, to find out for sure that they had had a good degree of consultation and so on. I thought that reference to that in the Bill should have occurred, and I am pleased to report to the House that it has occurred. The information that I received from Roxby Management Services and also from the corporate body of Western Mining is that there were meetings with opal miners at Andamooka, for example, at which meeting representatives of Western Mining were present, together with officers of the department. There were discussions at officer level with officers of the department and officers of the W.M.C. Suggested amendment were circulated through the Chamber of Mines and opportunity for discussion was given, and then further amendments as a result of input relating to the suggested amendments were made. I am told that they were also circulated, and there appears to have been a good deal of satisfaction with those parts of the legislation that apply to Western Mining. I have not been able to check in the same way with the Andamooka

mining people. I would suspect that the member for Eyre has possibly had some consultation, and we would have heard loud and strong if there was some objection to the provisions contained in the Bill.

One thing mentioned to me by Western Mining which I found interesting is that Coober Pedy miners were consulted also. The member for Eyre would understand why I asked him how far Coober Pedy was from Andamooka. His reply to me was that it was 200 miles away or thereabouts. So, I assume that what has been done here is to try to look ahead and provide for the case which might occur concerning access activity through precious stones fields in other areas as well as Andamooka. Perhaps the Minister will enlighten us about that during any response that he may make.

The other matters that I would need to raise on behalf of the Opposition, having already indicated that we support the Bill, I think can best be taken care of during the Committee stage. That will leave the Minister time to respond, as I have suggested. There is one matter that I would bring to his attention in relation to caveats. The caveator does not seem to be given very much consideration in proposed new section 73b *(c)*. If there has been an application for registration of transfer or other instrument affecting a caveat which a caveator may have had placed on, he is expected to respond within 14 days or else, in simple terms, he, she or they have had it. It seems that that provision is a little tough: it is a very short time, and I think notification would normally go to a person by post. This could concern matters which involve considerable sums of money in relation to persons' interests in relation to a claim or claims. If the Minister felt that 21 days would be a more suitable time, I would be satisfied if he undertook that such a provision might be effected in another place. I do not wish to move it as an amendment at this stage.

It seems to me that it may be one of those things where 14 days was put down when 21 days might have been a more suitable time for the passage, bearing in mind that people involved in the mining sphere are often mobile and they might take some time to receive the notice and be in a position to respond to it. I raise this for the Minister's attention. In view of the arrangement that has been agreed to on both sides of the House, the other matters I would like to raise will be raised during the Committee stages. I indicate my support for the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The member for Mitchell inquired whether there had been any lengthy discussions. In company with the Minister and officers of his department, and the Andamooka representatives of the Western Mining Company, I attended a fruitful meeting with miners in the community at Andamooka and all but one person was in agreement with the propositions put forward. The proposition was to allow the mining company to further explore the Stuart Shelf. This was the aim. The Minister and I have been aware that the opal miners have very jealously guarded the precious stones prospecting areas since they have been proclaimed. In the election by which I came to this House, I was embroiled in a bitter dispute which took place in 1969-70, in relation to the plans of the then Hall Government. The then Minister, Mr DeGaris, had agreed to give a company exploration rights over an area at Andamooka. All hell broke loose in that part of the State.

When this proposal was brought to my attention by the Minister, I suggested that the best way to make sure that those difficulties did not arise again was for him, in his usual co-operative and understanding way, to discuss it with the people concerned so that there could be no misunderstanding. We had an excellent meeting at Andamooka. We had a very large gathering of people assembled at Coober Pedy, where we first met the Executive of the Miners and Progress Association. One or two minor misunderstandings were sorted out by the Deputy Premier, and we then had a most fruitful discussion at the meeting where there was some opposition to the proposals that were put forward. However, common sense applied and the overwhelming majority of people supported the proposition so ably explained by the Deputy Premier.

At that meeting and at the meeting at Andamooka certain undertakings were given that opal miners of both centres would be consulted before any exploration drilling took place. As the member for Mitchell pointed out, this Bill gives nobody, not even the Minister, the right to carry out any mining operations on a precious stones prospecting area, and those undertakings will be honoured. If that is the case, there can be no opposition from any responsible person or group. I support the Bill, and I thank the Minister for taking the trouble of entering into such a lengthy and fruitful negotiations with my constituents.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I am gratified at the speedy manner in which this Bill has thus far proceeded in the second reading debate. I am grateful for the co-operation of the Opposition. I hope the attendance in the House at the moment is no reflection on the importance of this Bill, because it is an important measure. Some matters addressed here are probably of as much significance to the economic future of the State as are those in any other Bill that has come before the House in recent times.

The member for Mitchell pointed out there could be no exploration on a precious stones field under the current legislation. There is a pressing need to discover what else is available on the Stuart Shelf, which extends under the Andamooka precious stones field. The opal mining community is a fairly close-knit group, even though geographically the three opal fields are not close, and it would be folly to proceed with any amendments affecting the opal miners if we had not consulted the miners at Coober Pedy. The remarks made by the honourable member are correct in relation to the conditions that obtain in relation to the precious stones field and the Bill seeks to allow for exploration in the first instance on a precious stones field. We believe that it is important that we know the mineralisation occurring, particularly in the Stuart Shelf in the Andamooka area.

The second point raised by the honourable member was the proposition that an exploration licence be extended from two to five years. I apologise if the second reading explanation was brief in explaining some of these points. The fact is that exploration is a fairly expensive business in this day and age, and some degree of security is required if people are to embark on very expensive exploration programmes, particularly in the outback of South Australia. It is true to say that exploration in this country is more expensive than in other parts of the world, certainly than in the North American continent. Exploration in the outback of Australia is considerably more expensive. It was felt that it was not unreasonable to extend the period, but we believe that, as most of the exploration licences granted in the first instance were for very large tracts of country, it was not unreasonable that after a period of two years there may be some requirement to reduce the area, as the company should then be in a position to concentrate on the areas of most interest ot them.

The royalty provisions are significant. In seeking to amend the Act we were cognisant of the fact that the royalties in South Australia tend to be low by Australian standards. We sought submissions, probably up to 18 months ago, when we first decided to consider the question

of royalty, and the Mines Department, at my instigation, contacted all the major mining houses seeking their views on royalties. We got as many differing submissions as mining companies.

After consideration we decided that we would make some fairly modest changes, and in the first instance we would upgrade royalties. By Australian standards the base royalty of 2½ per cent levied at the mine site was, as I suggest, low. We are in the business of attracting mineral exploration to the State, and it was pointless to indicate royalty levels which were high by Australian standards when in fact the level of mining in this State is low and has diminished over the last 10 or so years. The returns from royalty have diminished.

It was initially thought that a range of royalties would be appropriate. The only way to do this was to prescribe them by regulation, because circumstances vary from mine to mine. There was some difficulty with that concept in that it was submitted by mining companies that the royalty rates should be visible; in otherwords, they should be spelt out in the legislation. I am not unsympathetic to that view. Although what is proposed in the amending Bill gives flexibility, it also gives a degree of invisibility, which is, in the view of many, undesirable.

The honourable member has referred to amendments. The reason for the amendments is that when we finally get to that stage we will be opting for a degree of visibility which is not apparent in the amending Bill. There are some amendments which will be dealt with when we get to the committee stage. The honourable member raised the question of an application to register for a lease on a precious stones field after fourteen days when the current Act spells out thirty days. I understand that the present provision goes back to 1893, when communications were by horse and cart, or whatever means of contacting the Mines Department was then available. Nowadays, we have offices on every precious stones field, so it is really no hardship at all to expect people, after they have pegged a claim, to make the necessary application to register within fourteen days.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I was thinking of those prospecting new fields.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The field must be proclaimed as a precious stones field, and if a person is pegging a claim on a precious stones field there are officers on all of those fields. There is no hardship at all in suggesting that the period of thirty days is excessive in this day and age, when there are officers on site on the fields.

The honourable member's comments about strata titles were correct. Agreement was reached in relation to the strata title legislation. I think that there has been a history of unsuccessful attempts to negotiate strata title provisions. The files I have seen in the Mines Department indicate to me that all attempts to reach some degree of accord have failed. I am not familiar with all the details, but I have learnt since I have been in this House (for a good many years in Opposition, unfortunately) that it is a good idea when dealing with the opal miners to get a degree of support for what one is attempting. I think that is probably true of the mining community in general. We seek to reach agreement before we institute changes.

We did reach agreement after visits to the Andamooka opal field and, subsequently, the Coober Pedy opal field, (from memory towards the end of last year). Both meetings were an interesting experience. After meeting the Andamooka people, who will be directly affected in the first instance (as the member for Eyre has pointed out), we reached almost unanimous agreement; there was only one dissenter there. Later, at Coober Pedy about 400 people attended a public meeting and we gained a significant majority in favour of what we were proposing. I can assure the honourable member that the information he has is correct; although the Western Mining people did not accompany us to Coober Pedy, they were present at Andamooka.

I think the last point raised by the honourable member is quite reasonable. It relates to new section 73b. He suggests that the period of fourteen days seems a little short for notification. I concede that point, because we do live in an age when we have mail strikes and delays, unfortunately. If the honourable member wishes to move for the twenty-one-day period he suggested, I indicate that I am quite sympathetic to his point of view, as I think it is valid. I think I have covered the matters raised by the honourable member. I repeat that I appreciate the support shown for this Bill, because it is an important one which will significantly advance the interests of the mining industry and the community in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Royalty.'

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the Minister for the clear and concise answer he gave to the matter I raised during the second reading debate. There is now no need for me to pursue the point.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

Page 4—

Lines 16 to 23—Leave out all words in these lines.

Lines 31 to 33—Leave out 'at a place determined by the Minister being the nearest port or other convenient point of delivery within the State' and insert 'at the nearest port within the State or at some closer point of delivery determined by the Minister'.

After line 33 insert paragraph as follows:

and

(c) by inserting after subsection (10) the following subsection:

(11) Where, in the opinion of the Minister the payment of royalty at the rate prescribed by this section would render mining operations uneconomic, he may, on the application of the person liable to pay the royalty, waive payment of royalty, or reduce the rate at which royalty is payable, upon minerals recovered in the course of those mining operations.

I think I should explain to the Committee my reasons for moving these amendments. As I explained during the second reading debate, the original concept of prescribed royalties by regulation made them invisible in the first instance. We believe that it is highly desirable that mining companies are able to read the Mining Act and know as precisely as possible what royalty rates apply. It would require an amending Act to change those royalty rates rather than it being done by regulation, which can be done while Parliament is out of session and without direct Parliamentary scrutiny in the first instance. What this change is in effect doing is changing the royalty from the 2½ per cent royalty calculated at the mine head to a royalty applied to the value of the upgraded mineral, the f.o.b. royalty. In other words, 2½ per cent of the upgraded value of the mineral as it goes on to a ship or where it is dispatched. Of course, at that stage the mineral is more valuable, so the royalty is more. The last part of the amendment gives the Minister some discretion, because the last thing we want to do in South Australia is to apply a royalty which could make an operation uneconomic. I do not envisage that the rates of royalty that we are prescribing would do that in the normal course of events, but I have been told about a quite modest mining venture. I will not name the company involved, but I can say that it is in a country area and employs 70 people. The upgrading enhances the value of the product quite dramatically so that the royalty likewise increases significantly. The last thing the Government wants to do is to put in jeopardy that sort of mining venture. By the same token, we acknowledge that mining companies must be prepared to pay what we believe is a fair thing to the community at

large, because the fundamental principle inherent in the Mining Act is that minerals belong to the Crown, the Government or the public. It is a question of balance.

Discretion is necessary. In circumstances where the venture is on the borderline and the rate of royalty could jeopardise the operation of the mine, or even close it down, the Minister should have discretion. The last part of the amendment provides for that. We are upgrading the rate of royalty from the mine head to a more valuable product, the f.o.b.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You are not upgrading the rate; you are increasing the value on which the rate is struck.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is right. The mineral that is upgraded is more valuable, so that 2½ per cent of that more valuable commodity is a greater royalty return. We believe that that is a sound principle. It is essential that the Minister has some discretion, because we are not in the mining business in a big way at present. There are some small mines, and the last thing we want to do is to jeopardise their operation.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Opposition supports the amendment and appreciates the explanation given. I indicate that the amendment is somewhat easier to follow now that I have a copy: I received a copy of an earlier amendment which no longer applies.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 10 to 45 passed.

Clause 46—'Rules of Warden's Court.'

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

Page 15, lines 5 to 12—Leave out all words in the clause after 'amended' in line 5 and insert 'by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1a) The rules may prescribe and provide for the payment of fees in respect of the lodging of documents in the court, or the issuing of documents by the court.'

This amendment enables the Warden's Court to provide for the payment of fees.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (47 to 59) and title passed.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I take the opportunity at the third reading to indicate that the Bill as it comes to us at this stage uses the term 'an access claim'. This term will remain in the Bill and I point out that it is not defined anywhere in the parent Act or in the Bill before us. I would not be surprised if some problem arose about that in the future, and I leave it for the Minister to consider.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY OF PORT PIRIE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the address recommended by the Select Committee on Local Government Boundaries of the City of Port Pirie, to which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I wish to refer to some comments made in this House by the member for Fisher in the Address in Reply debate in relation to the proposed aquatic centre and the moneys available for that project. The honourable member suggested that I had tried to stir up a hornet's nest. On 20 August (page 510 of *Hansard*), the honourable member stated:

I would now like to refer briefly to some words uttered by the shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport in relation to the proposed aquatic centre and the moneys to be made available.

The honourable member went on to say that, instead of my supporting the aquatic centre, I had picked up an article written by an ill-informed gentleman, Geoff Roach, who also wanted to stir the possum. That is a journalist's right, he said. If the honourable member perused *Hansard* and looked carefully at what I had said on previous occasions, he would find that I have gone on public record in support of an aquatic centre. For the honourable member's information and for the information of the House, I quote from *Hansard* of 21 July 1981 (page 87), as follows:

Let me say first that I am not opposed to the concept of an aquatic centre. I believe that there is a need, a priority, for an indoor all-weather swimming pool of olympic size in this State. However, I question the manner and methods of the Minister of Recreation and Sport in relation to this decision to provide the bulk of the money from soccer pools revenue in regard to this particular project.

As I stated on that occasion, I have never been opposed to the concept of the aquatic centre in South Australia. I believe that this State sorely needs such a centre. I was very disturbed at the manner and the method by which the decision was made to provide $650 000 from the Sport and Recreation Fund from Soccer Pools for this project without any discussion with or reference to the Sports Advisory Council.

As a consequence, the Sports Advisory Council was quite angry with the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and indeed the Director of the Recreation and Sport Division, for what they believed was a snub against them in regard to not giving the Sports Advisory Council an opportunity to present a certain point of view and to advise the Minister in regard to the distribution of the funds.

The *News* writer, Geoff Roach, wrote several articles regarding this matter. I refer to one in the *News* on Friday 24 July 1981, headed 'Aquatic Centre row won't float away'. Mr Roach wrote:

Although Sports Minister Michael Wilson is hoping the issue of football pools money financing the Federal Government's election promised aquatic centre will die a quiet death, it won't.

Instead, Mr Wilson is currently facing the threatened resignation of two-thirds of the 15 members of his own Government-appointed Sports Advisory Council.

This follows a meeting last week in which, say the disgruntled members, Mr Wilson gave a 'totally unsatisfactory' explanation as to how and when the priority for the aquatic centre was established and why pools money was to be used for its establishment.

It will meet again on Monday when the resignation threats will become fact—unless Mr Wilson guarantees not only preservation of present programmes and some expansion into provision of coaching and administrative salaries, but full consultation with the Advisory Council in future.

The Sports Advisory Council is set up to advise the Minister on the distribution of particular funds and all aspects of sport and recreation. I think that they were justified in their anger and disappointment in regard to the Minister's not conveying to them at least the courtesy of advising them of the proposals relating to the aquatic centre.

Following this aspect, my comments and the article by Geoff Roach, the Minister met the members of the Sports Advisory Council. I am given to understand that this was the first time in 18 months that the Minister of Recreation and Sport actually met members of the council collectively. I understand that at this meeting an offer was made to the Sports Advisory Council that an amount of $200 000 would be made available to fund sporting administration and coaching salaries.

I venture to say, particularly for the benefit of the member for Fisher, that, if the sports writer for the *News* had not brought the matter to public attention and if I had not raised the matter in this House and publicly, the Sports Advisory Council or the sporting bodies would not have been the recipient of this additional $200 000 for sports administration and coaching salaries. If I had not publicly criticised the Minister for his actions, I doubt whether those actions taken in regard to that $200 000 from the soccer pools funds would have taken place. I think that the member for Fisher would be quite aware of that. He is the Government representative on the Sports Advisory Council.

Following the meeting with the council and the Minister, the council, at its next meeting, carried a resolution restoring or conveying its confidence in the Recreation and Sport Division. It was somewhat of a negative resolution, and I think that it was needed to restore some face for the Government. The resolution, I might add, was not unanimous. There were a number of dissenters. It still conveyed the disquiet of some council members with the Government's performance over a soccer pools fund and indeed sports funds generally in this State.

The sporting fraternity is very critical of this Government's performance in recreation and sport, and I believe that that criticism is quite justified. The Budget presented to us yesterday in this House indicates quite clearly that the Government has again not given the priorities that should be afforded to recreation and sport. It has performed rather badly in this avenue, and I believe that the Government needs to be condemned over its attitudes and many aspects of the soccer pools issue.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Rubbish!

Mr SLATER: The Minister can say rubbish to that, but I have not got the time to repeat the remarks I have made previously. However, I am pleased to see that the member for Fisher is in the House, because he did make comments that I believe were quite unkind and untrue, and I have made those available in this speech. I hope that both the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the member for Fisher will take the time to read the remarks I have made this evening. To be fair and reasonable about my attitude to the aquatic centre, I repeat again for their benefit that I have never been opposed to the aquatic centre in this State.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are you claiming credit for this?

Mr SLATER: I am not claiming credit for anything. I am saying that I have always supported the concept of an aquatic centre in this State. I have made known to the Minister and the public that I have been opposed to the manner and method of funding of the centre.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): In fairness to the Minister, persons on the Sports Advisory Council, in particular, and myself, I take this opportunity to reply to some of the comments that the member for Gilles has just made. I think that the member for Gilles was trying to make the point, as the shadow Minister, that, if he had not raised some of the complaints in the House, the moneys that were made available for certain projects, in particular sports adminsistration, would never have been made available or that the amount made available may have been less.

At no time has the Minister or I suggested there was not some misunderstanding when it was stated that $650 000 a year was to be made available for the swimming centre that some people thought that that was the major part of the money that would be available from soccer pools, because, until that time, most people thought that only $1 000 000 would be made available from soccer pools. Unfortunately for the people involved, including the member for Gilles, they did not know that the amount was going to be far in excess of $1 000 000. I think that the member for Gilles realises that far in excess of $1 000 000 will come into soccer pools in any one full year, so that $650 000 a year can be found from that area to go towards a swimming centre.

I do not blame the member for Gilles attempting to stir up a political hornet's nest if he thinks that is to his benefit as a politician representing a point of view opposite to that of the Government. However, I think the member should be aware that the vast majority in the sporting and recreation community are satisfied with the approach by and amount of money made available through the present Minister for Recreation and Sport, considering the circumstances that the State is in.

I know from sitting on the Sports Advisory Council that initially there was some disquiet, and that is not denied, because they were not aware of all the facts in relation to the money that was going to be available. The member for Gilles may be able to argue that it would have been wiser for the Minister or the Government to announce how much money was going to be available for the sports administration programme before he announced the $650 000 a year for the swimming centre.

That could be argued, but at no time up until then had the Minister said that the amount available for any section of the programmes that had been advocated by the Sports Advisory Council would be diminished. That had never been said, and no member of the Sports Advisory Council ever said that. The priorities set by the Sports Advisory Council had never been publicly stated, nor had the Minister said where he would place those priorities. When the Minister had time to look at all the priorities and at the amount of money that was going to be available in preparation of this Budget, he then made sure that the priorities of the Sports Advisory Council asked for, were, in the main, adhered to.

I can say that there was general amazement as to the amount of money made available by the Minister in each area in response to the Sports Advisory Council's recommendations. The $200 000 that the Sports Advisory Council received to go towards administrating courses is important to the sporting and recreation community. This was not picked up by the previous Minister or by the previous Government and, within two years of this Government being in office, it has implemented a programme for which the sporting people of this community had been asking for up to 10 years. It is important that they now know that they have money available for State organisations in those areas where they qualify to support administrators in the sporting field.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Or coaching directions.

Mr EVANS: Of course the coaching area is one that was in operation beforehand and it has now been continued. Better than that, it has been continued in a way that now can be improved. We know that in the area of certificates that are made available the Federal Government came in to pick up some of the areas that had been developed by the previous Government. We know that it was an initiative of the previous Government; we do not deny that. It was a good project and it is to the credit of the Federal authorities that they, too, have ventured into this field. For the member for Gilles to claim that the only reason the Minister made available $200 000 was that the member for Gilles raised the matter in this House before the Minister considered all the priorities requested by the Sports Advisory Committee, I say is hogwash.

The member for Gilles may be able to get some pride and joy out of it himself; he may be trying to con himself or get a little bit of status within his political Party. However, I say to him in all sincerity that that was not the case, and everybody on the advisory council knows that that was not the case.

Mr Langley: A lot of them got the sack.

Mr EVANS: I do not know about that, but I do know that, before the last State election, the member for Unley was on the council, and as a result of that election he automatically got the sack, but that is something he had to put up with as a result of the election.

This State lacks facilities, in particular, where national titles or competitions can be conducted. If the aquatic centre is one of the first facilities established in the State to make available for the swimming community those facilities, then I say good luck to them. Such a facility is a credit to the State and to the Government and to the Federal Government that the money has been made available. I know that $7 000 000 is a lot of money and it may be more than that by the time the centre is completed, when inflation is considered. However, there is no use in putting it off until the future, when it will be more expensive. The Federal Government made available $3 750 000, and it was up to the State to find the balance. The Minister said that the Government would find the balance, and it had the opportunity to find it through Soccer Pools, because there was more money coming in than we expected.

More particularly, with regard to a gymnasium centre, the Minister accepted the challenge in that field and the Government said that it would make money available for gymnasts to have facilities for development and where titles and competitions of a high standard could be conducted in an environment that was better for the competitors. That is also a credit to the Minister. As much as the A.L.P. might say that it was not a final decision by the advisory committee to the Minister, such a committee is there only to advise the Minister. There are other decisions that the Minister and the Government must make if the Government sees a different priority at some time. The advisory committee, in the main, provides guidance for the Minister. The committee does not direct the Minister. The gymnastic people are happy.

With regard to soccer, the member for Gilles would know that money has been made available to the soccer people to conduct their youth championships here and they will be able to develop their facilities to a greater extent. Admittedly, they do not have the amount of money they would like to have.

In the case of volley ball, the amount of money that volley ball has received over the past few years, is a considerable sum. That sport is one of the most rapidly growing sports in the State, along with net ball. That is to the credit of the administrators and the publicity officers who promote the sport. I know that when those people read the first announcement about the aquatic centre they had no indication of how much money would be made available and they wrote letters to all Parliamentarians expressing their disappointment. However, they did not ask the question first, as they should have done, about what money was going to be available and whether that was the major part of the Soccer Pools money. The Minister of Sport and Recreation understands both areas; he is sympathetic to both areas and he is making more money available in those areas than any previous Minister has ever made available. The Sports Advisory Council now know, following dicussions, where the Minister stands, and it is satisfied that the Minister is conscious of its needs, and conscious of what it is promoting. The Minister is working with the council 100 per cent, and I give the Minister credit for that, and I also give credit to the excellent Chairman of the Sports Advisory Committee. I ask the member for Gilles to give more consideration to what he says before he starts to condemn people.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I can assure the member for Fisher that I was on the Sports Advisory Council in exactly the same position. I got the sack, and the same will apply to the member for Fisher, as he will get the sack if there is a change of Government. What about looking after some of the junior clubs? Ray Stewart, the Chairman, was sacked by the Minister, and Don Houghton is a political appointment. Ray Stewart had the opportunity if he so desired to move away from being Chairman. He was non-political, and he was told that he could be on the committee. The Minister cannot deny that. I can assure the member for Fisher and the Minister that the junior clubs are not being looked after by the Government. One member said that we should not give assistance to junior clubs. Who needs the money and keeps sports going? It is the junior clubs of this State. They are willing to help with a 50/50 subsidy. The member for Fisher talks about the big organisations, when the main thing is that these young people need help. The appointment of the Chairman was definitely a political appointment. Ray Stewart was non-political, and he was sacked.

My appointment on the council was a political appointment, as was the appointment of the member for Fisher. The fact is that the council is not going too well now, nor is it going too well outside with the public, whatever the member for Fisher says. The Government is not doing too well, either. I listened to the Premier when he was in Opposition, and there is no doubt in my mind that he was the greatest knocker of all time when the Labor Party was in Government.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I am not worried about the member for Morphett. He is worried about the communists, but I am not one of them. He will learn as he goes along. The member for Morphett tried to get away with it the other day, but it did not work. I listened to the Deputy Premier when he spoke.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Ray Stuart was a great bloke; he did a good job.

Mr LANGLEY: I know, but you sacked him; you cannot argue that he got the sack. I have spoken to him since.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I am not worried about Mr Halbert. That was a political appointment. Mr Halbert was going to stand against me. Mr DeGaris and his people had him up there, but he did not stand. Whatever the Minister says, Mr Stuart was sacked.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I didn't know Mr Halbert was going to stand against you; I do not know what his politics are.

Mr LANGLEY: I know his politics, but that does not alter the fact that the Minister sacked Mr Stuart. The Minister will not make me digress from what I am saying. The Deputy Premier did get up and tell us of the happenings of the mining industry. I listened as he read off a piece of paper for about 30 minutes concerning this matter. There is an article in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 15 September that I agree with.

Mr Ashenden: Was it an article or advertisement?

Mr LANGLEY: Whatever it may be, it has never been so close to the truth since I have been in Parliament. I do not wish to digress. The Deputy Premier spoke about the mining industry. He said he wanted to do that to get it in *Hansard*. I am doing it to get it in *Hansard*, because Kym Mayes and I have been doorknocking in my electorate, and we know how you are going. I will not say what I said about the Premier to the Minister, because the Minister is not a bad bloke. You can always talk to him. I will quote this advertisement to get it in *Hansard* just to let people know just how this Government is going. It is headed 'A birthday message from the Tonkin Government'. When the Premier spoke at the Royal Show, it was a great day. He spoke on behalf of the visitors, as other Premiers have done.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Were you a visitor?

Mr LANGLEY: Yes, and it happened to be in my district. I go further and say that a former Premier, Mr Dunstan, spoke at the show. I know members opposite do not like him, but he used to win elections. On that day the Premier gave one of the worst speeches I have ever heard at the Royal Show. You can ask the Minister for Agriculture. He is not in this House, but he was at the show. There were several other members of the Government there, also. John Bannon was also there. The Premier gave a political speech at the show, and it went down badly. Then Senator Jessop got up and said, 'What a wonderful job you are doing as far as the water is concerned,' and I assure every member opposite—

Mr Ashenden: Did you speak?

Mr LANGLEY: I did not speak, and I did not want to speak. I would have liked to speak after the Premier spoke. When the Premier spoke at the function at Mount Gambier, he made a decent blue down there. He did not even mention Don Dunstan. How do you think he went at the Royal Show? The Speaker was there. The Premier forgot to mention that Mr John Bannon was there, and when that was mentioned he got more claps than the Premier got, I assure you. The Premier lost plenty of votes there. When you make a political speech you go bad. He gave a good recipe about the 1970s and the 1980s, and told them we would be better off in the 1980s. He said the farmers would be better off than they had been before. As far as I am concerned, farmers rely on nature. If they do not get the seed in, they do not do any good. The Premier said, 'We are sick, but don't give up.' Well, most people have given up and gone elsewhere. I assure members opposite that they are going bad. It will not worry me any more, as I am retiring, but I am still working and I have one thing in my favour. I assure you I will have plenty more to say on it—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 17 September at 2 p.m.