

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 1 September 1982

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

QUESTION TIME

HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say why people who have telephoned the Premier's special advisory housing hotline were told, first, that the Premier is unavailable, but more importantly that the rental assistance scheme, which features prominently in the \$2 000-plus advertisement in today's *Advertiser*, is not yet available? Can the Premier tell the House when it will be available, and can he further explain why he allowed this misleading advertisement to appear before all the details of the scheme were worked out?

Yesterday my colleague, the member for Mitchell, raised this very question, which, of course, was prior to the advertisement appearing today, to which the Premier in reply stated that although Federal funds would not be available until November, the State would be making funds available now so that the scheme could go ahead. This morning, three days before the Florey by-election, an advertisement was placed in the *Advertiser* reiterating that this aspect of the Government's so-called housing package and rental assistance scheme was available by way of calling this special advisory housing hotline. I have been contacted this morning by a number of people who telephoned the number which was given in the advertisement but who were distressed when told that they would have to wait yet again for further relief.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I heard the Leader of the Opposition this morning performing, I thought, fairly emotionally on the media, compounding the error into which he has fallen again this afternoon. I want to point out that, first, the whole purpose of the hotline is to make sure that people get the advice that they need. There was no doubt at all that because the Opposition had so disgracefully represented the situation, not only publicly and in the media but also, certainly, in some literature that it distributed in the Florey by-election campaign, it was necessary to take some very real steps.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I bitterly resent the activities of the Opposition, which is playing politics and preying on the fears and genuine concerns of people who are having difficulty meeting their interest repayments and their rental payments.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That has been exactly what has been happening. I repeat what I have said previously in this House: members of the Opposition should be ashamed of themselves for preying in that way on people and on their emotions; it was a disgraceful and disgusting performance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier please resume his seat.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: About time.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. They are tolerated under certain circumstances, but demonstrations by any member of waving pieces of paper are not acceptable. I give the honourable member warning that it will not be accepted again. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let us look at the so-called misleading facts to which the Leader has drawn attention. I am amazed that he has done this, because a member of his own staff took up a considerable time with an officer at the end of the hotline this morning and his officer obtained all the details. I am convinced that, due to the dedication of the officers involved, the member of the Leader's staff was given all the details requested and given them with great accuracy. I am still not too sure what the Leader of the Opposition believes to be misleading about that advertisement. I repeat: every single fact which appears there is absolutely true; it is accurate, and there is no way that it can be refuted.

There was a particular problem, as I pointed out to the member for Mitchell yesterday, concerning the question of the rental component of that scheme, namely, that social security beneficiaries could well lose part of their entitlements that could have been reduced by the amount of help given.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You have just found that out?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That was something that I took up with the Minister of Housing, who, in turn, took it up with his Federal counterpart two weeks ago. The Minister of Housing put it on public record in a statement in another place on 24 August, and I refer honourable members to that statement. The Commonwealth Government has agreed that as of the Federal Budget night those entitlements will not be changed by any rental subsidy; I have already made that clear. There is no problem, and indeed, if honourable members are so concerned, let me say to the House that those people who have applied for rental relief, if they qualify, will receive rental relief from the date of their application. Therefore, I cannot quite see what the members of the Opposition are complaining about or why they are making a fuss.

All I can suggest is that they are determined, in some way or another, to continue to upset and cause distress to those people who are genuinely seeking assistance for their rental payments and mortgage repayments. That is the only thing that I can pursue. I am surprised that the member for Elizabeth is in the House as early as this. Normally he deigns to honour us with his presence a little later on, after the Leader of the Opposition has asked his first question. But it is delightful to have the member for Elizabeth with us. As I said yesterday, I would have thought that this was not a matter for politics. I would have thought that, with a scheme that is working to do so much good and to bring so much security and reassurance to people in the South Australian community, even members of the Labor Party would have wanted to be sure that everyone knew that it was available. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is complaining about that advertisement. That advertisement will reappear. At the present time it is scheduled to appear in the Friday afternoon edition of the paper. Also, it is scheduled on Sunday in the Sunday paper and it will be reinserted in the following weeks if it is considered there is an apparent need.

At the present time up to 100 people have made genuine calls and inquiries about the service so far this morning. They have asked about mortgage relief, rent relief and quite a number of other matters which have been covered. I am relieved that the Leader of the Opposition and his Party have given some prominence to the advertisement because I believe that, contrary to their aim, they have done the population a real service by drawing attention to the fact that the advertisement exists and thus stimulating people to find out what help and assistance is available.

This State Government has done more than any other State Government in preparing this scheme and getting it under way. It is the first in this field, despite what the

Leader of the Opposition said, and I am very proud of that fact.

LABOR PARTY PAMPHLET

Mr ASHENDEN: Does the Government intend to lodge a complaint to the Electoral Commission about the Labor Party pamphlet being circulated in the electorate of Florey, and in relation to the advertisement that appeared in the *North-East Leader* of today? I have been given a copy of the pamphlet which appears to contain at least two mistakes or distortions. I refer particularly to statements in the pamphlet concerning home buyer assistance and education. In relation to the article in the *North-East Leader*, I quote:

Now, unfortunately, South Australia is setting new records—record unemployment, record bankruptcies, and record increases in State charges and prices. Instead of flocking to South Australia, people are queuing to leave. And the efficiency of our education and health services is being threatened by State Government cutbacks.

I am advised that the Bureau of Statistics figures contradict completely the statements made in the advertisement about unemployment and people leaving the State. Also, as is shown in the Budget papers recently released, the figures are completely contrary to fact as regards health and education. Because of the misleading statements, will action be taken to have the matter rectified?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Unfortunately, there seems to be no regard for the truth in the election advertising that comes from the Australian Labor Party. Instead of witnessing the rather forced debating style of the Leader of the Opposition, may I suggest to the Leader that he stop debating and support either side regardless of whether it is the truth attitude, and that he get back into something like responsibility in Government because that, I understand, is what he aspires to, although he does not have much chance of getting there.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is the problem: this is not a debate. It is a matter of governing the State for the benefit and welfare of the people. The Leader of the Opposition may squirm and try to wriggle out of this any way he likes, but he cannot do that, because he is pinned down by the facts, and the facts are that there are distortions and untruths in the literature that is being circulated by the Australian Labor Party in connection with the Florey by-election.

Those untruths are quite easily demonstrated by reference to the records. We hear about a record level of unemployment, but the record level of unemployment in this State was 8.2 per cent under a Labor Government. Immigration has been referred to and, as the honourable member says, it is something that is said to be happening through people leaving South Australia and going to other States. The member for Newland only recently gave the lie to that untruth by putting on record in *Hansard* the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures and graphs that show that there is a net gain of population for South Australia and, indeed, there has been for some little time.

The statement regarding the economy indicated that there has been a net gain in both overseas and interstate migration into South Australia since the end of 1980, and nothing that the Leader of the Opposition can say will refute that. I have seen the pamphlet and the part that states, 'Unlike other State Governments—

Mr Hemmings: Go out and—

The SPEAKER: Order! I inform the honourable member for Napier that he may yet have that opportunity this afternoon.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The pamphlet states:

Unlike other State Governments, it [the Tonkin Government] has failed to assist home buyers in trouble.

That is further repetition and peddling of an untruth. The fact that the scheme is in operation has been widely publicised.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I assure the member for Elizabeth that I intend to publicise it far more in the future. As for the reference to continuing education cuts, if that means reducing the number of teacher positions in line with the high fall-off in numbers of pupil enrolments, let me say that, by making allowance for the teacher-pupil ratio, by making further sums available to ensure that that ratio does not suffer, does not constitute cuts, as the pamphlet implies.

I certainly do not intend to go running to the Electoral Commissioner as, apparently, the Leader of the Opposition has done in regard to these matters. These are simple facts, and the Opposition tends to indulge in misrepresentations of this kind. Members opposite distort the facts, and we have come to expect that from the Australian Labor Party. Whether anyone else wants to take further action is up to him, but I certainly do not intend to go running, whingeing, and whining to the Electoral Commissioner.

O'BAHN BUSWAY

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Transport say whether any of the Federal Budget allocation of \$10 000 000 for urban public transport in South Australia will be spent on the north-east O'Bahn experimental busway and, if so, whether that allocation will now provide an opportunity to conduct a full and public environmental impact statement on the O'Bahn route through the Torrens Valley and will not merely be a further addendum to the l.r.t. environmental impact statement? If not, where and on what projects will the \$10 000 000 be spent?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There is no need for a further environmental impact statement on the north-east busway. We have already had one, which was an addendum to the original l.r.t. environmental impact statement. Subsequently, at the request of the Minister of Environment and Planning, we reviewed that e.i.s., and the reviewed e.i.s. will soon be available. I will ensure that the honourable member receives a copy of that statement. The allocation of \$10 000 000 for public transport in South Australia will not necessarily be spent on the north-east busway.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what are the financial implications for South Australia of the rural assistance package announced by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Nixon) yesterday?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Members will be aware of the comprehensive package announcement by the Minister for Primary Industry yesterday and, in particular, as it is designed to apply to the drought stricken farmers of Australia, including, of course, those already in that position or those for whom it is pending here in South Australia. The initiatives contained in that package are most welcome and we believe that they will go a long way towards what has become a very serious national problem. The package came in two parts. First, it provides subsidies for interest payments on debts for the interest cost that exceeds 12 per cent, and I would not have to explain in this place the interest rates that prevail in the rural community as they flow from commercial lending authorities generally or from the stock

firm agencies in particular to indicate that there is a significant difference between the threshold of 12 per cent now announced and the real rates that apply.

The Government also provided a 50 per cent subsidy on the purchase of fodder for livestock, and that in itself will involve an enormous amount of money and, in turn, be of very great assistance to those who need fodder for their stock, more particularly breeding stock that it is essential to retain, and to those who have access to that fodder. The second factor associated with the Commonwealth's announcement related to general drought relief measures for carry-on finance, provision of water for stock, and for freight subsidies for the transport of fodder and livestock. The first \$3 000 000 of these measures in any one year is met by the State, with any costs above that figure being shared between the Commonwealth and the State on a 3 for 1 basis.

The Commonwealth, however, has suggested in its package announcement yesterday some very fundamental changes to that formula representing the Commonwealth-State agreement on drought relief. The four measures in the programme that the Commonwealth has suggested be changed, or added to the current ingredients, are proposed to be spelt out more clearly at a meeting of Agriculture Ministers in Melbourne next Monday.

In preparation for that, I draw the attention of the House to part of a telex that I received from the Minister for Primary Industry this morning. He identified these extra four measures in five parts. They would include the right for local government to sink bores in central locations for water for stock, with the authorities being reimbursed the full costs, and also costs of manning the bores where applicable. I do not believe, from advice received by the department and regional officers in agriculture, that there is going to be a great call on this particular factor in South Australia.

However, whether there is or is not, the Commonwealth, it appears, has, among other things, agreed to fund that function 100 per cent. It was also stated that the limits on carry-on loans would be raised to \$40 000 or double, whichever is the greater. The situation in South Australia is that we currently lend to individuals up to \$40 000, so our figure with respect to the loan limit is not proposed to alter (other than maybe in special circumstances), and we have agreement with Mr Nixon to deal with those circumstances on their respective merits. The Commonwealth will require that any money it makes available to the State for drought loans will be lent by the States at no more than 4 per cent interest.

It is in this area where, albeit an enormous contribution by the Commonwealth is at hand, in South Australia we will be making a significant contribution, both financial and in kind. We will, indeed, be subsidising to a degree the interest rate formula which has been laid down by the Commonwealth to apply to each contribution. There is no way that we can have two levels of interest rate applying to one area of difficulty or to one section of the community. In view of the announcement in that respect, I believe that South Australia is now locked into a 4 per cent interest rate to apply to loans, whether they be partially or totally sourced from the Commonwealth.

The fourth item in the telex schedule involves an interesting subject, one which I believe, when relayed to the community at large, will be most welcome. The Minister states:

Other States should implement carry-on loans to small businesses in drought declared areas under the same conditions that currently apply in Queensland.

I have not yet had the opportunity to peruse the specific details that apply to the Queensland system. It has been signalled to me from Commonwealth sources that we ought to do that very carefully before we become totally locked

into that system and have it apply in our State or indeed in the other States not yet involved. It is specifically an item which will be discussed, and appropriately so, at the meeting next Monday. On principle, it is a very welcome announcement.

Indeed, agents, storekeepers and traders in small country towns throughout the State are the first in the secondary industry or commercial field to suffer the impact of drought on the community at large. It is in that respect that we very much welcome the assistance proposed for the people at that level so that they can enjoy access to carry-on loans and interest rates comparable with those enjoyed by the primary producers they purport and, indeed, are obliged, to service.

The next item refers to a water cartage subsidy. It has been said by the Commonwealth to be 100 per cent recovery at, I presume, total Commonwealth cost. I do not know who at the Commonwealth level did their sums on that item (if they have been done at all), but that short statement, which will represent an enormous cost to the Commonwealth, will be well received by those who are bound into a situation of carting water from central points, established pipelines or other kinds of water holes throughout the country.

The final item cited in the telex refers to the freight subsidy on transport of fodder and livestock, to be set at 75 per cent. In South Australia we have, as a matter of practice, paid 50 per cent subsidy which, in effect, is a grant to primary producers forced to cart stock to and from agistment and forced to cart fodder to stock which they seek to keep on in the paddock during drought periods. To lift that to 75 per cent poses the question, 'Who pays the additional 25 per cent?' It reads as though the Commonwealth will, and we shall be setting out to see whether that observation will stick. Coming back specifically to the question raised by the member for Eyre (and it is an important question to all South Australians) I believe that the Commonwealth has made a massive contribution nationally to primary industry.

It ought not to be overlooked that the States which participate in that programme, and South Australia is one of those States, will be making a significant contribution of finance and time. In relation to the latter it is as obvious as a neon sign that Mr Allan Forrest, the present acting chief in my department which services this area of the community involving rural industry assistance matters, has with him a couple of field officers and a clerk, and they do an enormous job and have been doing so now for a number of years. With this greatly increased demand upon them it is obvious that some supplementary, albeit temporary, assistance will need to be given in that area.

I mention that specifically because that officer and his staff have for a number of years been responsible for field inspection, receiving, assessing and collating the evidence associated with every application for loan finance involving the rural community of South Australia. They have done an incredible job and I am grateful for the support I have received from those officers. I thank the member for Eyre for the question he has asked.

PETROL PRICES

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Premier state the Government's current policy on the fixing of petrol prices? Having recently carried out a small investigation into current petrol prices in the Iron Triangle area, I have found that the general petrol price varies considerably. In the city of Whyalla it is generally 44.9 cents per litre, in Port Augusta 43.8 cents, and in Port Pirie 43.5 cents, whilst at one service station at Crystal Brook selling a particular brand of petrol

and another service station at Port Pirie selling the same brand of petrol the price is 40.9 cents. I understand that the general price in Adelaide is about 39 cents to 40 cents a litre. On the figures I have supplied it appears that the people of Whyalla are currently paying more than 4 cents a litre than are people living in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The involvement of the South Australian Government in petrol price fixing is entirely at the wholesale level. There is no suggestion at all that there will be any extension of that policy nor any extension of the fixing of retail prices. As the General Manager of the R.A.A. said recently, the best thing to do when there are variations in prices such as has been suggested by the honourable member is for motorists to shop around to see what price they can get.

As the honourable member knows, there has always been a differential between country prices and city and metropolitan area prices, but those variations on many occasions bear little relationship to the actual wholesale cost price in those areas. I believe that the current situation is satisfactory. I also believe that the push by petrol resellers to increase artificially the price up to well in excess of 40 cents a litre has not worked. The general price at the moment is still under 40 cents a litre and I believe that that is the best way it can be applied at the present time.

I note that Mr Cain in Victoria has today instituted wholesale and retail price fixing for petrol. I can only say that that is a Draconian measure which will quite positively disadvantage a good number of motorists on the road as well as resellers and the oil companies themselves. Mr Wran in New South Wales, by putting on a special 3 cents a litre tax, has in fact put petrol up from being almost, I think, one of the lowest prices in Australia to being the highest priced petrol in Australia.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think the honourable member should do a little checking. I think he will find that in New South Wales country areas it well exceeds prices charged in country areas in South Australia. Mr Wran did that because he said he was denied at the recent Premiers' Conference \$38 000 000 that he expected to get from the Commonwealth.

He has put up a whole range of State taxation and charges including that 3c a litre for petrol, and as a result is getting over \$280 000 000 in return. It ill behoves members of the Opposition to complain about charge or tax increases which they maintain inaccurately that the Government has put on, when in fact their colleague, Mr Wran, in New South Wales has received \$280 000 000 from such increases since the middle of this year. No, there will be no change in the Government's attitude to petrol pricing at present.

Mr BLACKER: I direct my question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, which question is supplementary to the question just asked by the member for Whyalla. In the light of recent price variations in fuel in the metropolitan area, will the Government further examine the possibility of implementing a State fuel equalisation scheme as opposed to price fixing so that constituents in the non-metropolitan area are not disadvantaged?

Previously I have asked the Government, without obtaining a successful result, to investigate the feasibility of a State fuel equalisation scheme. As all members would know, the Federal Government is financing an Australia-wide fuel freight equalisation scheme. This has meant that the freight component of fuel pricing is confined to 0.4 of a cent per litre anywhere throughout Australia. During recent weeks there has been considerable discounting within the metropolitan area and prices have ranged from 37.7c a litre to 41.7c a litre. Many country areas have higher pump rates. In the area which I represent there is a pump rate of 44.7c

a litre, and in some cases it is higher, as has already been explained this afternoon.

As country people know that the freight component has been equalised, they are incensed that they should have to pay an extra 7c a litre, or nearly 30c a gallon, more for their petrol than some metropolitan users. Country people have expressed their concern to me as they believe that they are paying excessive rates in order to finance the discounting of petrol in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member's question was answered in part by remarks made by the Premier in his reply to the previous question, but I shall ask my colleague for a reply and bring down a report.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mrs SOUTHCOIT: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs inform the House of any assistance available from his department for businesses that are faced with massive increases in premiums for workmen's compensation insurance? One of my constituents is a painter and decorator and he has been in business for 20 years and has had only two claims during that time. He renewed his policy in May 1982 only after serious consideration at a cost of \$2 899 which was to cover two employees. On 15 July he received a claim from a company for a further payment of \$510, representing a 20 per cent levy for the new Act benefits to apply from 1 July 1982. The addition of this amount would make his payment for the year in excess of \$3 409. For the previous year he paid \$1 549, and for the year before that, \$784.

This man is not able to absorb these rises or to pass them on because of competition from registered builders who work on their own at much lower rates and who do not have to pay all the heavy overhead expenses. He believes that his only alternative is to dismiss his two employees who would then swell the ranks of the unemployed. My constituent's complaint is not with his insurance company; he attributes the problem to the massive compensations awarded in some cases by the courts and to the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I think it is fair to say in reply to the honourable member's question that concern about the jump in premium rates for workers compensation has been expressed by a large number of employers. I would certainly add to that my comments, namely, that I believe it is certainly one factor which is discouraging additional people being employed in this State. As the honourable member was not in the House when the relevant amendments to the Act were debated, I shall clearly spell out to her exactly what happened.

The former member for Mitcham, now Mr Justice Millhouse, as a member of this House brought in a series of amendments. I suppose they can be put into two categories. The first was to upgrade the lump sum payments for either total or permanent incapacity or part thereof, or for death. The other thing was to tidy up a number of sections of the Act where we believe the costs for compensation premiums have been very substantially inflated because of the nature of the administration and types of claims made and the areas that frankly would not be justified.

I point out to the member for Mitcham that it was her Party, the Australian Democrats, along with the Australian Labor Party, who, in the Upper House, decided to defeat significant portions of that amending Bill and as a result the costs of workers compensation in this State are higher now than they would have been if that original Bill introduced into the House had been passed. I have been fascinated by the fact that the Australian Labor Party has been very

silent, because they put forward amendments in this House that would have at least doubled the cost of workers compensation.

Mr McRae: Ludicrous.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It would have at least doubled the cost of workers compensation by the amendment passed by this Parliament alone.

Mr Trainer: How do you work that out?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I draw to the honourable member's attention the fact that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest the honourable member for Ascot Park have a silent discussion with the Minister on another occasion.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I would ask the honourable member for Mitcham that if she were to put pressure to bear on her colleague in the Upper House, the Hon. Lance Milne, to make sure that if similar amendments are brought into this Parliament and passed through to the Upper House that he will now support them.

Mrs Southcott: Will the Minister answer the question?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will come to the other points shortly. I think it is very important for the House to be fully aware that there were significant parts of that Bill defeated by the Australian Democrats and the Australian Labor Party in the Upper House. And if the subsequent amendments that were attempted by the Australian Labor Party, in particular, were passed the cost would have at least doubled by that legislation alone. There are four basic reasons for the jump in premium rates. The first is that the insurance industry throughout Australia has been running at a loss on workers compensation. That loss was 40 per cent last year and I can give the exact figures as to what the loss has been throughout Australia, but the figure runs to \$40 000 000 to \$50 000 000 throughout the whole of Australia. There has been discounting, or cut price premiums, offered by various insurance companies.

Because of those losses the industry is tending to return to a more stable situation. The second reason for the jump in premiums is the enormous escalation of wage rates in Australia over the last 12 months. Wages have gone up by at least 18 per cent, and, in some cases, by at least 30 per cent. Workers compensation premiums directly reflect increases in wages. So one can see that at least a 30 per cent increase in workers compensation can be attributed to the wage increases. Again, I find it interesting that here we have the South Australian Liberal Party and the Federal Liberal Government calling for wage restraint and yet we have a trade union movement and their political spokesman in the Australian Labor Party urging for higher and higher wages which has done so much damage to the Australian economy. So, I would ask the member for Mitcham to draw to the attention of her constituent the fact that the Labor Party has a policy of trying to escalate those wages even further, and I bring to her attention the fact that this Government tried to bring in wage restraints by amending the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act last year.

It was the Australian Labor Party and the colleague of the honourable member, the Hon. Lance Milne in the Upper House, who again defeated those measures. I hope that the honourable member brings that fact to the attention of the electorate. The third reason for the escalation in the premiums is that the number of common law claims and the size of the settlements have increased enormously because of Supreme Court decisions. One large insurance company in this State told me that the cost of covering common law claims has escalated from 7 per cent of its total cost of workers compensation to 17 per cent over a three-year period.

The honourable member referred to some of the large common law settlements that have been made. I stress that common law is not covered by an Act of this Parliament, as no doubt she would realise. I too have been concerned at the size of some of the settlements. I do not in any way wish to reflect on the judgments that are handed down by the judges of the Supreme Court, but I do know that some of the settlements have been particularly high. One judgment handed down by Mr Justice Millhouse was for \$305 000, which added considerably to the cost of workers compensation payments. My advice to the member for Mitcham is that, first, she should bring all of the facts that I have highlighted this afternoon to the attention of her constituent, and I will give her some background briefing to pass on. Secondly—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Give her some simple explanations for the Hon. Mr Milne.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, I will do that. Secondly, the honourable member should tell her constituent that, if he has one quote from one insurance company and has not been to other insurance companies, he should go to an insurance broker or at least shop around at other companies. There is no doubt that by shopping around it is possible to obtain lower premium rates.

Mr Hemmings: Is that the free market place?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The advice I have just given is good advice, because I know of someone who shopped around and consequently was able to reduce the premium rate by up to about 38 per cent. There are variations from one company to another. This matter is of concern, and I assure all employers in this State that they would be in a considerably worse position if the A.L.P. or the Australian Democrats were ever to get into government in the State of South Australia.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Health say what is the position in regard to the availability of beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre? An article in this afternoon's press, referring to the Flinders Medical Centre, states:

Some operations are being delayed by up to six months at Flinders Medical Centre, because of an acute shortage of beds. Appointments for non-essential surgery are being postponed, with orthopaedics, ear, nose and throat, general surgery and ophthalmology the worst hit areas.

The Administrator said:

We have reached a point where the demands on the place are exceeding our capacity to deliver. If we had another 100 beds, I could fill them immediately.

I have other evidence that there has been comment in the community from constituents that there are problems at the Flinders Medical Centre in this regard, and I have been told that a small number of beds that are not being used at present could perhaps be made available. It has been put to me that there may be some benefit in the Flinders Medical Centre's diverting some of its patients to neighbouring community hospitals, such as Blackwood hospital and similar hospitals, if those hospitals are able to accommodate those patients. Will the Minister say what is the position, to her knowledge, at two major hospitals, Royal Adelaide and Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can certainly assure the honourable member and all other members that there is absolutely no shortage of hospital beds in the Adelaide metropolitan area or, indeed, in South Australia. In fact, this State has a higher ratio of hospital beds per head of population than have other States, and by the Australian average, by accepted national standards, and by international

standards, we are grossly over-supplied with hospital beds in this State.

That is why the South Australian Health Commission is presently developing a hospital plan to ensure that there is a rationalisation of hospital beds in South Australia and also to ensure that all members of the population have equitable access to hospital beds in their geographical area. It is of great concern to me to read that waiting lists for elective surgery are building up and that patients' operations are having to be deferred. Certainly, there is no reason why this should occur. While there may be pressures on Flinders Medical Centre, there is certainly unused capacity in the operating theatres at Royal Adelaide Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

In addition, as the honourable member has said, there is unused capacity in the community hospitals that serve roughly the same geographical area as is served by Flinders Medical Centre, and a large number of operations are being performed in teaching hospitals that would be more appropriately performed in the community hospitals. Certainly, if a person wants a high-cost operation (a high cost to the taxpayer), the person has the operation in a teaching hospital. If one wants a lower-cost operation at an appropriate level of care, the place to have it is in a community hospital.

It is important to realise that, if hospital facilities were provided at a level that enabled immediate access for those who were wishing to have elective surgery, the entire hospital system would be totally inefficient and the burden on the taxpayer would be unbearable. In the case of Flinders, it is worth noting that the Repatriation Hospital on Daws Road is to reopen a ward. This will have an effect on Flinders Medical Centre, because currently some repatriation patients receive surgery there, so that proposal should relieve some of the burden on Flinders.

In addition, the Health Commission has advised Flinders that it is free to open the 24 beds not yet commissioned at the centre and that it has the capacity within the allocation in this year's Budget to do so. The centre has not responded to the commission on this option, which is a viable one. I should also add that the Health Commission offered, in June this year, to fund a management consultancy to assist Flinders Medical Centre in the management of its beds.

To summarise, there is no reason why any patient should have surgery delayed. The hospital has the capacity to open additional beds. There is unused capacity in surrounding hospitals and in other teaching hospitals, and the Government and the Health Commission look very much to the management of hospitals for a responsible attitude to ensure that all patients are cared for as soon as possible, and it may not necessarily be in the hospital where they first come for surgical treatment.

SPRING GULLY PARK

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say whether sheep are still grazing in Spring Gully Conservation Park, whether this is with the Minister's permission, what is the Government's policy generally in this matter, and whether he is grateful to me for having inadvertently in part protected him from the press in this matter?

Quite some time ago, when I was in Clare, some people approached me about stock grazing in the park, and on my return to Adelaide, I inquired and was told that from time to time, in very restricted circumstances, stock had been allowed into the park to graze grass that otherwise might dry off in summer and put at risk certain stands of native vegetation.

Accordingly, when a while ago the A.B.C. rang me to ask what I knew about grazing in the park, I said, 'This is an old one, it is a story that has been recycled—I would not worry about it too much if I were you.' My phone continued to ring and the estimates of sheep involved increased by a factor of 10 with each subsequent call. Eventually, as the Minister knows, in the course of private conversation I took up the matter with him. This is a serious problem. It is clear that the matter has arisen in recent times, possibly leading the A.B.C. to think I am on the Minister's pay-roll instead of being a member of the Opposition. I would round off my question by quoting from a letter sent to the Minister, to you, Mr Speaker, as the member for Light, to people in the media, to the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia and to me. The Mid-North Natural History Group's letter states, in part:

As most of our members are farmers or members of farming families in the Lower and Mid North, and as we are all members of rural communities, we are well able to appreciate the extent of this problem and its effects on individual farming and pastoral enterprises—

they are talking about seasonal conditions, and the letter continues:

But it is also obvious to us that a decision such as this is of no benefit to the farming community as a whole. Even if grazing were allowed in all parks only a few individuals would benefit, and this would be at an immeasurable public cost in the degradation of the parks.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am aware of the matter which the member for Baudin has raised in the House, and he has had discussions with me on this matter. The honourable member would realise that for a considerable number of years license has been granted to enable sheep to graze in a certain section of the Spring Valley Conservation Park. In fact, I am told that, when the decision was made to allow that to happen, it was seen as a management tool involving fire management in certain sections of the park. That has been going on for some time.

I was approached by officers of my department who expressed concern about that practice continuing, and I decided that the practice would cease. However, because of drought conditions this year, when I was approached to consider whether that area of land which had previously been leased for grazing would be made available again this year, I agreed that it would be, and I took up the matter with officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Unfortunately, there was a misunderstanding, and when the sheep were brought back into the park they were not retained just in the area that had been previously licensed: some were allowed to get into a larger part of the park. That matter was soon brought to my notice and I took immediate action to have the sheep brought back into the licensed area.

I have requested a number of reports from my department to ensure that that is still the case, the latest request being made yesterday. I have been given an assurance that the sheep are back in the area that was previously grazed. I am aware of some of the concerns expressed by conservation bodies and other people. However, I believe that if they had understood the situation as I have indicated it to the House (that the section of land—the 90 hectares—on which the sheep are now being grazed was previously licensed) they would understand the situation. Many people have not bothered to find out and have gone off half-cocked again about this issue. Because of drought conditions, it is my intention to enable grazing to continue for this period, but, as I have indicated previously, it is not my intention that it should continue under normal conditions. It is not my intention to widen the practice in any way, shape or form to enable grazing to take place in other national or conservation parks.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs state unequivocally that under the Workers Compensation Act an injured employee can receive treatment from a chiropractor and be reimbursed in full for all fees and expenses incurred? I have been approached by a constituent who was the victim of a motor vehicle accident on his way to work in March this year. Among other injuries, he suffered whiplash. After visiting his local medical practitioner, he was referred to a specialist, who was unable to provide relief from the pain he was suffering in the neck region. He then went to a chiropractor in early April. Since then he has received some benefit from the treatment provided by the chiropractor.

The fees for the services of the chiropractor are such that my constituent was embarrassed by the account with which he was presented by the chiropractor. He has been told by the chiropractor that if he received a letter from his general practitioner as a referral the fees would be acceptable by the insurance company.

As I understand it, section 53 (1) of the Workers Compensation Act refers to a certificate obtained from a legally qualified medical practitioner 'together with an assertion in the prescribed form that the workman believes himself entitled to compensation in respect of that incapacity and thereafter [payments] shall be made on the days on which but for the incapacity the worker would have been paid wages'. However, the amendments passed recently by Parliament affecting section 59 authorise a person to consult a registered chiropractor. I have checked with an insurance company in relation to payment of these fees, and I have been informed that its interpretation is that section 53 (1) conflicts with the newly amended section 59. I therefore seek an assurance or explanation from the Minister on what can be done to assist my constituent by covering him for workers compensation when using the services of a registered chiropractor.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this matter, because I think there has been some confusion about the exact position. Someone else has raised this matter with me, and I am at the moment having the matter fully investigated. My understanding of the situation, which I think from the advice I have received so far is the correct interpretation, is that if a person is injured at work he needs to go to a medical practitioner to obtain a certificate and, as the honourable member quite rightly indicated, it is section 53 of the Act under which that certificate is issued by a medical practitioner. However, as part of that treatment, if a person who is injured and has received a certificate should in fact go to a chiropractor to receive that treatment, he does not require a referral from the medical practitioner to visit that chiropractor. I want to make that quite clear. The amendments spell out clearly that there is no need for a referral from a medical practitioner.

However, the chiropractor is not able to issue the certificate under section 53 of the Act but section 59 as amended would allow a person to receive treatment from a chiropractor and for that treatment to be in fact a compensatable expense, provided, that the certificate under section 53 is a valid certificate and accepted by the insurance company and the employer or, if that is disputed, by the Industrial Court. I will check again the details supplied by the honourable member, but from what I can see, and I have had that confirmed by my department, there is no problem: any treatment from a chiropractor is compensatable under the Act as now amended.

There could be some dispute on the level of fee being charged by some chiropractors. There are certain acceptable levels of fee, and one or two chiropractors could be attempt-

ing to charge a higher than acceptable fee that may then be disputed. I think that is a quite separate issue. It is a matter which needs to be taken up urgently with the Chiropractors' Association and particularly the insurance companies to decide what is an acceptable fee for compensation.

LIVE SHEEP LOADING

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Marine undertake to investigate the provision of salt water pumps to wash down wharves after the loading of live sheep at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor? After the loading of live sheep at any wharf, a considerable mess is left on the waterfront, and the Marine and Harbors Department wharf staff do a commendable job in cleaning up this mess. However, their method is to use the fresh water stand pipes provided along the wharf face. This, of course, over the years uses thousands and thousands of litres of fresh water, and that seems to me to be a ridiculous situation in the driest State in the driest continent, particularly in a drought situation. We have the greatest source of water alongside the wharves—the sea—and the provision of salt water pumps for this job would save much fresh water and perhaps bring down the water rates.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, I would be pleased to have that matter investigated for the honourable member. As he knows—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Typical of his good suggestions.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Indeed, I could not put it better than the Premier. It may well be that we will soon have a diesel engine spare, as the member for Semaphore realises following our visit to the Marine and Harbors dockyard this morning. I will certainly look at the question to see whether we can use that or any other means to institute the method he suggests for washing down the wharves.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MARKET GARDENING INDUSTRY

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I move:

That, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a joint committee be established as a matter of urgency to inquire into all aspects of the market gardening industry in South Australia with particular regard to—

- (a) wholesaling and retailing of produce, including the question of growers' markets; and
- (b) the need for technical assistance to the industry, including the proposal for a vegetable research institute.

Members will recall that I moved this motion last year in private members' time and, indeed, on the final day of the sitting of the third session when it came to a vote it came closer than any other motion from this side of the House to possibly succeeding, with the motion going to a casting vote from the Chair. That indicated the support for the motion from a number of quarters, and I thank members who did support it, including the member for Flinders, representing the National Party. I believe that he appreciates the problems facing the market gardening industry in this State.

It was a pity that the Minister of Agriculture chose not to be present in the Chamber to actually vote against the motion. He chose to be outside the Chamber and had himself paired off rather than actually stand in the Chamber and put his feet where his opinion was. I know that many market gardeners in my district, and I am certain there must be many in the district of the member for Goyder,

are particularly anxious to know exactly where the Minister of Agriculture stands on this matter.

I move the motion again because I believe that the issue has not gone away and that the problems to which I referred previously still face the market gardening industry. Having spoken in the House a great deal on this matter, I do not wish to canvass the material that I have already canvassed in previous speeches made since I entered this place in 1979. However, I do refer members to those speeches and suggest that, if they wish to restudy the material, they should take a look at those speeches. The information I present this afternoon will for a significant part be new information.

The motion indicates, as the previous motion did, that there is not simply one problem related to the market gardening industry, but that it is in fact a multi-faceted problem. Part of the problem concerns the actual manner of wholesaling market garden produce and is itself divided into two sub-problems. One relates to the present operations of the wholesaling outlets, predominantly through the East End Market and through direct sales to supermarkets, with a much smaller proportion going through the North Arm market. The second problem relates to the price reporting mechanism for the sales that actually take place.

Then there is the other side of the question, which relates to the production level and involves improving the technical assistance available to the market gardening industry so that a better product can be produced for a lower price and so that producers can compete more reasonably with interstate produce and also achieve a more stable return for their efforts. I shall refer again to that point in a moment. In regard to the price reporting mechanism, I refer to some figures that were made available to me by a market gardener from the district that I represent. I have receipts of a series of sales to a merchant made in January by the market gardener concerned and her husband. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it, a statistical table referring to the prices paid to my constituent and the prices quoted at that same time in the daily press.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can give the assurance that it is purely statistical?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

TOMATO PRICES (glasshouse)

Date	Price quoted	Price paid
6.1.82	\$2-\$5	\$1.50-\$4
8.1.82	Most sales \$3-4 best to \$6	\$1.50-\$3.50
11.1.82	most \$3-4 \$2-\$5	\$2.00
15.1.82	best to \$6 most \$3-4 \$2-\$6	\$2-\$5
	best to \$6 odd \$7 most \$4-\$5	
	ripe and full color \$2-\$7.50	
22.1.82	\$2-\$6	\$2-\$5
25.1.82	\$2-\$6	\$1.50-\$5
27.1.82	\$2-\$5	\$1.50-\$4
29.1.82	\$2-\$4	\$1.50-\$3.50

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I thank members of the House for their concurrence. The table refers only to tomatoes produced in glasshouses, and it lists the range of prices paid to my constituent for produce sold on eight separate occasions in the month of January this year. The other set of prices listed are those which appeared in the *Advertiser* on the following day (in other words, the reported prices obtained by growers on the days in question on which my constituent sold

produce). Members will notice that there is a significant discrepancy between the prices quoted as being received by market gardeners and the prices actually received by the market gardener who provided me with her dockets.

I appreciate that arguments can be put forward about the quality of produce supplied by my constituent and about whether or not in fact it was of a high quality. It is for that reason that I have included in my table a range of prices from the lowest reported to have been paid to the highest reported to have been paid. Indeed, it is significant that on five of the eight occasions in question my constituent received a lower price for her produce at the lower end of her produce in terms of quality than the price listed in the *Advertiser* as having been paid to others. If those figures do not convey a message, maybe another way of looking at them would be to work out the impact upon the income available to growers had the price quoted been received instead of the actual price they were paid. In that regard, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it, another table that is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

INCOME FROM TOMATO SALES

Date	Actual Income	Income if quoted price received	$\frac{B}{A}$
	A	B	
	\$	\$	
6.1.82	117	142	121.4
8.1.82	94	148	157.4
11.1.82	88	169	192.0
15.1.82	153	183	119.6
22.1.82	101	108	106.9
25.1.82	120	138	114.5
27.1.82	72	78	108.3
29.1.82	32	37	113.8
	778	1 003	128.9

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: This table, referring to the same dates as those in the first table, shows the actual income received by my constituent (taken from the dockets that she provided me with) so that one can see the amounts paid and what they were paid for. In the second column an attempt is made to calculate what income she would have received had the prices, as quoted in the *Advertiser*, applied. The third column represents the ratio of the second column to the first; in other words, how much extra the grower could have received had the quoted price actually been paid. The table provides information concerning those eight occasions in question. On those occasions my constituent received \$778 for the sale of glasshouse tomatoes. Had the price as quoted in the newspaper been actually received, my constituent would have received \$1 003, which represents an increase in income of 28.9 per cent.

To clarify the table for the benefit of members when they have had the opportunity to see it, I shall refer to one example contained in the table to indicate how I arrived at my calculation. Therefore, members will be aware that I did not deliberately seek to mislead. For example, on 8 January my constituent sold 11 cases of semi-ripe first grade tomatoes for \$3.50; five cases of first grade ripe tomatoes for \$3; nine cases of semi-ripe second grade tomatoes for \$2.50; six cases of ripe second grade tomatoes for \$2; and four cases of third grade tomatoes for \$1.50. In my calculations I have transposed prices as follows (members will be able to see whether I have been reasonable or unreasonable in my calculations): using the prices quoted in the *Advertiser*, I have assessed the 11 boxes of first grade tomatoes as being worth \$6; the five boxes of ripe first grade tomatoes as being worth \$4; the nine boxes of semi-ripe second grade tomatoes

as being worth \$4; the six boxes of ripe second grade tomatoes as being worth \$3, and the four boxes of third grade tomatoes as being worth \$2. That is how I arrived at the figure of \$148.

Owing to somewhat cryptic reporting of the last four dates referred to in the *Advertiser* columns, I would estimate that the income that should have been received for sales on those last four dates is underestimated, and that the percentage figures in the third column show that.

To my mind, those details are quite conclusive evidence that the price reporting mechanism is in need of overhaul. I have suggested that the price reporting mechanism should be monitored by some independent body—independent of merchants and growers—so that it can provide neutral opinion about the prices that have been obtained by both groups; and, secondly, that inasmuch as the stock market gives details of quantities alongside each actual price paid, so should the price reporting of the market gardening produce. In other words, when the price table indicates that, say, \$5 was the upper range, we should be told how many cases were actually sold for \$5, and when it indicates that \$2 was the lower range, we should be told how many were sold for \$2, so that we can actually see what quantity of produce changed hands at each level.

I believe that the use of a very simple coupon system could provide us with that information. I acknowledge that there could be a danger of mistakes arising due to a bureaucracy being established to handle this matter and it is for that reason that I call for a select committee to examine the best means of providing decent price reporting.

As well as price reporting, for some time I have been calling for forward projections of price and demand and supply with regard to market garden produce. Members would know that very often there are marked fluctuations in the price that obtains for not only market garden produce but also for other produce. The Italians in Rome have been able to develop a system that analyses short-term future trends in the market gardening industry, measuring the estimated supply that will be coming into the market in the short term against the estimated demand that will be made upon the market in the short term. Thus, growers can be provided with a reasonably accurate analysis of the price trends that may occur, so that they know how to determine how much to take to the market on each day.

That is with regard to the price recording system. I will now turn to the actual income that obtains to growers. In other speeches that I have given I have said that there is an important need for a growers market to be established to act as a relief valve for the industry. I believe that if such a market were established somewhere between 15 and 20 per cent of growers produce would be wholesaled or retailed through such an outlet. The actual percentage that would finally be determined would depend upon the extent to which growers felt they were getting a fair return from either the East End Market or from sales direct to supermarkets by private contract. As they felt they were getting less from those avenues so would the proportion of sales made at the growers market go up and as the merchants and supermarkets came and gave a better deal to the growers so would the proportion of the growers market go down. So it would be a safety valve that would float between two percentages. Of course, it would also fit itself into the hierarchy of shopping outlets, as I have said on other occasions.

One of the points that is made by greengrocers and by merchants is that they have costs to pay and, also, they have to deal with the problem of wastage. They say that they have to pay rent on their shops, they have to pay utility costs, and that they cannot sell waste products that are damaged in transit or products that have been supplied to them that are of a poor quality on the bottom of crates. By storing products in a shop, some of them will perish. Of

course, that is certainly true and I acknowledge the fact that they have to have reasonable financial recompense for that. The other point that seems not to be recognised sufficiently is the costs that pertain to the grower. The growers do not simply go out at the start of the season spreading seed in a flippant way like some Johnny Appleseed and then hoping that good fortune and circumstances will result in their achieving bountiful crops.

They have to do a lot of work and spend a lot of money. I have had it put to me that the actual cost of production, excluding labour, of a case of tomatoes from glasshouse production will work out at about \$5 a case. That is excluding the actual labour input they are putting into it: the economic value of the labour they put into it. Well, how much of the money is available from the sales to the grower? I have two examples, backed up by receipts from merchants, paid to a market gardener in my electorate; again, they refer to tomatoes. May I just make this one point: I am talking about tomatoes by way of example but the same point could be repeated for cucumbers, capsicum and other products that are produced by market gardeners. On 18 August my constituent sold a total of 81 cartons of tomatoes and received \$196 for them. The prices ranged from \$1.20 per case for 32 cases up to \$5.10 per case for 15 cases. If one then applies the prices quoted in the *Advertiser* as to the amount tomatoes sold for at the Central Market and how much the consumer would pay for those tomatoes, one finds that the produce sold by my constituents would have netted considerably more.

Now, I cannot do the analysis against all of the individual prices indicated on the receipts, but I have taken the medium semi-ripe tomato as being at the top of the range, which is as they are on the docket, and the 32 boxes of bulk tomatoes being the bottom of the range. If one takes the semi-ripe tomato, the grower achieves an income of \$51. They were sold at Central Market outlets for \$150 if sold according to the prices quoted in the *Advertiser*. That indicates that there was a \$99 potential surplus available on those semi-ripe graded tomatoes. I say potentially available because one has to delete the losses that would have been sustained. Even if there had been a 10 per cent loss due to wastage or damage their would still be a significant price available to the merchant and the shopowner. Indeed, of the income received on those 15 cases, according to the prices quoted for the Central Market sales (remember they tend to be between 10 and 14 per cent cheaper than the prices obtained in supermarkets, for example) the grower received 34 per cent of the total income. If one does a similar calculation for the 32 cases of bulk tomatoes the grower only received on that occasion 24 per cent of the total amount received. The bulk tomatoes would have received from retail consumers \$160 and yet only \$38.40 was paid to the grower.

To take another date as an example, if members think to choose one date in isolation is unfair, if one takes 23 August, my constituent sold 100 cases of tomatoes receiving in total \$340, an average of \$3.40 a case. Remember that the estimated cost of production is \$5 a case, so she was losing money. Of the 26 semi-ripe top grade tomatoes there was a total potential revenue, if one applies again the figure from the *Advertiser* for the Central Market sales, of \$247. Of that, \$156 was paid to the grower leaving \$91 for the growers, merchant, shop owners and waste. Now that gave a very much better return for the grower of 63.2 per cent of the income. Let us look at the bottom grade, the bulk tomatoes. Of the 31 cases, they would have returned an income of \$186, of which only \$37.20 went to the grower leaving \$148.80 for the merchants or shopowners. In that instance only 20 per cent of the total revenue from those bulk tomatoes actually went to the grower. The other 80 per cent was to pay all the other costs of the merchant or shop-

owners. Out of the 20 per cent the grower has to pay the seed costs, the fertiliser costs, interest rate costs on loans taken out for storm damage (and members know how significant that has been for market gardeners), plus of course there is supposed to be some money left over from that to pay some wages to actually provide an income for market gardeners.

It is quite clear from the figures available that there is very little income left over. Just to clarify the matter for members when they do read the speech, the prices I am quoting are as listed in the *Advertiser* for both of those dates and listed in the section under 'The Market Place' (referring to the prices at the Central Market), on 18 August the prices quoted were between 50 cents and a dollar per kilogram for tomatoes and on 25 August between 60 cents and 95 cents.

The situation, I believe, is desperate. I have had numerous contacts with growers in my electorate to know the very real financial problems that they are going through. They try all sorts of outlets to achieve an increase in their income. They try and sell produce interstate, which is a very hazardous enterprise. I have had some examples quoted to me, and quite frankly the examples I am going to quote to this House are among the worst of those provided to me; they are the more dramatic ones, but the others still tell a very sorry tale. These figures relate to November 1980, when on 26 November one grower sent 129 cases of tomatoes of various grades to Melbourne and received a total of \$111.90.

Actually, I misled the House: that was the price that was paid for those tomatoes. However, the merchant then subtracted \$85.14 for freight, handling charges and inspection charges which left, for the 129 cases, \$26.76 to be paid to the grower, a price somewhat less than 21c a case. Remember, the estimated production cost for tomatoes is \$5 a case. Admittedly, in 1980 the production cost would have been somewhat less, but it certainly would not have been \$4.80 less. The other example was in relation to 57 cases of tomatoes that were sent to Melbourne: they brought \$49.20, from which the merchant deducted \$37.62 for fees, netting \$11.58.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: What caused that?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I will come to that in a moment. In fact, the result was a decrease in the return per case to 20c a case. Admittedly, that was a very bad time and, as I said, I am giving the very worst examples, to remind honourable members in this place that all is not good news for market gardeners in any manner of speaking. There are remarkably few examples of good, profitable operations that can be quoted, although there are some. On that occasion the wholesale fruit merchant was led to indicate to my constituent the reason for the very poor returns. He stated:

I have been selling tomatoes for the past 22 years. In all my past experience, this is the first time I have not been able to sell tomatoes at all at any price asked for.

In effect, some were sold for 70c a case. He further stated: I sincerely hope that this will be my last experience of this nature. It is a great shame that I have paid back these prices for Adelaide tomatoes. I trust and hope that you understand. Do not think that I have made any money. Not only have I lost a lot of money but also there are the worries and the exceedingly hard manual labour put into the tomatoes that you should take into consideration as part of my loss, too.

I feel a little sorry for the merchant, but I certainly feel very sorry for my constituent, who undertook a great deal of hard manual labour and who had a lot of worry in producing those tomatoes. The interstate market is one market that some growers have tried. However, it has been a somewhat capricious market for local growers and the returns have not been particularly good for most growers most of the time.

I believe that if we do not consider the state of the market garden industry seriously and offer it the support it deserves

we will lose that industry. In most cases, at present, market gardeners are not able to sell out, because land prices are not particularly high and, in many cases, they could not get back the money that they owe in loans of one sort or another. Should there be an upturn in the real estate market (and hopefully there will be in the years ahead), many of the market garden allotments will go the same way of those in years gone by—they will be carved up for real estate subdivision, because they hold a capital asset that will bring a capital profit, even if the growers cannot get an income profit from that land.

The result for the consumer will be less production space available in South Australia to produce those products, which must mean, finally, hefty increases in prices and heavy reliance on interstate produce. One might even venture to suggest that there may be reliance on some of the Queensland tomatoes that travel so well that one can bounce them like a rubber ball. In the long term there will be disinvestment in the industry as growers sell out for real estate subdivision. In the short term, the prospect that faces many growers is to take their land out of production. In many circumstances, growers are not even meeting recurrent costs. There is no reason for them to produce at all. In many cases, they would be better off leaving the land fallow and finding other means to raise the interest bill on the property. It is for that reason, I suggest, that a significant proportion of market gardeners have to work at a second job to see them through.

So the products that are available from South Australian resources to consumers will decline significantly in the years ahead if something is not done. I do not believe that much is being achieved by trying to forestall my request for a joint committee into the whole industry. We need that now. If the Minister could come to the party and agree to that now, members from both sides could sit down and seek opinions from the entire industry (not only from growers but also from merchants, greengrocers, supermarkets, and the poor hapless consumer), to try to work out what is to be done. My suggestion does not predetermine the solution that should apply but it outlines a way to find a solution that satisfies all of us.

Finally, this action would provide us with some opportunity to investigate what other countries do to provide technical assistance to the market gardening industry and which of those ideas could be translated into the South Australian experience, remembering that market gardening is one of the few areas of agriculture, albeit a very significant proportion of total production, for which no specialist research institute is available to investigate the way in which it can be improved technically and agriculturally. I call on members to support the motion, and I hope that they do so. I hope that we do not have to go to a casting vote situation once again, and I also hope that members of this House will allow the matter to come to a vote much earlier than June next year.

Mr RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION STAFFING

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I move:

That this House calls on the Minister of Education to undertake, as a matter of urgency, a study of the ways in which the concepts of 'needs-based staffing and funding' could be implemented successfully in South Australian schools by the Education Department.

I am aware of the pressure in regard to agenda items this afternoon and that this section of the Notice Paper must be dealt with by 4 o'clock. Accordingly, I seek leave to continue my remarks on this motion.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STREET TRADERS

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I move:

That by-law No. 10 of the Corporation of Adelaide relating to street traders, made on 5 August 1982 and laid on the table of this House on 10 August 1982, be disallowed.

By-law No. 10, proposed by the Adelaide City Council, substantially increases the fees for all street traders within the city of Adelaide, but in addition it proposes to allocate three additional sites for pie carts, one at the western end of North Terrace, adjacent to the Morphett Street bridge, another in Light Square, and another in Currie Street opposite the Topham Street car park.

I am seeking a disallowance of the regulations, because I believe very strongly that it is a miscarriage of justice that the proprietor of the pie cart in North Terrace, Mr Oram, has been the victim of unjustified harassment by the Adelaide City Council, based on unfounded and unsubstantiated complaints by other business proprietors. In the circumstances, he has been denied natural justice, because he has never been formally advised of any specific complaints and has been given no opportunity to make any formal submissions or to answer any allegations that have been made against him by any other ratepayer of the council.

I have noted with interest this afternoon that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation has brought down a report. The committee has taken some evidence but I note that it has resolved to take further evidence and to invite the Lord Mayor, certain elected members of the council, and the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide to have further discussions with the committee. I welcome that move and believe that the council's actions in relation to the increases in fees, the restriction of trading hours, and the offering of alternative sites are all designed to place the proprietor in a position where he cannot continue to operate in a financially viable way and eventually may have to close his business.

The issue of the pie cart on North Terrace has been one of long standing. It has been operating on that site since October 1971. Previously it was operated by the present proprietor in King William Street. In a business of this nature, location and trading hours are the all-important factors. He is completely reliant on passing trade. In 1980 the council sought to restrict the operations to from 6 p.m. to 11 p.m. on the present site, but the council did intend that the proprietor move the stand to an alternative site in King William Road after that time.

Mr Oram sought an injunction in the Supreme Court on this matter, claiming that it was extremely difficult to relocate during peak business hours. Indeed, it would take him an hour or so to shift the cart from North Terrace to King William Road and resume business. One thing that intrigues me is that, as far as I know, that injunction has never been discharged and the move by the council in the new by-law aspect is no doubt made to circumvent that injunction.

The reasons why the move was made in 1980 are the same presumed reasons why the move has been made recently to close the pie cart at 11.30 p.m., and they were based on complaints by other businesses nearby, namely, the Strathmore and Grosvenor hotels. Acting on information at that time, Mr Oram engaged, at his own expense, consulting engineers Peter Maddern and Associates, to ascertain whether the complaints were justified. Mr Maddern subsequently issued a report to Mr Oram and I will quote from that report. It is fairly lengthy and I will not take up time by reading the whole of it, but it is a very comprehensive report and shows conclusively that traffic was by far the most substantial contributor to external noise heard in the room.

The consulting engineers established themselves in a room at the Grosvenor Hotel, with microphones and monitors, to determine the noise level, and, as a result of that determination, a comprehensive report was issued. It gives times, comments, and measurements of traffic noise or noise of any other nature, and it proved very conclusively that most of the noise coming from North Terrace was associated with traffic noise and other factors. I think it is also significant that this report states:

The generated noise on the measured night was far too low to infringe any noise legislation.

In addition to the consulting engineer, Mr Oram employed another private consultant, a private detective, I think, to locate himself on the opposite side of the road in North Terrace also to determine whether any of the noise emanated from the pie cart. I have not that report with me but I have seen it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: A private detective?

Mr SLATER: A private investigator. Mr Oram engaged him, again at his own expense, to locate himself opposite the pie cart in North Terrace to view matters connected with the claims being made by the hotels that all the disturbances were associated with the pie cart. I think that this private investigator took submissions on two nights and viewed the scene. As a consequence, his report indicated also that most of the noise emanated from traffic and other noises. If we adopt the principle of closing businesses after 11.30 p.m. simply because patrons attend a particular business, we would be closing every coffee bar and pizza bar in the metropolitan area.

As I have said, I believe that what has been done is a particular injustice and I am pleased that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is taking further evidence and is prepared to look at the matter in greater detail by getting further information. In any situation where business relies on trading after certain hours, there is no doubt that from time to time people will congregate who have been enjoying themselves, perhaps elsewhere, but it is certainly not the fault of the proprietor of the pie cart if those people have indulged in intoxicating liquor elsewhere. That may have even been on the premises from which the complaints are coming. It could easily be that the noise emanating from the pie cart could be from previous patrons of the very hotels making the complaints. If not, there are plenty of other entertainment places in the general locality, such as discos and night clubs, that are open in the early hours of the morning.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It may be noise from here.

Mr SLATER: Politicians who patronise the pie cart could be unjustifiably regarded as being some of the patrons said to be unruly, but I doubt it. I am pleased that the Minister of Transport is in the House, because after those complaints were made by the Grosvenor and Strathmore hotels, the State Transport Authority or its officers, the railway police, I believe, gave an account of certain incidents associated with Adelaide Railway Station. I believe that there were certain incidents that may or may not be attributable to patrons of this pie cart. Anyway, the State Transport Authority gave information to the Adelaide City Council, but the major complaints came from the Strathmore and Grosvenor hotels and the evidence taken by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation shows very clearly that they have been the only complainers. There have been no general complaints from the community on the matter.

Mr Evans: And no survey was done by the council.

Mr SLATER: No survey was done by the council to justify those complaints. That is where justice has been denied in this matter. I would have assumed that the Adelaide City Council would not just accept complaints by ratepayers and hotels but that it would at least give Mr

Oram the opportunity to answer those complaints and, indeed, undertake an investigation to prove whether they were correct or otherwise. The council did not do that. Meetings were held involving Mr Oram and his solicitors, and the Adelaide City Council and its officers, but they all came to nothing. Most of the discussions were in relation to his acceptance of an alternative site. The three alternative sites mooted are not suitable. Location and trading hours are the key to it all.

I believe that the proposed by-law No. 10 is an effort by the council to close the pie cart on the basis of unjustified complaints. The fees set by the council have been increased quite substantially for all street trading stands in the city of Adelaide. However, in relation to the North Terrace pie cart, fees have been increased from \$2 526 to \$6 120 a year. This sort of increase applies generally to street trading stands. I understand that the system was changed by the council last year in order to determine the fees on the basis of turnover—not profitability but turnover. It is interesting to note also that for the alternative stands proposed the fees are substantially lower: for instance, for the Morphett Street and North Terrace sites they will be \$2 550 a year, and these people will be able to operate from 6 to 6.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It's not very handy for us, though.

Mr SLATER: It is inconvenient for the majority of people in Adelaide. I do not think it is a good site. Mr Oram would not accept it because he has been in the business and knows that he would not make a profit (in fact, he is likely to go broke) down there. People operating at the Light Square and Currie Street sites will be allowed to trade from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. if they get a starter, which they have not yet got, and their fee will be \$4 080 a year, which is substantially less than that charged (on a turnover basis) to the proprietor at the Adelaide Railway Station.

Let us look at the figures for July in regard to what has happened. A trading profit of \$23 000, according to Mr Oram's accountant, will be turned into a loss of some several thousand dollars. The July figures show conclusively that that is what is happening. His total sales for the month were \$11 759.65. Purchases were \$7 408.58, which gave a gross profit of \$4 351.07. Operating expenses totalled \$6 423.07, and subsequently he suffered a net loss of \$2 072 that month. That is the first full month of operation on the new trading times. A large percentage of the business is done after 11.30 p.m. The important thing about all this is that it is a travesty of justice as far as not only the proprietor but also the public is concerned.

Members may recall that some months ago I presented a petition to the House containing 5 000 signatures. Those signatures were collected in only four or five days. That indicates clearly that the public of South Australia want to retain the pie cart and the hours under which it previously operated. That petition indicated very clearly the public response to this matter. In addition, the pie cart provides a unique and distinctive service for Adelaide people after normal trading hours. It is patronised by shiftworkers, police, taxi drivers and ambulance officers, who all welcome the opportunity to obtain food and drinks at a reasonable cost. The retention of the pie cart should be considered in the public interest as well as in the interest of the proprietor.

Indeed, the Adelaide City Council has inhibited and restricted its operation to such an extent that the proprietor cannot afford to carry on on the basis of a loss of \$2 072 a month. I point out that a considerable capital investment has been made in the pie cart. There are operating expenses involved, and approximately \$44 000 is invested in a capital value of the pie cart. That includes \$6 000 to \$7 000 in the supply truck and a further \$10 000 in storage and back-up equipment. Only in the last few months the proprietor

installed new refrigerators and equipment in the cart. A substantial capital investment is undoubtedly involved. Already he has had to retrench three or four employees. As a consequence, jobs have been lost.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Casuals?

Mr SLATER: One was a casual and the other was a full-time employee. He is not able to now employ anybody full time. He is open only from 6 p.m. to 11.30 p.m.—five and a half hours. I repeat that I hope the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation will make every effort to resolve this matter satisfactorily on behalf of not only the proprietor of the pie cart but also the public.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 August. Page 742.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Tourism): The Government would certainly want to examine all proposals that might be put forward in relation to the Licensing Act. The Minister has already given an undertaking that this Act is in the process of review, which will take some time. I believe it would be inappropriate to move in any one direction at this stage before that review is completed. That is not to say that the proposal of the member for Whyalla does not have any merit but rather that it would be inappropriate at this stage to alter the legislation when it is in the process of review.

If I recall correctly, when the Licensing Act was last before the House on the question of Sunday trading, a general undertaking was given that no more alterations would be made to the Act because of the proposed review and that the views members expressed at that time and, indeed, on this occasion, would be taken into account by the Minister when the review was conducted. I believe I speak for all members on both sides of the House when I say that the questions raised by the member for Whyalla are of deep concern to us all. As a responsible member of the community, I want to ensure that under-age drinking is most rigidly controlled and that we protect young people and, indeed, the whole community from the irresponsible actions and consequences of such actions of under-age drinkers.

At the same time, I believe that the most appropriate way to undertake initiatives in this regard is to scrupulously examine the whole area and seek the views of everyone who could possibly be affected by any decisions taken in this regard. I am sure that the honourable member would know that, as Minister of Health, I am terribly concerned at the possibility of under-age drinking having adverse effects on young people, in respect of both developing bad habits and poor attitudes to alcohol in the informative years and the possibility of carnage on the roads which can result from it.

I am concerned also about the difficulties we are facing in overcoming the situation and the need, I believe, to develop more effective education programmes. The honourable member may not be aware that the Health Commission's health promotion services are currently conducting surveys by way of preparation for a campaign directed at the 15 to 25 age group in regard to alcohol. I know now of his interest in this subject and I will be happy to provide him with further information on that.

Having said all that, I think that the wisest thing to do is to await the outcome of the review and to have the whole question of licensing and controls on the consumption of alcohol debated by the House in the light of that review. I

can assure the honourable member that the Government takes this issue with the utmost seriousness.

Mr Max Brown: How long will that review take?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I cannot answer that precisely, but I know that the Minister of Consumer Affairs regards it as a matter of high priority. I believe that action is in train and I would think that the most accurate answer I could give would be to say that I would expect the outcome of the review to be brought before the House some time next year. I thank the member for Whyalla for his contribution, but the Government cannot at this stage support the initiatives that he is proposing.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE HOUSING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lynn Arnold:

That this House calls on the Premier to release the report into Government employee housing.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 748.)

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): The report referred to in the motion is from a committee called the Committee of Inquiry into Government Housing of Government Employees. It is currently before Cabinet and is under active consideration by it. It is quite inappropriate for Cabinet to release a report while it is still under consideration. Therefore, I have to state that we have no intention of releasing it until Cabinet has made some decisions on it.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STUDENT COUNSELLING SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lynn Arnold:

That this House calls on the Minister of Education to ensure that student counselling services are available as an element of staffing additional to direct teaching appointments at all colleges of technical and further education which provide adult Matriculation courses.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 755.)

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I will respond briefly to this motion and say that I oppose it, not because there is anything substantially wrong with the suggestion made by the member for Salisbury, but simply because in the majority of cases the requirements which he is stipulating are being met by the Department of Further Education.

The member for Salisbury is asking that we ensure that student counselling services be made available additional to direct teaching appointments at all colleges which provide adult Matriculation courses in South Australia. At present the Department of Technical and Further Education has nine student counsellors located at colleges throughout the State, including Croydon Park College of Technical and Further Education, Elizabeth Community College, Kensington Park college, Marlestone college, O'Halloran Hill college, Panorama Community College, Port Adelaide Community College, Regency Park Community College and the Whyalla College of Technical and Further Education.

In the current year we are providing adult Matriculation courses at 12 colleges, but those 12 colleges do not necessarily conduct very substantial adult Matriculation courses. In some cases they are minimal, and of those in fact only five conduct a full-time programme, with four actually offering

it in the classroom mode. Those colleges are at Elizabeth, Kensington Park, O'Halloran Hill, and Port Adelaide. We do have adult Matriculation courses also on offer through the Distance Learning College, that is, the open college, and it is believed that in the latter case a student counsellor would not be necessary since there is already at the open college a one-to-one teacher-student relationship and in fact any counselling is part and parcel of the very personal relationship between the lecturer and the Matriculation student.

I can, however, assure the House that although we already provide nine counselling services in the State, whereas we have 12 colleges offering Matriculation studies, we are quite prepared to give an assurance that all colleges which are offering a full-time adult Matriculation programme in the classroom will have a student counsellor located at the college to provide student counselling services and that that student counsellor will be in addition to direct teaching appointments.

As I said at the outset of this debate, there are instances where colleges may in future be added to the existing number of colleges, where courses may be further reduced at some of the colleges, and it is quite possible that services may be so minimal as to make it simply not practicable to offer a student counsellor. For that reason, while I oppose the motion, I point out that the matters addressed by the member for Salisbury have been largely attended to by the Department of Technical and Further Education.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT (REPEAL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 August. Page 753.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): The Bill has been introduced with the object of total repeal of the Alsatian Dogs Act, with the consequent impact that the provisions of that Act has on the breed as we now know it in South Australia, namely, the Alsatian or German shepherd. They are magnificent animals; they are able to think like a human being in many ways, and they adapt very well to training. It has been a long-time wish of mine to one day be a proud owner of a German shepherd.

Unfortunately, for good reasons or otherwise, the German shepherd has attracted an unfortunate name in connection with livestock. This has been brought about by the irresponsible mismanagement of owners. The whole crux of the matter and the debate about which this Bill revolves relates to that aspect alone. If owners were responsible, looked after their dogs and made sure that they were not roaming on other people's property, the need for such a provision would never have arisen.

Mr Hemmings: Just like any other breed.

Mr BLACKER: Yes. Unfortunately the German shepherd, being a large animal, attracts attention. One might think that one has seen a German shepherd crossing a paddock half a mile away, but the animal could just as easily have been a Labrador, a border collie, an ordinary collie or any other dog, any of which has the ability to destroy stock if it is so inclined.

The whole aspect of the Bill puts me in rather a dilemma because of my love for the animal. My in-laws have a German shepherd which is a champion dog and which has been through its five grades. The dog topped its particular class in the obedience school where it was trained, and its owners have a row of trophies and ribbons of which any owner would be proud. It is probably because of my knowl-

edge of that one dog that I have a soft spot for German shepherd dogs and, as I have said, in the near future I would like to be the proud owner of one.

Unfortunately, people in pastoral areas do not share my view, and there have been accusations that the German shepherd dog will cross with a dingo. Such a suggestion has been hotly refuted, and I would not argue with that, as I accept the opinion of those who would know more about it than I and who have been able to prove that German shepherds do not mate with dingoes. Nevertheless, when I was at the Moomba gas field I saw what was purported to be a dingo. If it was not a German shepherd which had been allowed to go wild, I would be very surprised, because it carried very striking similarities to a German shepherd. A man there said, 'There goes a dingo.' My reaction was to ask, 'Where is the gun?' He said that they did not keep guns up there as they believed in looking after the wildlife as well as everything else around. I made the comment that maybe he would not be the best of friends with pastoralists, and he agreed that pastoralists were not in favour of dingoes being allowed to roam wild in the relatively safe surrounds of the gas field.

I feel for the pastoralists in that regard, because there were dingoes there that were virtually hand fed. Certainly, they were provided from time to time with water from artesian bores which are allowed to fill a pond specifically for the purpose of watering livestock and, in this instance, dingoes.

There is an adverse effect in regard to the whole Bill. Every pastoralist becomes fearful for his livestock when there is a dog on or around his property. For that reason the pastoralists, through their producer organisation, the United Farmers and Stockowners, have maintained and reaffirmed the stance that they will not budge in their attitude towards the Bill. Because of the stock situation and the needs and requirements of pastoralists in this instance, I, too, must oppose the Bill.

Mr Hemmings: What about Kangaroo Island?

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member has raised the point concerning Kangaroo Island. I do not necessarily oppose the Bill because of its effects on Kangaroo Island, because Kangaroo Island is a relatively closely settled area. I do not take up the challenge concerning the need for the isolation of Kangaroo Island. I believe that at one time not so many years ago people were not allowed to take German shepherd dogs when travelling west of Port Augusta. However, that restriction has now been lifted, and I do not think that any detrimental effect has been caused to anyone in that area as a result.

There are many German shepherd dogs on Eyre Peninsula. The only dogs that cause any strife are those that are allowed to roam, which mostly occurs near towns and cities, as they are predominantly town dogs, usually found with two or three other dogs. Sometimes there may be packs of larger numbers, invariably including a trained sheep dog, which will actually do the rounding up of stock with the less trained animals, often being house pets that have gone in initially to play with the sheep. However, invariably once such animals get excited they can easily turn into killers, even though the very same animals are quite devoted pets which are fond of members of the family and of which the family itself is fond. In many cases people would maintain that in no way would their dog ever round up sheep, but unfortunately it happens. In this instance I have no alternative but to oppose the proposal put forward by the member for Napier, and I do so in the interests of the pastoral industry.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): When the member for Flinders began speaking, I was rather delighted with his opening

remarks about his friendly German shepherd, but I was soon disappointed by his further remarks, just as I am disappointed about the attitude of the Government on this occasion. Admittedly, my expectations were not particularly high, because this is not a Government for which I have a very high regard: it is indeed held rather low in my estimation. In fact I hold the Government in even lower estimation than that in which it is held by the public, probably because I see a little more of Government members. As I have said, my expectations are not very great, but nevertheless the Government still manages to disappoint me with its attitudes. I just could not believe that a group of so-called intelligent human beings could adopt this attitude on this particular Bill.

How could a Government be composed of such rogues and fools as to oppose such a commonsense measure as this private member's Bill, which was moved by the member for Napier? I would not have believed it possible if it were not for the fact that I am witnessing this with my own eyes. Any opposition to the Bill which is genuinely based on the sort of arguments that have been put forward in the past, the traditional objections, is a foolish opposition. And only political rogues, charlatans and weak Party hacks would go along with those objections knowing them to be incorrect. In the past there have been three misconceptions regarding the German shepherd dog that have regularly been brought out to explain why they should be discriminated against. The original reasons for the Act that we are seeking to amend were based on, as Mr West pointed out in his recent circular to members, several serious misconceptions: (a) that the German shepherd dog poses a serious threat to stock; (b) that the German shepherd dog was likely to mate with the dingo; and (c) that the German shepherd dog, then known as the Alsatian or Alsatian wolf dog, was a domesticated wolf.

Fortunately, the Government has not quite sunk so low as for the members to raise the third of those three objections. We have not heard too much about it being a wolf in dog's clothing. But we have had the other two misconceptions brought out, not only in recent weeks regarding this Bill, but also regarding an earlier Bill in 1980, when the member for Napier and myself, along with several other colleagues, attempted to make another minor alteration.

I will return to those misconceptions in more detail later, because I think that that particular correspondence that was directed to members from Mr West, as President of the German Shepherd Dog Club of South Australia Incorporated, is well worth quoting from at some length. In 1980, the member for Napier, the member for Playford, the member for Whyalla and myself sought to make a small amendment to the Alsatian Dog Act. In attempting to amend that Act we spent two and a half hours trying to persuade the Government; two and a half hours to no avail. The Minister himself, on page 2120 of *Hansard*, expressed some surprise at our determination. Now, I cannot understand why the Minister should have said this:

If someone had told me that we were going to spend two and a half hours debating this legislation I would not have believed it. The Government is not prepared to accept this amendment.

And what was the amendment? We simply asked that the word 'Alsatian' be deleted and replaced by 'German shepherd'. Yet the Government was so opposed to that simple commonsense measure that we had to drag it out for two and a half hours, and in the end we did get it to accept one small alteration: that the words 'commonly referred to as German shepherd' be added to the Act. Politicians are not held in terribly high esteem in the community. I think, if the public knew about this sort of nonsense from the Government, we would be held in even less esteem.

Mr Gunn: You should—

Mr TRAINER: I will be coming to the remarks of the member for Eyre shortly.

Mr Gunn: I make no apology for what I said; none whatsoever.

Mr TRAINER: I rather hope that those remarks are recorded by *Hansard* for the benefit of all the German shepherd owners of South Australia; and there are quite a lot of them. The Government refused to accept a reasonable proposition on that earlier occasion and it seems that it is refusing to accept a reasonable proposition on this occasion, too. Some of the arguments that were put up are quite absurd. I recall that the member for Glenelg thought he could settle the whole debate by pulling out a schoolchild's dictionary and referring to that, as if somehow we should have lexicographical legislation. Some of the other remarks were also quite absurd. Members would have no doubt in their minds concerning the view of the grazing industry towards Alsatian dogs. The member for Eyre stated:

They are not liked. People are very concerned about what happens if they are allowed to stray around the countryside. There are certain groups that believe that there is a danger that they will cross breed with dingos, that their owners will not be able to look after them properly, and that they will run wild and ravage sheep.

The honourable member for Eyre said 'to ravage sheep'. I assume that the honourable member meant to say 'savage' sheep. This certainly brings up other possibilities. I think it would be a new type of animal husbandry; put it that way. We had the member for Mallee and his interjection, 'It kills sheep and it mates with dingoes.' Now that was the level of the members opposite to that debate. Really, they ought to hang their heads in shame over the feeble arguments that they put up at that time and the whole thing stemming, basically, from First World War prejudice. As the member for Napier pointed out at that particular time, he referred for example to legislation that was dealt with on 2 August 1916 referring to place names and enemy origins and how 64 places in this State had their names changed from German sounding names to either an English or an Aboriginal one. And it would appear that the owners of German shepherd dogs at the time, in order to protect the animals from this anti-German prejudice, decided that the dog would have a little more safety if it was referred to as an Alsatian; even though the area Alsace has no connection with the German shepherd dog whatsoever. But they attempted to protect the dog from the same sort of prejudice that has been expressed by the member for Eyre and the member for Mallee in that earlier debate.

The Government's attitude to this topic is not only illogical, it is politically rather silly, too. A close examination of the large number of German shepherd owners in South Australia tends to suggest that a large proportion of them are living in the outer metropolitan electorates. Very frequently young married couples, who reside in what we can refer to as mortgage alley out in the suburbs, have not got a very friendly disposition towards this Government anyway, and apparently the Government is seeking to antagonise them further by persecuting their dogs.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Now you are disclosing your motives.

Mr TRAINER: Is that really what the Minister thinks? Does his mind really run along the gutter like that?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You have just canvassed the subject in that direction.

Mr TRAINER: I am merely trying to point out the political stupidity of the Government. Here I am trying to be helpful but the Minister will not even accept my offer of assistance; that is how politically stupid they are.

Members interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: The member for Henley Beach has only got a majority of 1.1 per cent; he is gone anyway, and there is nothing you can say for him.

The SPEAKER: Order! We will get back to the Bill which is before the House. It concerns Alsatian dogs.

Mr TRAINER: Indeed, I prefer to think the Act relates to the German shepherd dog but under the current way the legislation is worded I will happily accept your ruling on that. The member for Mawson has made some comments recently that indicate—

Mr Schmidt: The member for Mawson has made no comments at all.

Mr TRAINER: That indicates that he is not hostile towards the German shepherd dog.

Mr Schmidt interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I missed that interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and we can do very well without any being called for.

Mr TRAINER: I would hope that the member for Mawson would see his way clear to support the Bill of the member for Napier in this regard and some of the other members on the other side representing non-metropolitan electorates, and that would include the member for Mount Gambier, the Minister of Education. I would hope that he would see his way clear to support this Bill submitted by the member for Napier, because logic is on its side. For some reason, it is only within Australia that German shepherd dogs are not looked on as being German shepherd dogs. They are not even looked on as being shepherd dogs. In Germany the sheep industry would pretty well fall apart without this particular beast to look after the sheep, yet somehow the beast changes its clothing once it enters parts of South Australia. It becomes a very dangerous animal that has to be persecuted. Why do members opposite persist with this line of thinking that sections of South Australia, and South Australia alone, out of the whole of the world, should consider this beast as some sort of diabolical creature and treat it with such prejudice and silliness?

Already, the dog has given some good service in areas of the State, in its proper occupation of looking after sheep. I would like to read into *Hansard* a letter that was addressed to the German Shepherd Dog Club of South Australia from Alwin Crafter, who currently is in a different occupation from that related to tending sheep. Nevertheless, as I will shortly relate, members will see the relevance of his remarks to this debate. He stated:

As Secretary to the Private Hospitals and Nursing Homes Association of South Australia Incorporated, I have been removed from farming and stockbreeding pursuits since 1977; however, prior to that date my lifetime had been one of continuous involvement in stockbreeding, including breeding and training my own sheep dogs, and during a decade in secondary industry I continued to run a Dorset Horn stud of 300-odd individually registered ewes for flock ram production.

On returning to full-time farming in 1972 running a Friesian dairy herd of 100 milking cows plus 50 replacement stock, along with around 100 head of beef stock and 300 to 400 sheep, I obtained a pure-bred German shepherd dog, which I trained to work in conjunction with my one remaining aged red kelpie.

The German shepherd proved to be a most intelligently adaptable dog capable of safely and reliably working all farm stock from bulls to sheep—including stud Dorset Horn ewes with lambs at foot—because by nature the dog was of gentle disposition; however, his size and weight caused him to be more comfortable working cattle for long periods than sheep, which require light, fast-moving, agile dogs under Australian conditions. This same dog was exceptionally attentive and well behaved with children, including visitors, and was an excellent and intelligent guard dog; numerous people can be called upon to verify these statements.

The German shepherd enjoys human company and tends to devote its loyalty to one person, but can and will embrace a family group. There is no doubt that the breed responds most favourably to kindness with consistent discipline and plenty of varied activity to avoid boredom—but this too applies to all breeds.

It appears that the absence or laxity of registration laws in the past allowed irresponsible owners to avoid accountability for their carelessness, and the breed has received the blame; more recently the introduction of several other large, active and apparently similarly intelligent breeds of dog confirms the fact that times have changed and archaic, discriminatory legislation against the German shepherd breed cannot any longer be justified in fairness and good conscience. I wholeheartedly support the immediate repeal of legislation discriminatory to the German shepherd breed.

Yours sincerely,

Alwin L. Crafter

One cannot help but agree with that. I cannot see what strange political logic makes the Government oppose something that is so sensible. If this Government refuses to accept the private member's Bill of the member for Napier, we can assure the House that a Labor Government (and that is now not very far off in the future) will not. What Mr Crafter has quite adequately described as archaic, discriminatory legislation against the German shepherd breed should be done away with. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Finance Act, 1936-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its purpose is to establish an adequate legislative framework within which statutory authorities in South Australia may borrow or enter into other arrangements for the financing of capital expenditure. To explain the reasons for the legislation, it is necessary, first, to outline the nature of existing legislative arrangements and recent developments in relation to the financing of capital works. Many of the Acts of Parliament creating semi-government authorities in this State give those authorities power to borrow. Normally, this borrowing power is subject to the approval of the Treasurer and any borrowings so made are guaranteed by the State.

In recent years, it has been common at both the Commonwealth level and in the States for semi-government authorities to obtain capital funds by means other than borrowings. Leverage leasing has been the main example, and this technique has been used in this State by ETSA for coal-mining equipment and by the S.T.A. for buses. The authorities concerned do not have an explicit legislative power to enter into arrangements of this kind but are able to do so because of their general powers and functions. Under current legislation in this State, these arrangements are not guaranteed by the Government.

On 24 June last, the Commonwealth Government announced changes in income tax law which have the effect of denying taxation benefits to financiers entering into leverage lease or similar arrangements with tax-exempt public authorities. At the same time, Loan Council decided to free electricity bodies from Loan Council restraints.

The practical effect of these measures is that leverage leasing and similar arrangements will become both less necessary and more costly so far as public authorities are concerned. For example, a proposal for a large financing of this kind to be entered into by ETSA for the northern power station will not now proceed. The Electricity Trust will now

be able to raise funds in a more straightforward fashion. In the Government's view, the changes made by the Commonwealth and by Loan Council in June are to be welcomed.

However, although certain kinds of financing, especially leverage leasing, will become less common, the raising of capital by means other than borrowings is still likely to occur from time to time. For example, at present, arrangements are being made for the Housing Trust to obtain the use of dwellings to be financed and owned by the Superannuation Investment Trust and the S.G.I.C. under a management contract arrangement. It seems likely that similar arrangements will be entered into in the future involving private sector finance. It is desirable, in respect of such arrangements, that the Government be able to guarantee the obligations of the statutory authority concerned. The Government believes that present legislation governing the capital raising of statutory authorities is deficient in three respects, each of which will be remedied by the legislation now being introduced.

First, although the Treasurer's approval is required for borrowings to be made, it is not required for other financing arrangements which have the same purpose and effect as borrowings and which can be very large. We believe it would be appropriate for the Treasurer's approval to be required in the case of these other forms of financing so as to maintain and to facilitate overall financial planning and co-ordination.

Secondly, while present legislation provides for the borrowings of statutory bodies to be guaranteed by the Treasurer, there is no similar provision in relation to other financial arrangements. We believe it would be appropriate for the Treasurer to have a discretionary power to provide guarantees in respect of all kinds of financial arrangements entered into by public authorities.

Thirdly, current legislation makes no provision for fees to be charged by the Government in respect of guarantees it gives to statutory corporations or other entities. Such fees are common in the commercial world. Their absence in effect represents a hidden subsidy from the budget to statutory corporations and other entities enjoying the benefits of these guarantees. As the Campbell Committee so correctly argued—and I quote from paragraphs 1.65 and 1.66 of its report—'if a government considers that a particular sector or activity should be assisted . . . it is best done through a direct subsidy, grant or tax concession' so that 'the costs of the subsidy are visible and quantified, providing a basis for continuing assessment of the appropriateness of the levels of assistance'. The Government therefore believes that a power to charge fees would be desirable. The way in which this power might be used in practice would, of course, be a matter for discussion between the Treasurer of the day, the Ministers responsible for individual statutory bodies and those bodies themselves. The Government puts this legislation forward as another element in its programme of reform in public sector financial procedures, and I commend it to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts new Part VIC in the principal Act. New section 32k contains a number of definitions that are required for the purposes of a new Part. A 'credit arrangement' is defined as a contract or arrangement under which a prescribed authority borrows money, obtains immediately or prospectively the use or benefit of property owned by some other person or obtains some other form of financial accommodation. The Treasurer may, by notice published in the *Gazette*, exclude specified kinds of contract or arrangement from the ambit of the definition. A 'guarantee' includes a contract or arrangement of a prescribed kind. The purpose of this expanded definition is to enable the Governor to prescribe certain kinds of arrangement that may not technically come within the nor-

mal concept of a guarantee, as guarantees for the purposes of the new provisions.

A 'prescribed authority' is defined as an authority or body established by Act of Parliament and declared by regulation to be an authority or body to which the definition applies. Subsection (2) makes it clear that the new Part will apply to contracts and arrangements entered into before the commencement of the amending Act. New section 32l provides that a prescribed authority may, with the consent of the Treasurer, enter into credit arrangements on terms and conditions approved by the Treasurer. Subsection (2) prevents a prescribed authority from entering into credit arrangement without the consent of the Treasurer. Subsection (3) provides that the consent of the Treasurer may be general or limited to particular transactions and may be absolute or conditional.

Subsection (4) provides that a credit arrangement is not invalidated by failure to obtain the consent required under this new section. New section 32m empowers the Treasurer to give guarantees and indemnities in respect to contracts to which a prescribed authority is a party or contracts that are incidental, ancillary, or otherwise related to such contracts.

New section 32n empowers the Treasurer to charge fees in respect of guarantees or indemnities whether they arise under the Public Finance Act or under some other law. The amount of a periodical fee charged by the Treasurer in respect of the guarantee or indemnity is, subject to the regulations, to be fixed by the Treasurer. Such a fee may be recovered as a debt. This new provision will not apply to guarantees under the Industries Development Act. That Act already contains provisions for the payment of consideration to the Treasurer in respect of a guarantee.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a corporation to be known as the 'South Australian Government Financing Authority'; to make provision relating to the financial powers and relations of the authority, semi-government authorities and the Treasurer; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its main purpose is to establish a new statutory corporation to act as a central borrowing authority on behalf of semi-government authorities in the State. The corporation will be known as the 'South Australian Government Financing Authority'. Before turning to discuss the purpose of the authority in detail, I believe it would be helpful if I were to explain the institutional framework within which it will work, including the structure of Commonwealth/State arrangements in this area.

The financial agreement made between the Commonwealth and State Governments in 1927 and subsequently validated under section 105A of the Constitution provides, in effect, that, with certain rather limited exceptions, the State Governments as such cannot borrow directly. Instead, the Commonwealth borrows on their behalf and provides funds to

them. The amounts of funds so borrowed by the States each year are formally determined by Loan Council but, because of its overall financial strength *vis a vis* the States, the Commonwealth is effectively able to decide the level of these programmes as part of its budget policies.

The financial agreement in this way regulates the borrowings of the State Governments themselves. It does not, however, regulate the borrowings of the many separate semi-government and local government bodies created by State legislation. The borrowings of these authorities are regulated under a less formal agreement made between the Commonwealth and the States in 1936 and known as the gentleman's agreement.

Under this agreement, Loan Council has for many years done two basic things. First, it has approved maximum amounts of borrowings which could be undertaken by 'larger' semi-government and local authorities in each State, with 'smaller' authorities being able to borrow without aggregate limit. At present, 'larger' authorities are defined as those borrowing more than \$1 500 000 in a financial year. Secondly, Loan Council has determined maximum interest rates and other conditions on which authorities can borrow. Borrowings by authorities have normally been in two forms, namely, private placements with banks, life insurance companies and other institutional lenders and public loans in which, in addition to institutional support, members of the public can also subscribe.

In South Australia semi-government borrowings have been relatively less important than in other States, reflecting the fact that more functions of government—notably water supply and sewerage and port facilities—are provided here by departments.

The Electricity Trust has been by far our major borrower under the semi-government programme and it is the only authority to have issued public loans. The Electricity Trust and corresponding bodies in other States are now free of most Loan Council constraints following decisions taken by Loan Council at a meeting on 24-25 June last. However, all other authorities remain subject to the gentleman's agreement as I have already outlined.

Loans for the 30 or so other semi-government authorities which borrow in this State are arranged by Treasury by private placement with financial institutions. Although the loans for this group of authorities are arranged centrally in this way, the borrowings are made formally in the name of each individual authority. Local government authorities arrange their own borrowings within the Loan Council rules to which I have referred.

The arrangements for raising funds for semi-government authorities other than ETSA, although they have generally worked well enough in the past, have become increasingly unsatisfactory. There are five main reasons for this. First, the relatively small size of the borrowings by individual authorities has restricted the range of fund-raising techniques available. In particular, public loans have not been practicable, at least in a cost effective way. With capital markets becoming more complex and sophisticated, we have found the reliance on private placements to be unsatisfactory, particularly given the way in which certain Loan Council rules work in practice. This has affected both the availability of funds and their costs. The fact that capital markets are expected to continue to change rapidly in the future adds emphasis to the need for maximum flexibility in borrowing techniques.

Secondly, as a closely related point, the arrangements have meant that the investing public of South Australia has had limited opportunity to contribute directly to public sector fund raising for the benefit and development of the State. Apart from the relatively short periods each year when ETSA has had a public loan on offer, South Australians

wishing to invest in a Government-backed security generally have had to subscribe to loans of interstate or Commonwealth Government authorities.

Thirdly, the restricted size and nature of borrowings by individual authorities have curtailed the development of secondary markets in the State's semi-government securities. This development is necessary if markets are to be tapped in as much depth as we would like and if we are to compete adequately with large semi-government borrowers such as Telecom.

Fourthly, the system has meant that the debt allocations to particular authorities have been determined more by what has been available from lending institutions at the time they borrowed than by their individual needs and requirements. One example of this is the balance of long and short-term debt. Another example is the timing of allocation of borrowed funds to individual authorities. It has sometimes been difficult to allocate borrowings to them in a financial year in a way which fitted in with their capital expenditures and overall cash flows. Thus, full co-ordination of the capital requirements and cash management of authorities has been hampered.

Fifthly, the system has involved diseconomies of small scale in that numerous small authorities have had to maintain systems for servicing debt and associated functions.

The Government has therefore decided to establish arrangements whereby borrowing and on-lending to these authorities can be centralised in a formal way. The simplest procedure would be for the Government itself to be the borrower, but this is precluded by the financial agreement. This legislation therefore provides for a new statutory corporation to be established. Its operations will be subject to the gentleman's agreement, the main purposes of which I have already explained.

The proposed authority will borrow in its own name and on-lend to individual authorities as required. It will be able to offer attractive instruments to investors. It will enable most of the problems to which I have referred to be overcome but subject to continuing Loan Council constraints. We intend all semi-government bodies to be covered by the central borrowing authority, with the exception of ETSA, which has its own well established systems and markets. Local government authorities are not included in the scheme, but I understand that the Local Government Association has commissioned a study into the possibility of improved arrangements in that respect. This aspect of the matter will be kept under review.

In addition to arranging new borrowings on behalf of authorities the central authority will also have the capacity to take over and to consolidate the existing debts of authorities and to be involved in the investment of the surplus cash holdings of authorities. The possibility of a central borrowing authority has been under notice for several years in this State. Further impetus to the concept was given by the publication in September last of the Campbell Committee Report into the Australian Financial System which recommended, and I quote, 'that consideration should be given to the establishment of State Central Borrowing Authorities'. If any members are interested in the details of the committee's analysis of this matter I refer them to paragraphs 12.28 through 12.32 of the report. I note that this is but one of the many recommendations in this excellent report which have attracted the support of my Government.

The House will be interested to know that financial institutions, with whom we have been liaising very closely, have unanimously and very strongly welcomed our initiative. There can be no doubt that the proposed new arrangement will have great advantages from a marketing point of view. A number of other States are moving in the same general direction. Western Australia already has legislation on its

books, although the detailed nature of its arrangement differs and we understand it may not be intended to use it as broadly as we propose. I also understand that Queensland has recently introduced legislation to establish a central borrowing authority similar in concept to that which we propose. The Victorian Government has introduced legislation to facilitate centralised co-ordination of the cash holdings and flow of funds of its authorities and we believe that it is now looking closely at the central borrowing concept.

I have also kept the Federal Treasurer, in his capacity as Chairman of Loan Council, informed of our proposals, and no problems have been raised from that quarter. Indeed, at its last meeting, Loan Council, at my request, adopted a resolution which will facilitate the operation of State central borrowing authorities by permitting 'smaller' authority borrowings to be aggregated into one amount which can be borrowed by the central authority and then on-lent to individual bodies.

I have gone through this background at some length to highlight the fact that, although the step we are taking is new and innovative, it is being taken within a context of wide consensus about its desirability and appropriateness. Naturally, the semi-government authorities which will be affected by the proposed new arrangements have also been informed of the Government's intentions. Although consultations between the Treasury and all authorities have not been completed in detail and although there are some complexities still to be finally sorted out, no problems of any significance which would impede progress in implementing the central borrowing concept have been raised.

For reasons which I have explained, it is proposed that the central borrowing authority be established as a separate statutory corporation. Members will also observe that the financial powers of the authority are drawn in reasonably broad terms. This is quite deliberate, the aim being to give sufficient flexibility so that the authority can react speedily and efficiently to developments in capital markets and in the financial requirements of Government agencies.

However, it would be quite wrong to assume either that the authority would operate independently of Government or that it will involve a new bureaucracy. The legislation provides for the Under Treasurer to be Chairman of the authority and it is expected that it will be serviced largely from within existing Treasury resources. The legislation also gives the Treasurer, and hence of course the Cabinet, an unqualified power of control and direction over the policies and operations of the authority. Under the legislation, the terms and conditions on which the authority can assume the existing debts of individual authorities or make new loans to authorities will be decided by the Treasurer only after consultation with the Minister responsible for each authority. Thus, the authority is best regarded as an instrument of Government taking the statutory corporation form for reasons of convenience and having regard to the financial agreement and Loan Council arrangements.

I have explained how the proposed authority will enable the semi-government sector in the State to raise and allocate funds in a more co-ordinated, flexible and efficient way. There is, however, another aspect worth mentioning. This Government has put a major effort into improving the range and quality of information available to the Parliament and to the public concerning the public finances of the State. Programme budgeting is the principal example, although by no means the only one. One of the main purposes of programme budgeting is, of course, to enable the many programmes of Government and the amount of funds being devoted to them to be more clearly identified than they are in the traditional Budget papers.

The financial relations between the Government and some of its authorities are quite complex and often reflect decisions

taken some time ago when circumstances were considerably different from what they are now. The relationships are in some cases such that it is difficult to see clearly the amount of Government financial assistance being currently provided to the activity concerned. This occurs, for example, when such assistance is provided in an indirect way through interest rate concessions and the like. This situation is inconsistent with our programme budget objectives and, in the Government's view, clearly needs to be improved. The central borrowing authority will provide an opportunity and a means by which reforms in this area might be made and I have asked officers to look at this in detail. Anything which is done in this respect will, however, be incidental to the main purposes of the central authority and may be regarded as a potential side-benefit. The Government regards the proposed authority as a further step in its overall programme of public sector financial reform and co-ordination. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 sets out definitions of terms used in the measure. Attention is drawn to the definition of a semi-government authority under which the provisions of the measure will apply to a body corporate of the kind described in the definition only if the body is declared to be a semi-government authority by proclamation.

Clause 5 provides for the establishment of a 'South Australian Government Financing Authority'. This authority is to be a body corporate with the usual corporate capacities. Clause 6 provides that the authority is to be comprised of three or four members as the Governor determines. The Under Treasurer is to be the Chairman of the authority and the remaining members are to be persons nominated by the Treasurer.

Clause 7 provides for the terms and conditions of office as a member of the authority. Clause 8 regulates the manner in which business is conducted at meetings of the authority. Clause 9 provides for the validity of acts of the authority and immunity of its members from personal liability. Clause 10 requires members of the authority to disclose any conflict of interest.

Clause 11 sets out the general powers and functions of the authority. The principal function of the authority will be to develop and implement borrowing and investment programmes for the benefit of the corporations that are declared to be semi-government authorities for the purposes of the measure. The authority may also engage in such other activities relating to the finances of the Government of the State or semi-government authorities as are contemplated by the other provisions of the measure or approved by the Treasurer. Under the clause, the authority is empowered to borrow moneys within or outside Australia. It may lend moneys to semi-government authorities. It may accept moneys on loan or deposit from the Treasurer or a semi-government authority and may invest moneys. The authority is empowered to issue, buy and sell and otherwise deal in or with securities. It may open and maintain accounts with banks and appoint underwriters, managers, trustees or agents. Finally, the authority may provide guarantees, deal with property, enter into any other arrangements or acquire or incur any other rights or liabilities. The exercise of any of these powers, is to be subject to the approval of the Treasurer.

Clause 12 provides that the authority is to act in accordance with proper principles of financial management and with a view to avoiding a loss. Under the clause, any surplus of funds remaining after the authority has met its costs in any financial year must be paid into the General Revenue or otherwise dealt with as the Treasurer may determine.

Clause 13 provides that the authority is to be subject to the control and direction of the Treasurer. Clause 14 provides that moneys provided by the Treasurer to the authority are to be regarded as having been provided upon such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may from time to time determine. Clause 15 provides that liabilities of the authority are guaranteed by the Treasurer.

Clause 16 empowers semi-government authorities to borrow from or lend to or deposit moneys with the authority. Under the clause, the Treasurer may direct that a semi-government authority borrow from the authority rather than from any other lender and may direct that any surplus funds of a semi-government authority are to be deposited with or lent to the authority. The terms and conditions of such a transaction are to be as determined by the Treasurer after consultation with the Minister responsible for the semi-government authority.

Clause 17 provides that the Treasurer may deposit with or lend to the authority any moneys under the control of the Treasurer. The Treasurer may determine the terms and conditions upon which such moneys are placed with the authority.

Clause 18 makes provision for the Treasurer to rearrange existing financial relations of a semi-government authority. Under the clause, this may only take place after the Treasurer has consulted with the Minister responsible for the particular semi-government authority in question. Under the clause, the liabilities under any existing loan obtained by a semi-government authority from a private source may be taken over by the authority and a new debt relationship created between the semi-government authority and the authority. Alternatively, where a semi-government authority has an existing debt relationship with the Treasury, this may be converted into a debt relationship between it and the central authority.

Where a semi-government authority has received any grant from the Treasury for capital purposes, that funding may be consolidated with other funding by the central authority and an appropriate total financial relationship struck between the semi-government authority and the central authority. In general terms, the clause is designed to enable existing borrowing arrangements of a semi-government authority to be put on the same footing as it is proposed will be instituted for the future through the agency of the authority. Attention is drawn to subclause (8), which is designed to enable such a rearrangement to take place in relation to liabilities of the South Australian Meat Corporation, the former Monarto Development Commission and the former South Australian Development Corporation that have already been taken over by the Crown or Ministers of the Crown in their respective corporate capacities.

Clause 19 provides for delegation by the authority. Clause 20 provides for the staffing of the authority. Clause 21 authorises the Treasurer and the authority to charge fees for services provided under the measure. Clause 22 provides that the authority and instruments to which it is a party are not to be exempt from State taxes or duties except to the extent provided by proclamation.

Clause 23 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 24 provides for the accounts and auditing of the accounts of the authority. Clause 25 requires the authority to prepare an annual report and provides for the report and the audited statement of accounts of the authority to be tabled in Parliament. Clause 26 provides that proceedings for offences are to be disposed of summarily. Clause 27 empowers the Government to make regulations for the purposes of the measure.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUDICIAL REMUNERATION BILL

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981; the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1981; and the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides for payment of allowances, in addition to salary, to judges and masters. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes the appropriate amendment to achieve that end to the Supreme Court Act. Clauses 4 and 5 make corresponding amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and the Local and District Criminal Courts Act.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Aboriginal Heritage Act, 1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Aboriginal Heritage Act received the Governor's assent on 15 March 1979, but has not yet been proclaimed. The Act will replace the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act, 1965, and, unlike the previous Act, will deal solely with Aboriginal culture. All European culture will then be covered by the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978.

The Aboriginal Heritage Act, 1979, provides for the protection and preservation of sites and items of sacred, ceremonial, mythological or historic significance to Aboriginal people. Its aims are secured by various means. An Aboriginal Heritage Fund is established for use in the administration of the Act and for securing the purposes of the Act. The Act also provides for the appointment of a nine-member Aboriginal Heritage Committee to advise the Minister. Protected areas may be declared to protect Aboriginal sites and it is to be an offence to enter or use a protected area in contravention of a restriction contained in a notice of declaration. Intentional damage to or destruction of registered items of the Aboriginal heritage is prohibited, while exploration for, removal and sale of items are permitted subject to the Minister's approval. A person is obliged to report the discovery of an item and to take reasonable measures to protect an item in his possession.

Although the framework of protection established by the Act is basically sound, it has been found that there are a number of areas in which its provisions could be improved so as to provide more effective protection for Aboriginal sites and items. Consequential amendments were therefore introduced into the House of Assembly in November last year but since then the Government has decided that additional matters should be covered in the amending Bill. This

Bill is introduced in order to cater for all appropriate amendments to the principal Act. The purpose of the majority of the proposed amendments is to ensure that the legislation accords with accepted principles for the conservation of the Aboriginal heritage which seek to secure the preservation of a selection of sites and artifacts. This would ideally be achieved by the collection of information about all sites and artifacts in the State sufficient to allow an assessment of which should be preserved. There is, however, an immense number of sites and artifacts and the difficulty of identifying and assessing all of these before many are destroyed renders achievement of the goal virtually impossible.

The legislation therefore gives the Government power to control unregistered sites. This does not imply that all sites and items should be preserved. It is recognised that other legitimate activities may entail the destruction of some sites. What the legislation seeks to ensure is the consideration, but not dominance, of heritage issues when activities which may affect the Aboriginal heritage are to be carried on.

The ability to protect adequately sites and items has been enhanced in many ways. One concern is that the Act does not afford control over the disposition and publication of audio-visual material which depicts sites, items and associated ceremonial activities of a secret or sacred nature, or of archival significance to the State. It is considered necessary to make reference to this, as Aborigines may regard the audio-visual material as being as sacred as the original, and the publication of the material may therefore cause offence to Aborigines if only a part of the Aboriginal community have had, by tradition, knowledge of the secret events. In addition, audio-visual material may be of considerable archival importance to the State and so should be preserved for this reason alone. To redress those considerations, it is proposed to expand the definition of item of the Aboriginal heritage to include any record of any object or ceremony which is of sacred, ritual or ceremonial significance to Aboriginal people, or which is of significance to the State, and to require Ministerial consent for the disposition and publication of any material which reproduces sites, items and events which are traditionally to be kept secret from certain sections of the Aboriginal community.

Sites and items are to be further protected by an amendment to the provision dealing with their registration. The Act presently requires the Minister to keep a register of sites and items. Other sections provide for their protection. Some of the protective measures, as, for example the section which prohibits the removal or sale of items without Ministerial approval, may be applied whether or not the item has been entered on the register. Other protective measures are available only to those sites and items which have been registered. One such provision is that which prohibits the damage or destruction of an item of the Aboriginal heritage. The restricted application of some of the sections of the Act gives rise to the danger that important sites and items may be destroyed during the time-consuming process of identifying, documenting and registering all the sites and items in the State.

It is therefore considered that registration should not be viewed as the only means to obtain protection. Other States, for example, New South Wales and Western Australia, recognise the danger of loss of unregistered items and sites and protective measures do not depend upon prior registration. Their Aboriginal items and sites registers function as data bases, incorporating all information about Aboriginal items and sites in their State, and can be used to manage work which seeks to protect the Aboriginal heritage by providing, for example, assessments of the likelihood of sites occurring in areas which are to be developed, and as an aid to research by providing basic information on sites and their localities throughout the State. It is therefore

proposed that the provisions which presently relate only to registered sites and items be amended in order to apply to all sites and items of the Aboriginal heritage and that the legislation specify that registration is not a prerequisite to protection.

Consequential amendments are proposed in order to offset any perceived adverse effects of this more extensive protection of sites and items. The first applies to an exceptional situation which could arise in the future whereby it is necessary for some impact on or interferences with a site to occur. This can only occur with the written consent of the Minister. The second entails a narrowing of the definition of 'item' to introduce an element of significance. The third provides for the addition of a defence to a charge under the Act that allows a defendant to prove that an act to remove or interfere with an item was neither intentional nor negligent. Similar defences are proposed if a protected area is entered or used in contravention of a protective restriction imposed by the Minister, or if a person fails to report the discovery of an item.

Another major area of proposed amendment relates to protected areas. Before the Minister declares an Aboriginal site to be a protected area, every effort will be made to contact those people who have an interest in the area. This process may not, however, be exhaustive, and so it is proposed to allow a period, after the gazetting of a declaration, for public comment on the proposed action. The Minister will then be allowed a further period to consider any objections and to either confirm or withdraw the declaration, as he considers appropriate.

To assist the Minister in making a decision regarding the declaration of a protected area, several criteria for the consideration of the Minister are introduced. These are:

- the recommendations of the Aboriginal Heritage Committee;
- the significance of the site to the Aboriginal people;
- the archaeological, anthropological, ethnological, historic or scientific significance of the site;
- the significance of the site for educational or recreational purposes;
- the current or proposed use of the land on which the site is situated;
- the effect of a declaration on the interests of the State; and
- the effect of the declaration on the owners and occupiers of that land.

Gazetting of protected areas before the public review period is considered essential to prevent damage resulting from widespread knowledge of the site's location. A definition of 'owner' has also been added to the Act to assist the provisions which require the Minister to notify the owner of any land which is intended to be declared a protected area. The disposition of portable items also requires some amendment to ensure that items of importance to South Australia's heritage are not removed from their proper places or interfered with and are properly housed and conserved. The Act allows the Minister an opportunity to offer to purchase any item. His consent is also to be required to any form of transaction involving the disposition of items of the Aboriginal heritage, as, for example, a gift.

It is also felt that there is a need for stricter control on research activities involving Aboriginal sites and items. The Act provides that it is an offence to damage or destroy an item of the Aboriginal heritage and requires that the Minister's consent be obtained before an item is removed or interfered with. There are some research activities, however, which do not specifically fall within the present legislation but which may adversely affect sites or items. For example, the repeated taking of rubbings of rock engravings may cause accelerated weathering in some rock types and eventual

erosion of the engravings. So that research can be monitored and control exercised over which sites are studied and how they are studied, it is proposed that a new provision be added to the Act making research activities at an Aboriginal site subject to the consent of the Minister.

There are also a number of inconsistencies in the legislation in relation to the protection of sites and items and the various penalties for offences under the Act. Three further amendments correct the inconsistencies. While the Act makes it an offence to damage or destroy an item, there is no complementary provision with regard to Aboriginal sites. Such a provision is considered essential as some sites of great importance do not contain registered items. These are, in particular, sites of ceremonial and mythological significance to Aborigines which are natural features of the landscape. There is, therefore, a need to amend the Act so that it is also an offence to damage or destroy a site. A similar situation occurs in the provision obliging the Minister to cause searches to be made to discover items of the Aboriginal heritage. Sites should also be added here.

There is also an inconsistency in the penalties which are provided for offences against the Act. While there is a fine of \$10 000, or imprisonment for three months, for damaging or destroying an item, and a fine of \$10 000 for removing or otherwise interfering with an item, there is a fine of only \$1 000 for excavating an item without the Minister's consent. An unauthorised excavation may be a more serious matter than the removal of an item. A penalty of \$10 000 for excavating without a permit would more accurately reflect the possible seriousness of this offence, and it is proposed that the Act be amended accordingly.

In addition to providing better protection for sites and items there is a need to amend several provisions relating to the Aboriginal Heritage Committee. The first involves membership of the committee. The Act states that the committee shall consist of nine members, and specifies that at least three must be Aboriginal, one must be a nominee of the board of the South Australian Museum, and one must be a nominee of the Pastoral Board. It is believed that the Minister may be better served if the non-aboriginal members of the committee are not representatives of specific groups but are drawn from a wider spectrum of interested people. This would allow the committee greater flexibility in meeting differing challenges. Adequate Aboriginal representation is essential, since Aborigines may often be best aware of the spiritual and functional importance of sites and items to the Aboriginal people. It is therefore proposed to omit the requirement that some of the members of the committee be nominees of particular groups.

The committee's functions also require review. Previous proposals which redefine the role of the register make it no longer necessary for the committee to consider register entries. It is suggested that this function be removed and replaced by a more appropriate provision empowering the committee to advise the Minister on the protection of sites and items. Since the Minister is now required to give consent to the destruction of sites and items, the committee should be empowered to advise the Minister on this function, thus ensuring that the Minister is aware of all relevant matters before making a decision. An additional function of importance which the committee is to undertake is to recommend the acquisition of land, as provided for in the Act.

A further amendment concerns the requirements of the committee to present an annual report to the Minister on the administration of the Act. The committee is intended to perform an advisory role only and so it will be inappropriate for the committee to report on the administration of the Act when it does not have any executive duties. It is therefore proposed that the Act be amended so that the

committee is required to present a report on its work each year rather than on the administration of the Act.

Some aspects of the powers of inspectors require elucidation. The Act does not give the inspectors power to obtain the name and address of a person who is suspected of having committed an offence. The power to do so would enable inspectors to carry out their duties more effectively, and so an amendment to this effect is proposed. In addition, to avoid the possibility of inspectors exercising their powers unreasonably, an amendment is proposed to enable the Minister to direct inspectors in the performance of their functions.

With regard to proprietary rights, it has been suggested that the legislation does not make it sufficiently clear that inclusion of a site in the inventory or declaration of a protected area will not give rise to rights of a proprietary nature. It is not the intent of the Act to confer such rights and an amendment to clarify this issue is proposed.

Finally, it is considered necessary to clarify the way in which proceedings for offences against the Act are to be commenced. The Aboriginal Heritage Act does not presently vest the right to commence proceedings in a particular person, so that according to the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1978, anyone could bring an action. This would be undesirable. It is therefore proposed that proceedings be only capable of initiation with the consent of the Minister. In addition, since the institution of proceedings is a serious matter, it is proposed that the Minister's power to delegate conferred by the Act, should not extend to a delegation of the power to authorise proceedings for offences against the Act.

These proposed amendments are designed to strengthen the Aboriginal Heritage Act so that it may be as effective as similar legislation in other States of Australia and elsewhere. The introduction and implementation of effective legislation which allows for the systematic identification and assessment of Aboriginal sites and items, and for the protection of significant traces and items of the Aboriginal culture, will ensure that this State's Aboriginal heritage is preserved for the benefit of all South Australians.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 which sets out definitions of expressions used in the principal Act. The clause introduces to the present definition of 'item of the Aboriginal heritage' the requirement that traces of Aboriginal culture and remains must be of some significance. This amendment was in the earlier amending Bill, which has now lapsed. The clause now additionally provides that 'item of the Aboriginal heritage' may include any record, produced by mechanical means, of objects or ceremonies which are of significance to an Aboriginal tribe and which are kept secret from some parts of the tribe or other people, and any record that is of archival significance to the State. The clause again includes a definition of 'owner', which is now extended to include the holder of a mining tenement, and deletes the definitions of 'registered Aboriginal site' and 'registered item'. The clause also provides for a definition of 'restricted material', which enhances the extended definition of 'item of the Aboriginal heritage'.

Clause 3 amends section 7 of the principal Act in the same manner as the now lapsed, earlier Bill. The phrase 'items of the Aboriginal heritage' is struck out and the passage 'Aboriginal sites or items' is included. This ensures that sites of significance are preserved. The clause also again introduces a proposed new subsection (3) to clarify the effect of registration on the status of Aboriginal sites and items. Clause 4 amends paragraph (a) of section 9 by deleting reference to registered items and registered sites and substituting a passage which refers to items of the Aboriginal heritage and Aboriginal sites. The Minister is therefore empowered to apply the Aboriginal Heritage Fund to acquire

any item or site of significance, and not only those which are already on the register.

Clause 5 amends section 10 of the principal Act by introducing a proposed new subsection (4). A subsequent clause of this Bill provides that Ministerial consent will be required before proceedings can be commenced for offences under the Act. The proposed new subsection prevents the Minister from delegating this responsibility. Clause 6 amends section 11 of the principal Act, which provides for the appointment of the Aboriginal Heritage Committee. Under the present section, that committee consists of nine members appointed by the Governor, at least three being Aboriginals, one being a nominee of the board of the South Australian Museum and one being a nominee of the Pastoral Board. The proposed new section is to simply provide that at least three members are to be Aboriginals; the qualifications of the remaining members will be at the discretion of the Governor. This proposed amendment was in the now lapsed amending Bill.

Clause 7 provides for the amendment of section 16, which deals with the functions of the committee. Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection (1) are to be struck out and substituted by provisions which have greater clarity and force. The amendments provide that the committee may advise the Minister on measures that should be taken for the protection of items or sites of significance to the Aboriginal culture and any other matters affecting the exercise of the Minister's powers under the Act. The committee is also to recommend whether areas should become, or cease to be, protected areas, and to recommend to the Minister the acquisition under the Act of items or sites. The majority of these amendments are carried over from the previous amending Bill.

Clause 8 amends section 17 of the principal Act and provides that the committee is to report annually to the Minister on its work. The committee is presently required to provide a report on the administration of the Act. Clause 9 provides for the amendment of section 19 of the principal Act, which relates to the powers of inspectors. The amendment confers on inspectors the additional power to require persons whom he reasonably suspects of having committed an offence to give him their names and addresses. A proposed new subsection (2) is also included and provides that an inspector may not exercise any power under the section in a manner contrary to a Ministerial direction.

Clause 10 substitutes for section 21 a new provision dealing with the declaration of protected areas. Under the present section 21, the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, declare a site to be a protected area under the Act. This is retained in subsection (1), but the proposed new subsection (2) provides matters which the Minister should specifically consider before he acts. These matters include the recommendations of the committee, the significance of the site, the use of the land and the general interests of the State. The proposed new subsection (3) preserves the requirement that owners and occupiers of private lands on which Aboriginal sites are situated are given adequate notice of the declaration and an opportunity to object. The proposed new subsection (4) allows the Minister to act without giving notice under subsection (3) if a declaration is required urgently.

Subsection (5) is to require notice of the declaration to be published within seven days of its date in a daily newspaper circulating throughout the State. The notice must invite any interested party to lodge an objection within six weeks of the date of the notice. This requirement was introduced in the previous Bill. A proposed new subsection (6) provides that a declaration shall expire after three months, unless the Minister, after consideration of any representations to him, confirms the declaration by notice published in the *Gazette*. The proposed new subsection (7) allows a notice

to specify restrictions on the access to, and use of, the protected area, while subsection (8) makes it an offence to contravene a restriction: penalty of \$10 000 or imprisonment for three months. These two provisions correspond to those presently in the principal Act. The clause also introduces a defence to a charge under the proposed new subsection (8). This defence allows the defendant to prove that his acts were neither intentional nor negligent. A similar provision is to be found in the previous amending Bill. The proposed new subsection (10) empowers the Minister to revoke a notice under this provision by subsequent notice published in the *Gazette*.

Clause 11 provides for an amendment to section 22 of the principal Act, which deals with the erection of signs in the vicinity of protected sites. The word 'registered' is to be struck out whenever it occurs, so that an Aboriginal site will not have to be registered in order to obtain protection. Clause 12 provides numerous amendments to section 25 of the principal Act. Section 25 is concerned with the protection of items of the Aboriginal heritage, particularly those found on the land. As in the previous amending Bill, the penalty for a contravention of subsection (1) is increased from \$1 000 to \$10 000. Subsections (2) and (3) of the principal Act are to be replaced. Again, the proposed replacements are lifted from the previous Bill. The proposed new subsection (2) is to include a reference to the discovery of items of the Aboriginal heritage, while the proposed new subsection (3) provides that a person who discovers and collects items from land which does not comprise a protected area or Aboriginal site is not, by reason of doing so, guilty of an offence, and it is to be a defence to proceedings under the section for the defendant to prove that his acts were neither intentional nor negligent.

Further amendments to section 25 look to strike out the present subsections (5) and (6) and insert four new subsections in their place. The proposed new subsection (5) provides that a person who proposes to sell or dispose of an item of the Aboriginal heritage must first give written notice to the Minister. The new provision widens the circumstances of the application of the present subsection (5), which only refers to the 'sale' of items. A proposed new subsection (6) provides that it is an offence to sell or dispose of items without Ministerial consent. This is again similar to a provision of section 25, except that it is wider in its application. The proposed new subsection (7) provides that a person shall not divulge restricted material contrary to the traditions of the Aboriginal people, without the consent of the Minister. This clause is to be read with the definition of 'restricted material'. A final subsection specifies that consent under the proposed new subsections (6) and (7) shall only be given by the Minister after he has considered the advice of the committee on the issue. A consent under the section may be subject to conditions.

Clause 13 provides for the amendment of section 27 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (1) and substituting a proposed new subsection which provides that a person shall not damage or destroy an Aboriginal site or item without Ministerial consent. Penalty, \$10 000 or imprisonment for three months. The present section 27 (1) does not provide for the possibility that the Minister may want to give his consent in this regard. This amendment was part of the earlier Bill. Clause 14 introduces a proposed defence to a charge for an offence under section 28 of the principal Act. The defence is again that the contravention of the section was neither intentional nor negligent. This amendment provides further consistency in the legislation.

Clause 15 provides for two additional subsections to section 30 of the principal Act. It is proposed that proceedings for offences under the Act are not to be commenced without Ministerial consent, and a document appearing to evidence

the consent is to be accepted, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof of the authorisation. Similar amendments have been proposed earlier. Clause 16 provides for the introduction of two new sections. One proposed section requires a person who intends to enter an Aboriginal site for research purposes to obtain Ministerial consent before proceeding, and the other provides that registration or a declaration under the Act does not give rise to any right of a proprietary nature.

Clause 17 amends section 32, which contains the regulation-making powers. It is proposed that a regulation made under paragraph (a) of subsection (2) will only be able to provide for the supervision of operations on Aboriginal sites and protected areas and will not include, as the Act presently allows, supervision of operations in the vicinity of these places. The clause further provides for amendments to paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection (2), which are consequential to the earlier amendments which remove references to 'registered' Aboriginal sites and items.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

In South Australia suicide is a felony, often called self-murder, and attempted suicide is a misdemeanour punishable by a term of imprisonment not exceeding two years. Survivors of suicide pacts are also guilty of murder. In 1970 the Law Reform Committee, in its fourteenth report, recommended that attempted suicide should no longer be a crime and in 1977 the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee, in its fourth report, recommended that neither suicide nor attempted suicide should be a crime.

To regard suicide as a form of homicide is an intellectually neat classification but the killing of a person by himself raises very different social and ethical considerations from the killing of a person by another. The fact that suicide is an offence is immaterial to the person who is at once the perpetrator and the victim of crime. However, the fact that suicide is an offence casts an unnecessary extra burden of shame and grief on the suicide's family. There are no good reasons for retaining suicide as an offence and it should cease to be one, as is the position in the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania and Victoria.

There has been no prosecution for attempted suicide in this State for many years. The fact that attempted suicide is an offence increases the stigma associated with those who attempt suicide. It is sometimes suggested that the crime should remain on the Statute Book because some persons, who have no firm intention of committing suicide, nevertheless make what appear to be attempts in order to attract attention, and it is desirable to retain some means of dealing with them under the criminal law. There is no evidence that the prosecution of such persons for attempted suicide acts as a deterrent either to them or to others of a like mind. There can be no case for treating this supreme man-

ifestation of human misery as an offence against the criminal law.

Where two people enter into an agreement to commit suicide and one person kills the other but himself survives, the survivor is guilty of murder. Sometimes the circumstances surrounding the survivor are tragic and it would be unrealistic to expect a jury to find the survivor guilty of murder. Accordingly, provision is made in the Bill for a jury to bring in a verdict of manslaughter in those circumstances if they believe that the accused was a party to a genuine suicide pact. The judge will then be able to impose an appropriate sentence based on the facts surrounding the suicide. While the Government believes that neither suicide nor attempted suicide should be an offence it does not believe that people should be free to incite others to commit suicide or bring pressure to bear on them to commit suicide. The Bill makes it an offence to aid, abet or counsel the suicide of another and a person who by fraud, duress or undue influence procures the suicide of another will be guilty of murder.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts in the principal Act a new section 13a. Subclause (1) of the proposed new section provides that it is no longer to be an offence to commit or attempt to commit suicide. Subclause (2) provides that a person who finds another committing or about to commit an act which he believes upon reasonable grounds would, if committed or completed, result in suicide is justified in using reasonable force to prevent the commission or completion of the act. The effect of this subclause is to retain the present position whereby reasonable force may be used to prevent the commission of a felony, suicide being presently a felony. Subclause (3) provides that a homicide that would constitute murder is reduced to manslaughter if the killing was done in pursuance of a suicide pact. This would also apply in relation to an accomplice to a homicide if the accomplice acted in pursuance of a suicide pact.

'Suicide pact' is defined in subclause (11) as an agreement between two or more persons having for its object the death of all of them whether or not each is to take his own life. Under that subclause, a person is not to be regarded as acting in pursuance of a suicide pact unless he was acting at a time when he had a settled intention of dying in pursuance of the pact. Subclause (4) fixes the penalty where an attempt to kill is reduced under subclause (3) from attempted murder to attempted manslaughter. The penalty is fixed at a term of imprisonment not exceeding 12 years. This penalty is in line with the penalty fixed by section 270a of the principal Act for an attempt to commit an offence that carries a penalty the same as that for manslaughter, namely, life imprisonment. Subclause (5) of proposed new section 13a provides that where a person is killed in pursuance of a suicide pact, an accomplice to the killing shall, if he was not himself a party to the suicide pact, continue to be guilty of murder even though the offence of the principal offender is reduced by subclause (3) from murder to manslaughter. Subclause (6) provides that a person who aids, abets or counsels the suicide of another or an attempt by another to commit suicide is guilty of an indictable offence. Subclause (7) fixes the penalty for such an offence.

This is fixed at a term of imprisonment not exceeding 14 years where suicide was committed, and at a maximum of eight years imprisonment where suicide was attempted. Where a person convicted of an offence against subclause (6) is found to have acted in pursuance of a suicide pact, the penalty is fixed at a maximum of five years imprisonment where suicide was committed, and at a maximum of two years imprisonment where suicide was attempted. The penalties fixed by subclause (7) where suicide was attempted reflect the penalties fixed for corresponding attempts under section 270a of the principal Act. Subclause (8) provides

that a person who by fraud, duress or undue influence procures the suicide of another, or an attempt by another to commit suicide, shall be guilty of murder or attempted murder, as the case may require. Subclause (9) provides that a person charged with murder or manslaughter, or attempted murder or manslaughter, may if the jury so finds, instead be convicted of an offence against subclause (6). Subclause (10) places the burden of proving the existence of a suicide pact and that he was acting in pursuance of the pact upon the accused. Subclause (11) provides the definitions outlined above. Subclause (12) provides that where a person induced another to enter into a suicide pact by means of fraud, duress or undue influence, the person is not entitled in relation to an offence against the other to any mitigation of criminal liability or penalty based upon the existence of the suicide pact.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 31 August. Page 874).

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Last night I referred to electricity charges and other related matters. I have since had an opportunity to study comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to large increases in the subsidy under the Country Areas Subsidy Act, which provides that persons, no matter where they reside in South Australia, shall pay no more than 10 per cent for electricity over and above the tariff applying elsewhere.

It would appear from the Leader's comments that he was opposed to that and was opposed to country people receiving that subsidy. I believe that people in country areas should pay the same rate for electricity as people in the metropolitan area pay. Many of my constituents have to make large capital contributions to have their properties connected to an electricity supply. I have a number of problems in my district in relation to charges.

I realise that a large amount of money is involved, but I believe that all South Australians should be charged the same rate. Therefore, I hope that the Government and the Treasurer will take appropriate action soon to give effect to the suggestion that I have put forward. I also remind the House that the criticisms that have been made by the Labor Party in recent times in relation to electricity are really only grandstanding, and I seek an assurance from the Leader of the Opposition or his colleagues in relation to the comments they have made about electricity charges. I ask whether they can assure the House and the people of this State that they will legislate to prevent the Electricity Trust from increasing charges, because that is the tenor of what they have been saying.

They are going to ask the taxpayers to pick up the tab. We know that that suggestion is quite ridiculous. I am sure that if they had read the comments in the Electricity Trust's annual report, as the member for Mitchell would have done, they would have seen that they are quite straightforward. If we want to avoid the problems that New South Wales has had, the trust has to have an adequate amount of funds to expand the operations and to do the necessary maintenance. Over a long time the trust has given a very good service to the community in South Australia, and the sort of nonsense that the Leader and his colleagues have put up is direct criticism of the efficiency of the trust. We know that the Labor Party was in an identical position when it was in government. Charges had to be increased and, regardless of

who is in government, they will have to be increased in future. The Leader and his colleagues ought to address themselves to the following comments on page 4 of the document:

The trust believes that circumstances are now such that firm action must be taken to obtain a proper sharing of existing Cooper Basin reserves in order to protect the position of South Australian users beyond 1987 and allow time for other measures to be taken to secure longer-term supplies.

I am pleased that the Deputy Premier has already taken action. I sincerely hope that he is successful and that he can untangle the mess in which the Dunstan Government placed South Australia. This matter has been of concern to the Government and to constituents who often discuss the matter with me. We have heard a lot about unemployment from members opposite and I am pleased that the Deputy Leader is in the House. He has had a lot to say and has been very critical of this Government, but he has failed to tell the people and the House what alternative programmes he has that would alleviate the problem. If one examines the industrial relations and the industrial policy of the Labor Party, one sees clearly that it is going to create more unemployment, going to inflict on commerce and industry more charges, place more impediments on employment, and create more unemployment. The Labor Party document states:

An extra week's pay for each year of employment should be provided for each person over 35 years of age.

What would that cost? The policy goes on:

Compensation should be provided by employers to employees for capital loss in homes where such employees have to take work in other localities.

Another part of the policy states:

... the right to paid leave to attend all trade union training courses approved by the relevant union.

It does not mention the approval of the employer. The document also states:

... a four, four and a half or five day working week; or a nine day working fortnight; or a 35-hour working week; or increased leisure time by a reduced working year.

That all sounds very nice, but what effect will it have on commerce and industry? Many firms are facing difficulties. The 38-hour week is causing problems. It is all right for the honourable member opposite to shake his head. He ought to discuss the matter with some of the employers in my electorate with whom I have discussed it. Then we have this grandiose Dunstan proposal on worker participation:

Labor declares that industrial democracy is an essential element in the need to establish democratic rights for the working people.

I thought that the first thing to do was to guarantee long-term employment, but industrial democracy relates to the union officials, not to people on the shop floor. Under the Labor Party proposal, a person who does not belong to a union will be a second-class person. That is like the Cain logic, namely, that if a person does not belong to a union that person will not get salary increases in awards. I thought that the Labor Party stood for freedom of association and the rights of the individual, but it wants to create a new class and special privileges for unions.

Yesterday I was given a document that has been circulated around a certain part of the State where a by-election will take place. We have had complaints about the Liberal party using so-called underhand campaign methods. We all know that Mr O'Neill was elected to the Federal conference of the Labor Party on the left-wing ticket. We know of his other left-wing association, but we have been criticised for saying that. A letter that the Leader sent out endeavours to blame the Government for many misdemeanours that are incorrect. It is a scurrilous document, and I am pleased that the Premier has taken appropriate action to correct it. During my time in the District of Florey, I happened to see the

Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Peake campaigning. They did not look very happy or comfortable.

Mr KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Last evening, when the member for Unley was discussing the by-election in the District of Florey and literature applying to that by-election, the Chair ruled that he was out of order, and he discontinued that discussion. I ask you, Sir, whether your ruling today will be consistent with that given by the Chair last night.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart would well know that the Chair will always be consistent and, if that was the ruling last evening, that will be the ruling this afternoon and this evening. Is the honourable member seeking to draw attention to some transgression? He certainly has not done so. He has asked whether the ruling will be the same.

Mr KENEALLY: My point is that the by-election in Florey—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member seeking to highlight a current transgression?

Mr KENEALLY: Yes. I was drawing your attention to the comments made by the member for Eyre, who, for the past three or four minutes, has been discussing the by-election in the District of Florey.

The SPEAKER: With due respect, the honourable member for Stuart is not drawing the Chair's attention to the words of the member for Eyre. The honourable member for Stuart asked whether the Chair would be consistent in its rulings, without referring to any transgressions. If, in fact, the honourable member for Eyre has been transgressing, I ask him to desist and to address himself to the appropriate debate.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Mr Speaker. It is obvious that the member for Stuart came into the Chamber only to disrupt the proceedings; he has now left. I was referring to alternate policies. I was bringing to the attention of the House relevant information. I was about to say that it would appear—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: The same argument—

Mr GUNN: That is right. The Deputy Leader did not look to be in familiar surroundings. I thought the honourable member would have been more at home at Flemington or Morphettville. He looks happier when he is in those surroundings.

Mr Rodda: Or the members' bar.

Mr GUNN: Yes, the members' bar at Morphettville or Flemington. I know that members opposite find it more appropriate to associate with the sport of kings. On a final note, I am wondering how long it will be before the Labor Party in this State takes the lead from its Victorian counterparts and calls a special conference to discuss the current national uranium policy.

In my electorate, as everyone knows, we have a large-scale development gradually gaining momentum. A considerable amount of work is taking place involving large sums of money. The Victorian A.L.P.'s uranium policy is reported in the *Australian* of 30 August 1982, as follows:

The Victorian Labor Party will hold a special conference to debate the Federal A.L.P.'s uranium policy. The conference will be held on October 3 and is expected to attract a "full house" of delegates. The Party's administration received a petition from more than 60 State conference delegates at its meeting on Friday night.

The petition called for a special State conference to discuss the issue. It followed a recent meeting of more than 400 A.L.P. members who voiced strong opposition to the uranium policy adopted by the Federal A.L.P. at its national conference last month. The new uranium policy allows for a Labor Government to "phase out" the uranium industry but removes the obligation to immediately repudiate existing uranium contracts.

They can allow it to start and then stop it. The article continues:

The State secretary of the Victorian A.L.P., Mr Bob Hogg, a member of the Party's Socialist-Left faction, moved the modification in the A.L.P.'s previously uncompromising attitude to the

export and mining of uranium. Shortly after the national conference Mr Hogg was excluded from the Socialist-Left faction and a bitterness has emerged within the group over the uranium issue's treatment at the national conference.

Mr Hogg said last night that he opposed a special conference. He said that he believed the issue should be debated three weeks later at the Party's scheduled State conference. He said the special conference would seek a review of the A.L.P.'s uranium policy and a special national conference to examine the policy.

The decision to hold a special conference is certain to give the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, more ammunition . . . moderates within the Labor Party claimed that the special conference would be interpreted as a victory for the Socialist-Left faction even though opposition to the mining and export of uranium had a strong following within all factions of the Party.

How long will it take the leader of the left in South Australia—the real Leader of the Labor Party (the member for Elizabeth)—to get the numbers to hold his own conference in South Australia to again repudiate his Leader? I have already referred to the argument he had over transport fares, when he described his Leader as being as weak as orange lily water. It will be interesting, because we are yet to have a clear and precise statement from the Labor Party as to where it stands on the issue of Roxby Downs, Honeymoon, and other deposits which can be mined in this State.

I am pleased to support the document, which is a responsible financial document. Governments cannot continually spend more money than they have. They have to make the best use of funds available to them. This Government has done that. Unfortunately, the Opposition appears to allow its political philosophy to blind its judgment. Any political Party that does not look at the practical effects of its policies is heading for trouble. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, and I commend the Treasurer.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Two significant factors have not gone undetected by me in this debate. The first is that the Liberal Party backbenchers have not, in any great numbers, come forward and supported the Premier's Budget. So far, I believe only one has spoken. Whether any more intend to speak or whether they are ashamed of the Budget, I do not know. The second factor is that those who have spoken on our side have not had a good audience to address. The numbers in the House last night were something of which to be ashamed. There were about four or five members in the House when I was here.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is a matter of judgment. However, we are discussing an important facet of the economy in South Australia. Whether or not people like the debate, they ought to listen to it. In my speech I will try to keep to the matter before us, unlike the member for Eyre, who deviated a long way off the target in his attacks on people in the House, including the member for Peake and me, as well as others.

The Australian economy has suffered successive quarters of negative economic growth. A lot of people are discussing whether we are passing from a recession into a depression. Unemployment has reached a most appalling level and is expected to increase dramatically again in the next 12 months—some experts say to 14 per cent. A number of the nation's major daily papers have been running editorials reflecting on the incidence of poverty in our society. Yet this year's State Budget is a pitiful statement of the Premier's lack of resolve to do anything about the matters I have mentioned.

It is accompanied by a document on the condition of South Australia's economy which is supposed to provide the background against which the Budget has been framed. But, rather than being a critical and incisive analysis of what needs to be done, it is more a catalogue of woes. As

is the case with the Federal Budget, the attachment on the economy has been prepared by Treasury. This is intended to give the document an air of impartiality to allow a few necessary things to be said about the South Australian economy which the Premier would not like to have to admit himself, but above all to provide a laundered statement about the State's economic management for the Premier to hide behind.

It contains enough unpleasant facts for the Premier to be able to say things are very difficult and use that as an excuse not to do anything about it. The Budget itself indicates the Premier's dull acceptance of the situation. I am not suggesting that the present Government is responsible for all the underlying problems facing our economy; double digit inflation, high interest rates, negative economic growth, and staggering unemployment. I am suggesting that its response to the situation is totally inadequate and that the general thrust of its policies (or rather the lack of it) is aggravating the situation.

Naturally, the Federal Government's policies have much more impact on the economy, but it would be fair to say that it is the general philosophy and approach of the Liberals, both in this State and federally, which is contributing to the deepening of the recession in this State. They adopt the classic conservative response, reacting to a down-turn in economic activity with a range of contractionary policies. It is a process being carried out at the moment at both State and Federal levels. I would find any attempt by the Premier to dissociate himself from the Prime Minister, or to blame the Federal Government for neglecting South Australia financially, to be total hypocrisy.

They are each adopting similar approaches to economic management within their own particular jurisdictions. These policies are not working and have not been working for some time. It is becoming increasingly evident to most South Australians that a necessary precondition for lifting the economy out of the recession is the defeat of both the State and Federal Liberal Governments. Today I want to talk about the State Budget, with emphasis on its effects on employment. The full consequences of the Federal Government's mismanagement seem at last to be becoming evident to the Prime Minister, who is making a valiant effort to apply a few band-aids, at least where they will give one last gasp of life to his electoral chances.

Some of those band-aids are not unwelcome to me, particularly his latest industry assistance package, but when I heard the results of a national survey done in June by the Metal Trades Industry Association I was left wondering about what else we could do to improve the immediate future of South Australia's metal industry, particularly in the Iron Triangle.

The survey covered 347 companies employing 125 035 workers in four States. The sample included a broad cross-section of the industry by size and sector. It showed that in 12 months from June 1981 to June 1982 total employment in the industry had fallen by 3.9 per cent, and a further decrease of 2.6 per cent is expected by December 1982. Half of the respondents reported a decline in the 1981-82 financial year and 43 per cent expect a reduction during the second half of 1982. That is not a very good record for any Government to wear. Low production levels are being reported as the cause of the reduction in employment, and no real improvements in the level of production are expected until the second half of 1983. In terms of the number of people affected, employment in the companies surveyed dropped from 130 110 in June 1981 to 125 035 in June 1982, with an expected further decrease to 121 779 by December of this year. Those results show that in the whole of the metal industry there has been a contraction of about 20 000 jobs

in the last year, and there is every indication that a further 12 000 jobs will go before Christmas.

We can only guess at how the skilled trades have been affected. In 1978, Commissioner Heagney requested a survey of over award payments in the metals industry to establish the level of supplementary payments. The survey indicated that the percentage of tradesmen was 10 per cent to 11 per cent of overall employment. That would suggest that about 2 000 tradesmen were among the 20 000 retrenchments, with the expectation of a further 1 200 by the end of the year.

However, there is some indication that tradesmen might not be affected proportionately, at least as far as actual unemployment is concerned. For example, retrenchments at Kelvinator a few weeks ago saw skilled workers being offered jobs at lower classifications, and I heard of cases of people taking pay cuts of up to \$70 a week. Things are not quite as bad in Whyalla at the moment as they are in the other major steel towns around Australia, such as at Kwinana, Newcastle and Wollongong, but I am sure that, as a barometer of the condition of manufacturing, the M.T.A. survey gives cause for considerable alarm in South Australia, and this Government is not doing much about it.

Fortunately, the vehicle industry, which is the largest section of the State's manufacturing industry, is undergoing something of a resurgence. This is partly because of the growth in the market for light commercial vehicles and partly because people who cannot afford the interest bill to upgrade their housing are able to direct the resources they have available into buying a new car. The resurgence in the car industry, however, is the one bright spot; the condition of other industries is quite a different story.

The Leader of the Opposition on a number of occasions has been moved to put a clear picture before the House of the closures and retrenchments that have dogged South Australia's commercial and industrial sectors under this Government. The Government has attempted to make too much political capital out of too few projects. It is trying to give the impression that South Australia is really moving ahead in the three major areas of tourism, mining and high technology industries.

The Opposition does not want to denigrate any particular project—particularly as a lot of work was done on most of them during the period of the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments. In the area of tourism, two long-awaited projects are finally getting off the ground. The international airport terminal and the international hotel are both needed to develop our tourist industry, but the Government has not matched this progress with a substantial increase in commitment to developing complementary facilities. South Australia is not going to become a tourist mecca without considerable work.

We have to be realistic enough to recognise that other States already have international hotels and international airports, and in many ways a quite similar range of attractions. A Ministry of Tourism with a total budget of less than \$4 000 000 will not make the State a world leader, and, of course, the Victorians seem to have pinched one of our greatest tourist promoters in the last week.

Technology Park will, I hope, become one of the most important initiatives of the Tonkin Government. At the moment, it is being established as a suitable environment to attract high technology based industries, but actually attracting suitable industries is the more difficult part of the project. I hope the Technology Park Adelaide Corporation, which will promote it, will be enormously successful, but I think this, too, will be a long-term proposition.

However, the area where the Premier has been prone to the most exaggeration is mining. South Australia has some very fine resources, but only a handful have reached the

stage where development is likely to proceed in the near future. Roxby Downs, if it proceeds, is about a decade away from production, and I do not think that can be denied by anyone in this House. The Honeymoon and Beverley uranium deposits are relatively small and will not employ many people.

The only major project close to coming on stream is the Stony Point liquids scheme. We simply cannot afford to go on pretending that our Eldorado is at hand, because it is not at hand and it is no good the Premier trying to say that it is. The Premier has been practising a form of cargo cultism with his absurd comparisons between South Australia and Texas. What I am most concerned about is that the Government is relying on a limited number of projects which are not going to provide anything like the number of jobs which need to be created in South Australia to take up the ever-increasing unemployment situation. The size of the projects, the lead times, and the general economic uncertainties all have to be considered.

In my view South Australia's future will not depend on any particular industrial sector becoming an Eldorado. It will not be mining, high technology or tourism; though we will have our successes with all of those, or at least we hope to have our successes. South Australia will become an even more diverse economy. We have some excellent resources to work with, whether it is minerals, agriculture, forestry, fishing, or our labour force, because I have always contended that the South Australian work force is one of the most skilled and technically available work forces in the world, not only in Australia, and that has been proven time and again. It is only a matter of providing the industries; we have the labour force and the skills to take up those challenges in South Australia.

It should be obvious to most people that, as our technology advances, traditional productive activities will take a diminishing amount of our resources, at least of our labour. In these circumstances, service industries become relatively more important. They are likely to become as important to the functioning and growth of the economy as a whole as is any other sector. A very large part of the service sector is operated by Government. What I cannot forgive is the Tonkin Government's sustained attacks on the public sector of the economy, which Don Dunstan and members on this side of the House spent 10 years in building into a modern and productive part of South Australia's economy.

The figures the Premier presented in Treasury's summary of the condition of the South Australian economy show that State Government employment in South Australia has been reduced by 4.4 per cent over the last four years. In the same time State Government employment in the whole of Australia has increased by 4.1 per cent. The Premier has watched South Australia fall 8.5 per cent behind the national average for growth; that could mean more than 8 500 jobs.

Mr Lewis: Work is still being done, though.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is not being done, and services are being cut. That is the position, and it is no good the member's putting his head in the sand concerning that fact, because services that were being provided by the Labor Government are not being provided by the present Government. That cannot be denied in any aspect. Without wishing to overstate the case, it is obvious that, if the number of people employed in the public sector is reduced, that will have repercussions on employment throughout the economy. That is an obvious fact which no-one can deny. That is one of the factors influencing the economic circumstances in South Australia at the moment.

Before I discuss some of the more direct effects of the Budget on employment, I want to touch on the issue of wages. The Premier and other members of the House are always looking for scapegoats concerning the state of the

economy, and particularly concerning unemployment. This year dole bludgers appear to be out of fashion and unreasonable wage demands appear to be the in thing. We have heard every member of the Government telling us about those terrible workers claiming wage increases, but some Government members are themselves on \$70 000 a year.

Last Wednesday the Premier referred to the allowance of \$80 000 000 for wage increases. The Premier said that it was not an amount that he wanted to spend if he could keep actual wages down. He said that the less that was spent on wages the more would be available for spending on capital works. The Premier's exact words were, 'Excessive wage increases will mean less money for capital works, less for the building and construction industry, and fewer jobs.' After the Premier had said that he looked knowingly at the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who must have helped him to cook it up, and one could imagine them thinking, 'Let's see how far we can get on that one.'

There is an infinite number of variables that can be adjusted in a State Budget without having to relate capital works to the ordinary allowance for wage increases. Wage increases are part of our life; they are part of the need of people to keep up with inflation and, unless people do so, they get into a poverty situation which is the situation that many people are already in.

Mr Lewis: That is through no work.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, that is not true. The honourable member does not take note of the facts. There are people working who are not receiving wages commensurate with others above the poverty line. The relating of allowances for wage increases to capital works is a scapegoat tactic, and if the Premier was honest about it he would admit that that is so. For the past seven years living standards have been declining because of the Federal Government's policies, and in this State the use of back-door taxation over the last three years has made matters much worse. The few hand-outs that Mr Fraser provides for in his last Budget before an election are taken away again at the first available opportunity. Due to increases in interest rates, inflation, cuts in Government services, and the lack of tax indexation, the living standards of most people are continually falling. In that context it is worth analysing what the Premier means by excessive wage increases.

However, I think the Federal Government's total lack of a wages policy is more relevant. Members of the House were reminded of this matter only last week or the week before when I asked the Premier to explain to the people of South Australia what the wages policy of the State Government was. The only reply that we received from the Premier on that occasion was that it was one of restraint—there was no policy given at all. Either the Premier did not understand it or the simple fact of the matter is that there is no wages policy of the Federal Government or of the State Government. I mentioned this matter during my Budget reply speech last year (and I am referring to the Federal Government's total lack of a wages policy). Things have not changed very much, except that now there is a new Federal Minister for Industrial Relations, Ian McPhee, who is still trying to pick up the pieces of Ian Viner's failure a year ago last April. I think that the Liberals had better wait until they have some kind of workable wages policy before their Ministers, either State or Federal, make any blatant assertions about excessive wage increases.

There are a few points that I want to make concerning details in the Budget which have a bearing on my responsibilities as shadow Minister. I have mentioned already the matter of what I regard as being an under-commitment to tourism, given the Government's trumpeting on that subject. A couple of weeks ago I was invited to Cleland National Park to see the great grandstanding introduction of the new

five-year tourism programme. When I was asked by an A.B.C. reporter my feelings about the programme, my thoughts were that it sounded very good (and I compliment the Government if it does something good), but the point was that there was not one cent committed to the project to assist it along the way: it was merely a document provided, a plan with no commitment, no financial commitment at all.

An under-commitment which is much more disturbing is that concerning the paltry amount of money allocated to the Small Business Advisory Bureau. It appears that the bureau is to undergo some upgrading, small as that might be. It is to become the Small Business Advisory Unit. However, only \$119 000 has been allocated for staff. Even if additional funds do not represent the cost of upgrading for a full year, from my experience during the number of years that I was a Minister I know how much staff can be employed for that kind of money, and I have some idea of what needs to be done.

I regard the Government's commitment to assisting small business as minimal. I have said before and I will say again that the Government's commitment to small business is lip service only. Daily, I have contacting me people who are extremely critical of the policies of the Government in relation to small business. Many people in small business have pointed out the fact that the Government has no policy, and they have been reflecting upon the policies that the Labor Party has announced and have been endorsing them in many areas.

Dr Billard: Like six months notice of dismissal.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have noted that the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment is to undergo a cut in salaries in real terms of about 5 per cent. Funds for the Job Transfer Office, training services, and the Industrial Commission have been cut. I refer to the interjection made a moment ago concerning the six months retrenchment notice. I have said before and I will say again that workers in industry are entitled to proper employment conditions, and so are small business people. If a political Party has a philosophy of looking after workers, the wage-earners, it should also extend that philosophy to looking after small business as well. The Labor Party is attempting to put together policies that will induce small business people to believe that that is what we are about. It is no good the honourable member saying that we are only looking after wage-earners because of the policy retrenchment notice provision in our policy: there are retrenchment provisions in force all over the world. Admittedly, they have been late coming to this nation, but all other nations provide those protections for workers.

The Manpower Forecasting Unit, the Technological Change Centre and the Industrial Safety Division have received increases. I am delighted that those bodies have received those increases, because they are all vital and very important to the progress of the State. Last year I was extremely critical of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, particularly during the Estimates debate, because in my view at that stage it appeared that there was to be a reduction in the safety division and a reduction in staff.

I do not believe that we can afford to cut any Government services, particularly those concerning safety. There has been a rather hefty increase this year, and I sincerely hope that the Minister uses the funds that have been made available by training extra staff and extra people so that workers are protected in their work place. If that is done it will certainly overcome some of the problems concerning workers compensation for which today the Minister blamed members on this side of the House. I believe that, if the work place is made safe, and if there are sufficient inspectors, staff and people trained to protect workers from the possibility of

accidents at work, workers compensation premiums must fall.

Given the magnitude of some of the changes and the small overall result, I imagine that there has been some kind of re-organisation, which I will look into later to see what changes of emphasis have occurred. That opportunity, of course, will come in the Estimates Committee debates, when we will be able to ask the Minister what he is doing about actual staffing arrangements and those areas where there have been increased budgetary allocations.

The thing that has the greatest implication for the rest of the economy is the continued running down of the Public Buildings Department in terms of its capital works programme. Last year the amount of money spent on capital works by the department increased by only 1.7 per cent. This year an increase of less than a quarter of a per cent is contemplated. That is a decline of at least 15 or 20 per cent in real terms for the last and forthcoming financial years. It is absolutely typical of the contractionary policies of this Government.

I believe that if the Government continues those sorts of budgetary policies it has no possible hope of getting any movement in the economy at all. I would hope that this Government is not given the opportunity to implement this Budget. I hope that, before very long, there is an election, and I am quite convinced that the Labor Party will be elected so that we can bring in our own Budget and improve the economy in this State dramatically.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): When my colleague who has just resumed his seat rose to speak in this debate he pointed out that it has been rather noticeable, to this stage anyway, that there has been very little support for the Government's Budget by way of speeches from the other side of the House. He mentioned that at least one Government member had, to his knowledge, spoken in this debate, and that, of course, is you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was in the House when you spoke, Sir, and I was listening quite intently.

I was rather surprised to hear you say, in your capacity as the member for Eyre, that ETSA has given very good service to South Australia and that, therefore, it would not have the problems in relation to power which have occurred in New South Wales. You prefaced that remark by suggesting that the rates for electricity that have been charged over the years in South Australia have been such that in some way they would have prevented what you described as troubles with the provision of power in New South Wales. As I have said, I was rather surprised to hear the comment because, for the life of me, I cannot understand how the setting of certain rates for the sale of electricity could have a bearing on the power troubles in New South Wales.

Mr Lewis: They didn't have enough capital to build the power station.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It may be of interest to you, Sir, and to the honourable member who has interjected that the problem in New South Wales arose from an entirely different cause altogether and is not at all related to the question of whatever rates are being charged. What happened in New South Wales was that a number of generators, which were all ordered on the same design base from a manufacturer, received and placed in service, subsequently began to suffer severe failures.

The argument involving what occurred in New South Wales would have a much better basis if the criticism were made that perhaps the purchase of equipment of a similar type from the one manufacturer could lead to problems if design faults subsequently occur. But certainly, it would not seem to me to have anything in the world to do with whether proper or adequate rates were being charged by the

utility, whether in New South Wales or South Australia. So, I thought, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you might appreciate that explanation, which I am certain is the correct one, because on a previous occasion in this House I quoted from the questions and answers in the New South Wales Parliament in relation to that very matter involving the failure of the generators concerned.

We are looking at what I believe is the fourth Budget of this present Government, and the relevant documents were given to us in the House at about the same time as the annual report of the Electricity Trust was tabled. Because of some wording in that report, by sheer coincidence, I presume, the Minister of Mines and Energy found it necessary to make a Ministerial statement in the House. In that statement he said that the annual report of Electricity Trust of South Australia, which he had tabled, referred to the supply of natural gas to South Australia after 1987. He said:

It is, as honourable members would know, a matter of concern to the trust, South Australian Gas Company and, of course, the Government that the State's entitlement to natural gas from the Cooper Basin expires at the end of 1987.

He went on to play that old familiar tune, which he has been playing for some three years or more, concerning whose fault it was that gas was sold to New South Wales for a longer term and in a quantity much greater than has been reserved for South Australia, and I will not bore the House with his remarks on that matter. The Minister did say, however, later in his statement:

It is against this background that I inform the House that the Government is taking positive steps to resolve this situation—

three years along the track. The Minister has never found it difficult to talk about the problem, and I do not believe that anyone would quarrel with the fact that there could be a problem after 1987, but when it comes to doing something concrete about it the best we have been able to get is this statement that the Government is taking positive steps to resolve the situation. The Minister went on to say:

The Government has taken part, in conjunction with A.G.L., in discussions with the Amadeus Basin producers and the Northern Territory Government regarding the possibility of obtaining natural gas supplies from the Northern Territory in the event that sufficient economic reserves are delineated by current exploration programmes.

He pointed to the fact as though it were something particularly new for which he might justifiably claim some credit. I can remember the previous Minister of Mines and Energy taking similar steps in 1979 to see what other available supplies of gas could be organised, whether exchange deals could be arranged with A.G.L., investigating certain new finds in the Cooper and other basins, and the possibility of extra gas being available from Bass Strait through the Victorian supply scheme, and so on. So, really, we have not been given any new information by the Government except that for three years it really has not got anywhere, and I think it is reasonable now, after three years, that the Government can be asked what it is really doing. We have had to sit here for three years and cop all the distortions that have been served up about why contracts were signed which led to this situation.

We have had to live with the criticism that a previous Labor Government was less than prudent in respect of the future gas supplies for South Australia. That is not the situation at all, and the matter has been gone through in this House on more than one occasion. If that were the scene, surely we would never have had a previous Premier of this State, the Hon. Steele Hall, claiming credit for the organising of those very contracts. One can see easily, from a very quick examination of that scene, that the criticism that we have had to accept for almost three years this month

has been unfair, unjustified, and not a true statement of the facts. Nevertheless, that is what has happened.

I suggest that now the boot is on the other foot. The present Government has known about this situation for three years and, until now, it has not been able to come up with any solution whatsoever—nothing new, nothing concrete. I do not suggest it would have been an easy job to organise that issue, but I would think it fair to say that, after almost three years, something should be in the pipeline (and I do not intend a pun by that phrase). So much for Ministerial statements of that nature, which we have come to expect from that Minister and other Ministers.

For the first time, with the Budget documents, we were given a document called 'The South Australian Economy, Presented by the Hon. D. O. Tonkin, M.P., for the information of honourable members on the occasion of the Budget, 1982-83'. This was the first time we have had such information. I welcome the idea behind the presentation of additional information to members. An understanding of the Budget can be quite a difficult exercise, and, when we are given explanatory and other information of this nature, it is to the credit of the originator, so I give credit to the Government for doing that. I do not agree with all of the information and the statements in the document, but at least a step in the right direction was taken in presenting this document to members. On page 29 of the document, under the heading 'Mining industry', as a survey of the South Australian economy, as it were, it is stated:

The volume of sales of natural gas from the Cooper Basin increased by 14.5 per cent in 1981.

The document goes on to explain that there were increases by South Australian consumers and that there was a much larger increase by New South Wales consumers. It is further stated:

Price rises made an important contribution to the 32.8 per cent increase (to \$98 100 000) in the 'ex Moomba plant' value of gas sold in 1981 over that of 1980.

I point out that the sales contract, which exists until 1987, provides for the Cooper Basin producers and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia (the purchasers of gas) to meet and agree on annual price reviews. If the agreed review of the price cannot be organised, if the two parties cannot mutually choose a figure that will apply to the price, there is provision for an independent arbitrator to determine the price of gas. I understand that in both 1980 and 1981, resort to arbitration was required, and, once again, in 1982 the result is the same: the matter is to be resolved by arbitration.

I want to stress to the Minister that no doubt any claim to go before an arbitrator by a producer would contain information based on cost structures of the producer concerned. It would be fair for any arbitrator to examine the figures on costs of production, and so on, in determining a price. I understand that that is allowed for under the legislation that governs this scene. It has been put to me that there is a need for an over-view and review of this legislation, because the producer does not in any way have to demonstrate efficiency of operation or management in compiling the costs that can be put forward as a basis for an increase in the price of gas.

Information has been given to me which, on the face of it, suggests that there is a degree of over-manning in the producer company structure. Of course, I am referring to Santos. I understand that the operations conducted at Moomba and in other areas, in the fields away from the plant, could be more efficient than at present. I do not go any further than that. I point out that this information has been put before me and it has been suggested that the Government has a very important vested interest in ensuring that the price for the gas that is finally arrived at, whether by mutual agreement or by arbitration, has to be low enough

to provide for a satisfactory return to the producers and to allow consumers in South Australia to be able to pay for the gas.

The reasoning for that is quite simple and I am sure that honourable members would appreciate that the economy and viability of industry users of gas depend to a very large measure on their ability to pay the costs of the fuel that they use directly, in some cases, or the costs of the electricity that is provided to them by way of power, generated with the use of natural gas as fuel. I will leave that topic, because to this stage I have had no opportunity to make any checks, but on the face of it, the information that was given to me appeared to have some factual basis.

You, Mr Deputy Speaker, referred earlier to the Electricity Trust Annual Report and you quoted from it information that was of interest to members. In my reading of the report, I noticed a rather curious circumstance in regard to pages 1 and 2 of that document. On page 1 of the document, it is stated:

Sales of electricity increased by 3.5 per cent over the previous year and demand reached a record level.

This is the important part:

At the same time costs in all areas of operations continue to increase substantially, mainly as a result of wage and salary determinations, increases in the price of natural gas, and higher interest rates on borrowings.

I ask members to note the order—wages, gas price increases, and higher interest rates. On page 2, in regard to the difficulties of economies of scale, it was stated:

With lower rates of load growth the effects of economies of scale are diminishing and are being more than offset by rising fuel costs, substantial increases in the costs of new generating plant and high interest rates on borrowings as well as continual increases in labour costs.

In the short passage from page 1 to page 2, whereas wages were being blamed first in order of priority for increases in cost, on the next page they have been set down as fourth in order of priority. There seems to be some confusion in the minds of the people who prepared the report, or possibly there was an anxiety to even support the Government's claim of wages outstripping the capacity of the economy to pay and increasing at a rate that is not fair in the present economic circumstances.

The remainder of the report contains some other interesting features that I believe deserve to be aired. If we look at the cash reserves of the trust, we see that \$94 000 000 is mentioned as being the current amount. I have no quarrel with that, because I know that the trust will have a large capital outlay continuing over some years and it is obviously prudent for it to develop as far as it can, a reserve scheme so that, when the demand for the cash occurs, it will have some cash on hand and will not have to borrow it all. However, it is interesting that the report states that the average rate of earnings on those cash reserves, a large sum, was 13.5 per cent, yet on the trust's borrowing, the borrowing cost was 16 per cent. There was a 2½ per cent differential between what it was earning and what it was paying on borrowings.

I have not any financial skills or training, but I know from contact I have had with financial people who have the skills that it is argued that, if one is borrowing at any more than 1½ per cent above what one earns on reserves, one may be in difficulty in later years. I have studied the Act, and the trust is not prohibited in any way, as far as I can see, regarding what it can invest in and earn from, and one can only conjecture that the higher rate may be due to the fact that the trust has been asked to lend to other State departments or statutory bodies. However, no reason is given in the report.

Another curious set of figures in the report is that there has been an increase from 1980-81 to 1981-82 in revenue from sales of electricity. The increase has been from

\$256 993 000 to \$319 793 000. On a fairly simple calculation I have made, that indicates an increase of almost 19 per cent in revenue for the year just completed. There was a 3.5 per cent increase in sales and, therefore, it would seem that there has been quite a substantial increase in electricity charges over the past 12 months that has led to a significant jump in revenue, albeit that the money may be needed and may be justified. I offer those figures for your perusal later, Sir, as in your remarks you were discussing this area.

If we look at another area in the Estimates of Receipts part of the Budget, on page 5 we find that the statutory corporation contributions line for the trust shows that last year \$14 809 686 was paid, and the estimated receipts for this current 12 months, to be paid by way of a levy that applies on sales to the Government, \$18 500 000. An increase of over 20 per cent is estimated. I understand that the current rate of increase in demand for electricity is now below 3½ per cent and is probably about 2 per cent, so it would seem that other electricity price increases may be in the offing if the 5 per cent levy is going to reach the figure provided in the Estimates of Receipts. I suggest that that will not be palatable to the people of South Australia when one takes into account the recent hefty increases to which I have been alluding.

One other area I wish to cover in relation to the Budget that deals with the portfolio for which I have shadow responsibility is the Financial Statement and the number of words given to the Minister and the Department of Mines and Energy throughout the document. I recall the statement by the Minister about 23 or 24 September 1979. He was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying:

It is all go here, I am afraid.

While one can amuse oneself by placing a nuance in that sentence at different points, I gather that the Minister was saying that everything was going to hum and going to go and that he was going to get it going in that manner. Apparently, we are not going to see any of that in this Budget, because the figures provided show that a very small increase has been made. For the year just completed, there was an amount of about \$50 000 underspent in the Department of Mines and Energy and there were savings on the Cooper Basin consultancy side, and the payment for services by Amdel were offset partly by increased expenditure on the department's drilling operations. It seems that things are not humming and haring along nearly as much as we have been led to believe by the Minister of Mines and Energy over the past three years, with a constant barrage of figures about who is exploring where, who is drilling what hole, and how much money is being spent in the State.

If we look at the suggested bonanza that is going to occur as a result of vastly increased mining activity, we find that for the coming year, territorial revenues to be collected by the department are expected to be \$10 200 000 in 1982-83, compared to \$8 500 000 in the previous year. It looks as though that bonanza that we have been told about is still some distance away and around the corner, and I guess that we can only await the veritable stream of money that will come to this State. There has been a real con trick going on. The way in which the royalties are computed takes into account the costs involved in production, and in the early days, even with a scheme like the Stony Point project, enormous costs are involved in the setting up. For instance, interest charges on the large sums involved will be such that it will be some time before any substantial royalties come to the State even from such a scheme as that, which we, as an Opposition, support.

Realism is needed in the matter, not the constant rhetoric we get from the Minister opposite and the Premier suggesting that if we hitch our wagon to oil, copper and uranium,

everybody in the State will get rich and all we have to do is sit back and await prosperity. On the contrary, that is not the scene at all.

The figures in relation to the projected activities of the Department of Mines and Energy this year are such that there is only a 4.3 per cent increase on the funds used last year, which were underspent anyway. That is at a time when we are in double digit inflation, and 4.3 per cent would not go anywhere near meeting the necessary amount. The 4.3 per cent increase would not be sufficient to provide for even the inflationary component associated with wages and other costs in that area.

I was speaking of recurrent and other costs but if one looks at the capital pages provided in the document, the answer is that the Minister proposes to spend \$400 000 less in the current year than was spent last year, at a time when we are told by him that everything in the garden is lovely and that the Mines Department can solve the economic problems of the State. I believe I have demonstrated the fallacy and stupidity of believing the sort of things the Minister puts out. We, on this side, do not believe it and look forward to being elected to Government at the next election so that we can come forward with a Budget for this State which will take into account realistically its future in minerals and energy and the energy scene generally.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr Hemmings: My God, he—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hanson does not need the assistance of the member for Napier, who has already been warned by the Speaker.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I intend to be very brief, because I do not believe that an Opposition could be so inept in pursuing the Government Budget and the Budget documents. I did not believe that we had an Opposition that could be so negative and could adopt this attitude in again trying to put down a Government that is endeavouring to do something positive for the benefit of the people of South Australia. The whole problem we face in this State is the difference between the negative and the positive. If we are going to run around with a negative attitude, South Australia will get nowhere. There will be no development and no prospect of obtaining employment. If we think and act positively, something will be done.

I was going to make a comment that not one member of the Opposition has quoted from or even used the document that came with the Budget titled, the South Australian Economy. That, of course, is a very important adjunct to the whole of the budgetary papers because it sets out, in an apolitical form, the history in relation to the economy of South Australia and how we have fared. If members read it and studied it, they would liken the situation in South Australia to that which Queensland was in some 20 years ago. South Australia is undoubtedly in a better financial position than most other Australian States. We do not have to go to the whole hog situation as Neville Wran did in New South Wales and pinch some \$300 000 000 from the various statutory authorities. That was the greatest embezzlement fraud that has ever been placed before the taxpayers in any State in Australia and would never stand up under any constitutional investigation. It is a pity New South Wales does not have an effective Public Accounts Committee operating in its Parliament.

What has happened in New South Wales in regard to tax is a disgrace. If members of the Opposition want us to do that in South Australia, by all means let them say so. However, there is no way that the Government is going to adopt that attitude. It will not solve anything; it puts off the evil day and creates a false economy. When a Govern-

ment has to repay the huge borrowings, as will be found in New South Wales, it will then accept the advice given in relation to the Administration of Neville Wran. However, not one speaker for the Opposition has taken the care to examine the documents and point out where the Government has increased its spending or why it has done so.

In looking at one area, on pages 66 and 67 in relation to the arts, let us remember that for years the previous Labor Government in this State spent very little and gave a low priority to tourism. In fact, back in the early 1970s the amount of money allocated to tourism was barely enough to meet operating costs, let alone the occasional pamphlet or piece of literature to assist tourist offices to undertake reasonable promotion. Now we find the mentor of the 1970s of South Australia has had a change of attitude in this regard as he has been offered and has accepted the position of Director of Tourism in Victoria. Good luck to him! I do not begrudge him that position at all. I hope in the 1970s he learnt his lesson. The impact of it was that the best and quickest growth industry is the tourist industry, because it is labour-intensive.

The only thing that is killing our tourist industry in this State and our nation is penalty rates. It will be a game Government that will stand up and abolish penalty rates for the workers in this State. However, if we look at the hard cold facts, we cannot compete with our near neighbours in the South-East Asian region or in some parts of Europe and America, because penalty rates are killing the accommodation and travel industry as a whole. The industry does not operate on a five-day a week, 9 to 5 arrangement. It is a seven-day-a-week operation, 365 days a year and almost 24 hours a day. Not even considered in the casino debate was the cost of running that type of operation when we have to consider penalty rates.

So, in anything we do or anything we talk about in the areas that are labour-intensive, particularly tourism or the arts, we must remember that it is penalty rates that cost us plenty. It costs more to hire the Festival Theatre on the weekend than for the rest of the week. Nobody has said anything about that or offered to provide any assistance in that respect. We can look at the Budget for the arts and see that in 1981-82 the Government voted \$9 500 000. The actual payments were \$13 700 000 and this Budget amount is \$16 500 000, in excess of a 20 per cent increase. We can look at the various areas where funds have been expended. The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust will require almost \$2 000 000 to meet its debt services. It annoys me to think that, after all these years, the dispute relating to construction of the Adelaide Festival Theatre has not been settled or finalised. There is still no clear title to the Adelaide Festival Theatre. It is costing us \$2 000 000 a year to meet the debt services.

We have seen the growth and development of various regional cultural centre trusts. It is a welcome move to afford to the people in those areas the opportunity to participate in the benefits to come through those regional trusts. However, it is not a cheap operation. The debt services alone for the five country regions will be \$4 200 000. Grants for the operating expenses will be some \$575 000. When the public and the people can consider criticising the Budget, let them bear in mind that the Government has a responsibility to cover all areas within the State and within the various portfolios. The money has to be expended in a manner in which the majority of people will benefit.

So, the arts has done very well indeed. Yet not one member of the Opposition has come out and said that, irrespective of what the Opposition believes from a philo-

sophical viewpoint, the Government deserves credit for what it has done in the arts.

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

ROYAL COMMISSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PRISONERS (INTERSTATE TRANSFER) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

REFERENDUM (DAYLIGHT SAVING) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): The member for Hanson, who was the second member on the Government side to speak on this very important measure, criticised the Opposition for not having referred to the *South Australian Economy*, was published by the Premier. I do not want to disappoint the member for Hanson, but I read that document, and I am sorry to say that I did not find it of any value to me whatsoever. As a matter of fact, I think that it just reiterates very many of the points that members of the Opposition have been making over the past 12 months. There is a lot of history, and it really places the blame for the economic ills of this State on everyone else.

I formally support the Budget, but I do so without any enthusiasm or joy. The Budget is a confession of failure, and it seems that the Treasurer places far more importance on politics in this document than on people. Considerable time is spent on placing the blame for our ills, and nowhere does it come up with recommendations or suggestions as to how they should be cured. It is lacking in spirit and confidence, and it will do nothing to encourage spending and investment. If one reads the first few pages, it becomes very clear that economic recovery in this country is, indeed, uncertain. It shows the public that the Government's economic predictions cannot be relied on. During the past 18 months or so we have heard on many occasions comments by the Premier and the Chamber of Commerce to the effect that we have turned the corner, that things are looking ahead, but the Government has failed once again to put forward any economic ideas on how to handle the employment difficulties of this State. In his speech, the Premier stated:

The cornerstone of the Budget strategy for this year is a continuation of sound financial management. This is the fourth successive Budget I have introduced containing no significant increases in State taxation. Indeed, reductions in taxation introduced by my Government in 1979 and 1980 benefited the South Australian taxpayer to the extent of some \$30 million a year. That benefit is continuing and increasing. In addition, my Gov-

ernment has reduced the public sector work force significantly and I will refer to this matter in more detail shortly. It is difficult to quantify the benefit of that action on Government expenditures. The main benefit has been to the building and construction industry and to private sector employment.

The bold initiatives to create 7 000 jobs for young people now exist in name only. There are financial cut-backs in almost every area, with some departments worse off than others. At the same time, State charges have soared—electricity is up, water and sewerage rates are up, vehicle fees have increased, fares on public transport are up, and charges for more than 100 other items have soared since this Government came to power. It appears that there is more than one way of skinning a cat, and the Treasurer has obviously discovered that particular method.

'Stop the job rot', they cried. Yet, on the Premier's own admission, Public Service and teaching jobs will be axed further. The Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer also have admitted that unemployment will be worse next year. In that context it should be remembered that in last year's Federal Budget the allocation for unemployment benefits was increased by \$33 800 000, or 3.7 per cent. However, the actual increase in benefits paid was a massive \$228 600 000, which represents a 22.9 per cent rise. That meant that the allocation was almost \$200 000 000 less than the actual amount that was required.

In the 1982-83 Federal Budget, an extra \$342 700 000 has been allocated for unemployment benefits, a rise of 28 per cent over the actual expenditure in 1981-82, and one wonders, with the way in which the economy is being handled, whether that amount will be sufficient to pay benefits to all of those who are presently unemployed and to the many thousands more who, unfortunately, will lose their jobs during the next financial year. The average number of unemployment benefit recipients is estimated to rise from 332 000 in 1981-82 to 395 000 in 1982-83, an increase of 63 000. That represents a budgeted increase of 19 per cent, and the Federal Treasurer forecasts no increase in employment during 1982-83. That is not a very bright future, to say the least.

I want to refer now to the transport area of the Budget. The total vote for transport in the Budget is approximately \$4 700 000 more than the actual payments of 1981-82. This figure represents approximately a 4½ per cent increase in actual money terms, but with inflation running at well over 11 per cent, it must represent a reduced effort by the Government within the Department of Transport. The transport vote itself has increased by \$268 799, or by less than 2 per cent. The Highways Department vote has risen by \$827 768, or by a little over 3 per cent. The miscellaneous vote has risen by \$3 599 400, or by a little over 5½ per cent. With regard to the Administration and Planning Division the vote has increased by only \$55 537, or by about 3½ per cent. Again, it appears that last year's effort in this area will be reduced.

In regard to road safety, and so on, the vote is up by an amount of \$102 255, which represents an increase of about 14½ per cent. However, before one gets too excited about that, one should realise that that amount could very well reflect a full year's operation of the new Central Inspection Authority workshop at Regency Park or the rearrangement of staff. I believe that it must be one or the other, and only time will reveal the true story in that regard.

The vote for the Government Motor Garage has risen by \$53 741, or by about 5½ per cent, which represents an anticipation of a reduction in staff or perhaps a reduction in overtime. The vote for the Motor Registration Division has risen by \$248 619, or by about 4 per cent. That amount represents a totally inadequate sum, and I am forced to strongly criticise the Government for this reduced vote, as

a reduction in staff can mean only a lesser service to the public. As it is the money from motorists that already pays the cost of the registration offices, I point out that motorists are entitled to an adequate service and should not be subjected to the Government's penny-pinching exercises. The vote given under the heading of 'Contingencies—Administration and Planning Division' has risen by \$26 817, or by about 14 per cent, but the increase is almost exclusively for administration expenses and minor equipment. I will be seeking an explanation of why this is so and for what purpose the money will be used.

In regard to the Road Safety and Motor Transport Division, the amounts proposed are well down on the amounts given for the last financial year. In fact the amount has been decreased by \$73 282, or by about 8½ per cent. I ask the Government to explain what additions can be achieved in regard to road safety centres that cost only \$2 000. The Government claims to be concerned about road safety, yet it can spare only a miserly \$2 000 to be spent on those centres. That is quite incredible when one takes heed of the road toll figures and compares them with the figures that applied for the same time last year. Why is there to be a reduction in projects and displays represented by an amount of almost \$38 000? Also, is this reduction an indication that the Government is satisfied with the marked increase in the road toll this year? Is the random breath test evaluation a further attempt to get material to prop up the Government's failures in the entire area of road safety? A great deal of clarification is required concerning a number of areas related to road safety, which clarification I intend to seek during the Estimates Committees stages.

The vote for the Government Motor Garage contingencies has been reduced by \$105 676, but only because no provision has been made for the replacement of Ministerial cars, and because the responsibility for the purchase of motor vehicles and their replacements has been transferred to the Department of Services and Supply under the Ministerial control of the Deputy Premier. However, I can find nothing in the appendix concerning the Government Motor Garage or the Highways Department. There is an amount showing for transport, so it could well be that that amount will cover the Highways Department as well. Also, there is an amount of \$206 000 shown under the heading 'Other'—whatever that means.

The proposed total expenditure for 1982-83 for the purchase of motor vehicles for Government departments is \$7 130 000, but cunningly enough the amount of expenditure for the previous financial year is not disclosed in that section, and members would need to go through the lines of all Government departments to check out that matter, which indicates that perhaps the Government has something to hide in that area. The vote for the Highways Department has risen by \$493 495, or by about 4½ per cent, and it suggests, as do other lines, a very clear reduction in effort, a situation which should not be tolerated, particularly when the need to upgrade our roads is so very urgent. Such expenditure makes a complete mockery of the Government's claim that it has done more for roads.

It must also be remembered that the money for the running of the Highways Department and for the building of roads is provided by motorists who are entitled to the best roads possible and who should not be frustrated by the Government's ineptitude. The proposed vote for the State Transport Authority shows an increase of \$3 613 000, or of about 6½ per cent. Again, it can be seen that there is a need for the authority to reduce its activities; it must either reduce staff or contain its operating costs in some other way. The subsidies for community and country town buses (both of which were initiatives of the former Labor Government) are simply being continued; I suppose that we should be

grateful that the present Government has not axed those schemes, as it perhaps would like to do (perhaps it is too afraid to do so).

It is extremely disturbing to note that the transport concessions for pensioners are being reduced in the Budget by \$30 337, which is a clear indication of the disregard of the present Government for those people in need. I understand also that the travel concessions for unemployed people has been reduced by the Department for Community Welfare. It may well be that the Government does not expect pensioners and unemployed people to travel on public transport as much as they did last year, even though our population is growing older and unemployment is ever increasing.

Most of the increase in capital payments is on account of housing and the O'Bahn north-eastern busway. Explicit payments on the O'Bahn busway are to rise by \$6 900 000. When giving examples of areas where activity is financed outside the Consolidated Account, on page 7 of the Financial Statement, the Premier stated:

As to capital works, funds will be needed increasingly in future years if the State is to meet normal demands and make some contribution towards infrastructure for major developments. In 1982-83, capital funds will be under further pressure, due to the need to set aside \$42 million to support recurrent operations. This amount is less than last year and the actual need will depend, of course, on the extent of salary and wage increases during the year.

The need to reserve those funds is not an ideal situation. Basically, it has arisen because of the effect of cost increases on recurrent operations, our determination to avoid taxation increases and recent trends in the level of Commonwealth grants.

However, it is important that the situation be put into proper perspective. Let me make three points.

First, the Consolidated Account is only a part, though a large part, of the State's system of public finances. The position is different if the overall picture is looked at. I plan to table in this House fairly soon a Treasury paper which will show the finances of the State on a consolidated basis. Overall, we expect capital expenditures by the Government itself and the various statutory corporations to increase substantially in real terms in 1982-83.

An example of an area where much of the activity is financed outside the Consolidated Account is welfare housing. The programmes are delivered by the Housing Trust and the State Bank. The Government proposes increases in the funds from the Consolidated Account, from the semi-governemnt borrowing programme and from other sources in 1982-83. Details of welfare housing proposals are set out later in detailed comment on the 1982-83 Budget.

Second, within its capital allocation of funds, the Government will be proceeding with a number of major projects in 1982-83. Work on the North East Busway will continue and increase in tempo, and we will start upgrading the railways signalling system.

It is noted in the Budget Appendix 1, on additional information on major items of payments of a capital nature, that the estimated total cost of the north-east busway is \$95 000 000, and that anticipated cash cost was based on the approved cost of \$53 500 000 at 1981 prices. I think it can be assumed that the cost of the O'Bahn busway will escalate to well in excess of \$100 000 000.

The expenditure last financial year on the busway was \$7 490 000, and the proposed expenditure for 1982-83 is \$12 500 000. That is an enormous amount for an experiment (and that is all it can be called) with no planned date of commencement or completion, according to the Budget documents.

Mr Mathwin: It would cost three times that sum to provide the trams that you wanted in the first place. They are not flexible.

Mr ABBOTT: For the benefit of the member for Glenelg, I point out that an article that appeared in the *Australian* on Friday 27 August bears out the comment that I made, namely, that the O'Bahn system is purely and simply an experiment. Under the heading, 'Essen travel put on right track', it is stated:

The world's first track-guided route section for buses on a scheduled public route began in the West German town of Essen on 28 September 1980.

It was the first section of a multi-stage transport scheme, initiated by the Essen Transport Authority, which was confronted with an urgent need to move public transport along narrow streets through a comparatively small area of the city.

The O'Bahn system had all the basic parameters which met the unique transport problems with which Essen had to deal. There is a 1.3 km section of guided track dedicated only to the special Mercedes-Benz buses, but once through this section the buses move into traffic streams and function normally.

The operational track, known as the Fulerumer Strasse section, is being used as a test case for a further 2.6 km of track and a tunnel which will be incorporated in 1985. This new section will incorporate the use of an old tramway route in Essen which would have been prohibitively expensive to extend.

The Fulerumer Strasse is providing a great deal of operating data which is helping to refine the O'Bahn bus operation. There are 21 Mercedes-Benz articulated buses being used on the service and extensive measurements, observations and passenger and driver surveys are being conducted to evaluate its success.

Here we have a Government that has adopted the Essen experiment without any proof of its being a successful busway operation in the city of Adelaide. The display of the experimental O'Bahn bus at the Royal Adelaide Show is simply a further indication of the Government's desperation in the lead up to the election to try to convince the public that the proposal is other than an untried and unproved experiment.

The Minister had acknowledged that the schedule for the O'Bahn operation was not until 1986—some 4 years hence—yet he was displaying the bus publicly as if it were to go into operation almost forthwith. It is little wonder then, when this is explained, that some people have suggested that the Government's display is, at best, rather dubious. The statement by the Minister that after the show the bus will be used for further experimental purposes is yet another clear indicator that Adelaide may well have 'bought a pup'. If the system were the success the Minister claims it to be, we would find it operating in cities around the world, but, on the Minister's own admission, apart from Essen in West Germany, no city anywhere in the world has an O'Bahn operating for public transport. It must be remembered that Essen is the home of the O'Bahn and has only about 1.8 km of track, or a little more, operating virtually as a demonstration project.

It is clear that when the O'Bahn was foisted on the public the Minister claimed that it would be much cheaper than the l.r.t. scheme of the former Labor Government, but as time goes by the fallacy of this claim is slowly but clearly emerging. Already the published estimated cost has soared to \$95 000 000, with four years building and experimenting still ahead. I have been informed from a very reliable source that the design staff have already found that the hastily prepared estimates did not take proper account of the soil conditions along the route of the scheme and, as a result, the concrete structures will cost considerably more than the estimates provide. Worse still is the fact that the O'Bahn will cost far more than would one of the l.r.t. proposals, and for a much lesser service. Of course, the cost of operation of l.r.t. is considerably less than that of O'Bahn. There are many unknowns attached to O'Bahn, but one thing is certain: Adelaide will have the dubious distinction of being the only city in the world, other than Essen, to host the O'Bahn experiment, and the even more dubious distinction of the taxpayer's picking up the tab for the experiment.

I referred earlier to the Government's intention to cut jobs in the Public Service and in the Education Department. I have had handed to me tonight a leaflet put out by the South Australian Institute of Teachers, relating to the shrinking education dollar. Its value is approximately 90c, and it refers to the education cuts which will harm every

person's child. On the back it states the following startling facts:

Education has a low priority in the State and Federal Budgets. Both State and Federal Governments fail to keep their election promises for education. Government directs money away from education and other Government services such as health welfare and housing.

All have been viciously attacked since the last election. Since 1979, the education dollar has been cut by 10 per cent.

Essential services—not provided.

Essential buildings—not provided.

Essential teachers—not employed.

It appeals to the public to tell their local politicians how they want their money spent, and to use their vote wisely. We heard on television tonight the Premier forecasting that there will be a 10 per cent swing against the Government in the Florey by-election to be held next Saturday.

Mr Mathwin: He did not say a 10 per cent swing. He said that it would be down to 10 per cent.

Mr ABBOTT: The Premier stated that there would be a 10 per cent swing against the Government.

Mr Mathwin: Your Leader said it was not a foregone conclusion. He is a bit worried.

Mr ABBOTT: There is likely to be a 17 per cent to 18 per cent swing when one considers the performance of the present Government.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I rise to support the Budget. I do so because it is the traditional thing to do. If one is going to oppose it one has a huge task ahead to convince Parliament that that should be the case. In so doing, I have some reservations about the overall fiscal policies of Governments, not just this Government but Governments of the day, and the tendency to use Loan funding for the Revenue Account. I know that it can be a hotly debated issue, and one can find strong supporters on one side and equally strong opposers on the other side. However, it is a matter of great concern to me.

I refer to the direction in which we in South Australia are heading in relation to Government funding of State and Federal operations. As each Budget period comes around we hear a lot of political statements about the desirability of balancing a Budget. On the one hand, we have the Treasurer making claims that he has balanced the Budget and, on the other hand, we have the Opposition claiming that the figures are rigged. It seems to be a common practice that has occurred over a number of years with both past and present Governments. The ultimate outcome concerns me.

Let us look at the situation in a simplified manner. Governments of recent years have been using Loan funds to pay recurrent expenditure. Liberal and Labor Governments have been doing it. It has become almost ignored, but should it be? Should we let it be ignored or take positive steps to see that the system, which is now becoming the norm, is changed? What is really happening when this takes place? I believe that it is gradually undermining the economic finance system to the stage where we are 'passing the buck' for the responsibilities of financing today for the generations of tomorrow. For example, in the last two years more than \$80 000 000 have been transferred from the Loan Account into general revenue. That represents \$80 000 000-worth of capital expenditure that has not taken place within this State. Just which of the areas are most likely to have been neglected or missed out in that \$80 000 000?

I do not think it would be presumptuous of me to suggest that it has been non-metropolitan areas. What happens in relation to that money? That \$80 000 000 has to be repaid, with interest. If the Government borrowed that money at 12½ per cent interest, the interest repayment bill would be \$10 500 000 a year. We must also add to that the capital

repayment. That is a noose around the necks of our future generations. It is \$10 000 000 plus which will be saddled to every budgetary period from now on, and it is \$10 000 000 which cannot be used for capital expenditure in areas where it is most needed.

The use of Loan funds to bolster up the day-to-day revenue of the State is, I believe, nothing but a disaster. Those who own farming properties could liken it to selling off the back paddock to pay the annual commitment. We all know that the back paddock must run out eventually. Whichever way we look at the situation, we are placing our future generations in an untenable position. The practice of using Loan funds to pay current expenditure became obvious in the United States some years ago and now every State in that country has passed laws to force Governments of the day to be responsible for their actions. Each State has a slightly different scheme with which it achieves that objective, but basically Governments must budget within the confines of their revenue raising abilities.

If for some reason a Government exceeds its Budget and has to use Loan funds to balance its Budget for a particular year, it is legally bound to raise additional revenue at the next Budget to repay the deficit immediately. In this way, Government officers, Ministers and treasury officials are all bound by Parliament to be responsible for their actions and not act with short term expediency in order to catch votes and leave the responsibility for their actions to some future Government and future generations to rectify.

I add to this scenario another thought to ponder: just who is going to pay the bill? I ask all people to seriously consider that question. I believe that when and if such a situation does occur it will be the people at the end of the line who will be most severely affected; in other words, country people, primary producers, small business people, and all those people who are unable to pass on increased expenditure. On top of all that, let us add another aspect to this financial structure. This country has been saddled with a Public Service superannuation bill which is growing out of all proportion. When superannuation schemes were originally implemented, the contributions were roughly 50-50 from the employer and the employee. With today's inflation rate and escalating wage rises it is impossible to predict what that bill might become.

It has been estimated that the Government is now paying 82 per cent of the superannuation bill. Let us look at a situation where a person joins the Public Service, joins the superannuation scheme and contributes at the rate of 5½ or 6 per cent per annum at today's wage rates. On retirement that person is not superannuated at the rate at which he contributes but at the rate of pay at which he retires. In many cases an escalation factor is built into the scheme, so the Government's bill is many times that which it expected it would pay when the superannuation scheme was first implemented.

I believe that Governments' have a tiger by the tail. They do not really know what to do with it. I expect that it will not be too long before Governments will find they are unable to meet their obligations in the payment of superannuation. I believe that if we looked closely at some of the finances of some of the States in Australia, we would find that that situation is dreadfully near. We have a major problem with finance and we have Governments committed to superannuation schemes that are unpredictable. Added to this is the propensity of some Governments to use Loan funds to pay day-to-day expenditure and we have a future projection which is mind boggling, not only in relation to a Government's ability to repay but also in relation to the loss of capital expenditure from areas where it is most needed.

I believe that Governments should not be allowed to continue to commit future generations to massive interest bills. A 10-year projection of 15 per cent interest on \$100 000 000 would result in an accumulated deficit of \$404 500 000 at the end of that 10-year period, assuming there was no further use of Loan funds in the intervening period. If there was a continuing use, obviously that amount would escalate. I believe this is a very serious problem. However, we cannot point the finger at one particular Government and say that it alone is at fault, because both Governments of recent years have been doing exactly the same thing. Parliaments must try to force Governments to act responsibly in relation to financial management so that future generations are not saddled with impossible burdens.

In looking at some of the background material on the subject I was advised to consult a book by Aaron Wildavsky, and I quote from the cover of that book, as follows:

If the Federal Government balances its Budget without reducing its expenditures, the result is higher taxes. If Federal revenue is cut without regard for expenditures, the result is higher inflation. If one State cuts its taxes more than its neighbors do, then that State supports its neighbors by paying more tax to the Federal Government.

Can we avoid these dilemmas? Can we avoid higher taxes, on the one hand, and higher inflation, on the other, while asking, State by State, the same level of sacrifice from everyone? Aaron Wildavsky says we can and tells us how in this provocative—

It then refers to the book, and continues:

His solution is a constitutional amendment limiting Federal expenditure to a fixed percentage of the gross national product. In his own words:

Each year's expenditure depends upon last year's plus the percentage by which the output of the nation's goods and services has gone up. Hence, under the amendment, the size of the public sector could not grow faster than the size of the private sector. Should the political process produce a lower level of spending in any one year, the size of succeeding years, which depends on what has gone before, would similarly be smaller.

It further states:

The idea is not to limit spending to some absolute amount, regardless of national productivity or new needs that cannot now be foreseen, but relate public consumption to private production so the one doesn't eat up the other. A constitutional expenditure limit is a social contract establishing a division of resources between the private and public sectors.

Many of the comments and statements should be heeded because, unless we watch carefully what we do, we could saddle future generations with interest bills that will tie their hands in regard to what they can do with this country in the future.

On 24 August I was called from this Chamber by an *Advertiser* journalist and asked to comment on a proposed article concerning a constituent of mine. I was asked to comment on the resignation of a former branch member of the National Country Party, Mr Michael Bammann. On seeking clarification from this journalist I was advised that the alleged reason for the resignation was in protest against the National Country Party's contesting metropolitan seats. I told the journalist that the reasons alleged were not those stated by Mr Bammann in his letter of resignation dated 22 June. I then showed the actual letter of resignation to the journalist, and it read as follows:

Dear Peter,

It is with regret that I am handing in my resignation as Cleve Branch President of the National Country Party of Australia, and also terminating my membership. I feel that I am only holding the branch back as there are better versed and more politically minded people amongst the N.C.P. members, who would be more capable of holding down this position. Also, I feel there has not been a lot achieved for the State as a whole. I will not divulge the information I have had as a member of the N.C.P. to any other political Party. I will hand over the letters and correspondence I have to the branch Secretary Eddie Elleway as soon as possible.

Yours sincerely,
Michael W. Bammann.

The journalist's reaction then was that Mr Bammann was not likely to be of much assistance to any political Party.

Mr Keneally: Mr Bannon?

Mr BLACKER: It is Mr Michael Bammann. Also, I stated that Mr Bammann's inactivity was of concern to the Party. He had called only a few meetings in six years. We had complaints from members in the area and we were taking steps to have him removed from office. In fact, in order to accommodate Mr Bammann, the Flinders electorate meeting convened a regular meeting at Cleve, but Mr Bammann chose to go net fishing that night. I then challenged the journalist about who had tipped him off and, as expected, the journalist was tight lipped about his source of information.

I then suggested that a certain member of the Upper House, who had been very vocal against the National Country Party, was the culprit. A spontaneous reaction from another journalist in the same room left little doubt that the informant was the Hon. Martin Cameron. The subject was then dropped, but a further discussion ensued as to the likelihood of such a trivial article being printed. I told him that possibly 1 000 members of the National Country Party are former Liberal Party or L.C.L. members, but that is not news. In any event, those people have a right to confidentiality in their political choice. I am sure that if we did open our files the contents thereof would raise a few eyebrows.

When that article failed to appear in the press the next day, I assumed that the matter had been laid to rest. However, it appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser* on Thursday 26 August, pushing the findings of the Western Australian Costigan Report on to the third page. It is nice to know that one can rank at that level. That article, under the heading 'Cleve N.C.P. president quits to join Libs' stated:

A West Coast President of the National Country Party has resigned and joined the Liberal Party in protest at the N.C.P.'s electoral campaigns in metropolitan seats.

Mr M. W. Bammann, President of the N.C.P.'s Cleve branch since 1976, quit the party in May and joined the Liberal Party on Monday.

The Liberal Party has attacked the N.C.P. over its metropolitan seats activity which has diverted campaign funds to defend Liberal candidates against the N.C.P.

The Liberal Party blamed the N.C.P. for the Liberals' failure to win the seat of Mitcham at the May by-election, when N.C.P. preferences played a crucial part in the election of Mrs Heather Southcott, now State leader of the Australian Democrats.

Mr Bammann said on Tuesday the main reason for his resignation was the N.C.P.'s decision to run candidates in marginal Liberal-held metropolitan seats. The 40-year-old farmer of Cleve, west of Cowell—

and that comment incensed all the people at Cleve—

on Eyre Peninsula, said of his switch: It might prick some ears and cause some feedback. It's just leaving the way open for non-Liberal parties to get back to power again. It's splitting the vote. I do feel quite strongly about it.'

He said the N.C.P. move into metropolitan seats was a waste of funds when both the N.C.P. and the Liberal Party were working towards the same end. Cleve is in the electorate of Flinders, which is held by the N.C.P. State Leader, Mr Blacker.

Mr Bammann said Mr Blacker had won the seat because of the Liberal Movement split in the Liberal Party, yet the N.C.P.'s campaign indicated the party was trying to recreate that situation in South Australia.

Mr Blacker said: 'I am quite confident in my own mind there are other issues involved in this. I am disappointed he has done this when he was in a position to have input into that decision-making (on the N.C.P. campaigns) and he chose not to.'

I think honourable members would know how fallacious most of those statements are. I am still amazed that such a trivial story took precedence of the findings in the Costigan Report and shared the front page of the *Advertiser* with the State Budget. I was contacted by many radio stations, only one of which made anything of his story. The rest dropped the article on recognising how infantile the matter was.

When I entered Parliament House that morning I took the trouble to congratulate the Hon. Martin Cameron on the article that he had prepared for the front page of the *Advertiser*. He did not deny the allegation, but assumed a rather rosy complexion, further confirming my suspicions of his involvement in this whole affair.

That afternoon I expressed my concern to the Premier, indicating that I believe that the Hon. Martin Cameron was involved and that, more than likely, so was Mr Peter Dunn, who is well known to me, as he unsuccessfully sought preselection against me for the House of Assembly seat of Flinders. On returning to my district that evening I received a message from the Editor of the *Cleve Tribune* asking me to contact him. As I was going to Kimba the next morning, I called in to see him. He wished to discuss with me another matter and the manner in which the Hon. Martin Cameron had used the evidence of the *Tribune* for Party-political purposes. On his desk was a copy of Thursday's *Advertiser*, and a discussion ensued about the origin of Mr Bammann's article. At that time I learned that Mr Bammann was circulating a hand-written letter believed to be in the Hon. Martin Cameron's handwriting. He was seeking an opinion whether the contents were libellous. The editor asked whether he could print the article but was told that the *Advertiser* was to be given first preference. Mr Bammann was subsequently told that if the article appeared in the *Advertiser* it would be old news and the local paper would not be interested in printing it.

Mr Bammann said that he expected the article to appear in Wednesday's *Advertiser*. However, when told that it would be impossible to get the article to Adelaide in time, he replied that Mr Peter Dunn was to fly the article to Adelaide in his private plane. Whether or not this occurred, I cannot say, but the article was in the hands of the journalist by Tuesday evening.

Up until this time, I had some sympathy for Mr Bammann, as I believed that he had been used by the Hon. Mr Cameron and his Party and that Mr Bammann's responses to the journalists when telephoned for his comments were the direct result of other people's words in his mouth. The fact that Mr Bammann was circulating a hand-written article on the day prior to the journalist contacting him indicates that he was willing to be used.

On making further inquiries in Cleve, I was told that the Hon. Martin Cameron, when asked why he was in Cleve, stated that he was on a secret mission to get 'the National Country Party'. One wonders at the stupidity of such a comment. However, I was absolutely convinced that the whole exercise was the brainchild of Mr Cameron, and I then had evidence of his involvement on three separate occasions.

Later that day I telephoned the Premier and told him of this and, rather than deny Mr Cameron's involvement, the Premier stated that Mr Cameron had not covered his tracks very well. I then asked the Premier for an undertaking that the Hon. Mr Cameron would cease his vendetta and that I expected a reply before the weekend was over. Until this moment, I have had no undertaking from the Premier that the Hon. Martin Cameron would cease such activities, and I can only assume that the Hon. Martin Cameron has the support of the Premier.

In fairness to other Government members, I know that they disagree with the Hon. Mr Cameron's tactics. The sorry part of all this is that it is all so totally unnecessary and that all the publicity that the N.C.P. has received has been because of Mr Cameron's vendetta against us. Had he kept his mouth shut and recognised the benefits to be gained by two non-socialist Parties running and exchanging preferences, the N.C.P. would still be struggling for recognition.

I assure Mr Cameron that, if he continues to use such questionable tactics, we will have no alternative but to defend our position in the strongest possible manner. This whole unfortunate business raises three worrying questions. First, how did such a trivial story as Mr Bammann's resignation receive such prominent coverage? Secondly, who drafted the article for Mr Bammann? Thirdly, why is Mr Bammann now telling people in Cleve that he has been misrepresented?

It is obvious that Mr Cameron is prepared to use anyone at any time to further his own political ends. I hope that this is a lesson to him and his supporters that nothing can be achieved by these sorts of tactics. I suggest to the Premier and the Liberal Party that in the interests of that Party and the non-socialist cause, Mr Cameron should be persuaded to desist.

I have endeavoured to make that as concise as possible. As members would no doubt appreciate, I could probably go on with much more detail, as I seem to be getting a phone call every day from someone telling me where he was, what he was doing, whether he was at a school council meeting, or where he was going.

I now want to change the subject and to add my support to a small furniture manufacturing business called Constantia, in my electorate, which can claim world fame. Constantia makes some of the finest furniture in the world. That is a bold statement, but is one that I am sure will be agreed with by anyone who has seen their work. I wish to read from two international magazines of world repute in the terms of wood craftsmanship. An article that appeared in *Master Craftsman*, a paper to which the only contributors are master craftsmen themselves, puts Port Lincoln, South Australia and Australia on the map as being amongst the top wood craftsmen of wood furniture manufactures in the world.

Two or three years ago I took to the Premier and the Government a query in trying to get assistance for the three young chaps running the business, namely, Mr Ken Martin, Mr Malcolm Averill and Mr Burnie Koker—three craftsmen in every sense of the word. In a U.K. paper called *Working in Wood*, an eight-page article appeared with photographs of these craftsmen's work under the heading 'Modern Craftsmen in the traditional mould . . . Constantia.' That article has a subheading:

Three Australian craftsmen who have established Port Lincoln, South Australia, as the fine furniture making centre of the Australasian Continent.

The article then goes on with pictures of their work and describes the nature of the men and their dedication to their craft. It finishes with these few simple words:

Thank you, Constantia, for a gallery of work that is not only a credit to Australia but to the craft of working wood.

These three gentlemen will be exhibiting at the Royal Adelaide Show, and I do not necessarily say that as a plug for them. They have fought against incredible odds to maintain their standards of workmanship. They have worked excessive hours. I do not think that it would be unrealistic for me to say that the three of them have been working more than 100 hours a week, and their work is something that has to be seen to be believed. I was very pleased that, when the Chief Secretary was in Port Lincoln two or three weeks ago, he was able to go and see the fine craftsmanlike work of Constantia.

I only hope that the Government can at some time in the not too far distant future see fit to give these people its support. Rather regrettably, the advice that was given to them some two and a half years ago was that they should get out of this hobby-style type of craftsmanship and get into the mass production of the furniture, and the matchwood and the pineboard type of furniture manufacturing. When

we have items of their cabinet making now being sold, in one case for \$17 800 for a book-case on a chest of drawers, that gives an indication of the magnificent craftsmanship that is involved in this work. I do commend to members of the House that if they get the opportunity to see some of the work of these men at the Royal Adelaide Show, they should go and see what craftsmen in South Australia can do.

I recommend to the Government that it get photographs of the exhibits of their work and put them on the front page of their South Australian book or at least give them a prominent place. These gentlemen are of world class. They are the only craftsmen in Australia who specialise in the manufacturing of furniture to be invited to be members of the Guild of Master Craftsmen. That puts them at the very top, at the pinnacle of Australian furniture manufacturing.

I must say that at this stage they have received practically no support whatsoever. I believe that the Chief Secretary was rather aghast to see a letter pinned to the wall with some of the responses that they received when they were looking for assistance initially to attend a furniture expo in Melbourne. They were lucky enough, when they had mortgaged every cent that they had, to be invited to exhibit at the Sydney Craft Expo, and they were fortunate enough to be able to sell most of the furniture that they took over. That probably has just got their heads above water, and they are now making a reasonable go of it.

Today I asked a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, that related to the dilemma (I think that many people could call it a dilemma) with fuel pricing throughout the State. We all know that the Federal Government is paying for a fuel freight equalisation scheme. That means that the freight component of fuel pricing anywhere throughout Australia is within 0.4 of a cent, so any difference in petrol pricing anywhere else is because of factors other than freight. There are, of course, many reasons for that. The fuel companies tend to differentiate amongst their outlets as to the size of commission that they will give. If a person in a little rural outback town is going to put only a few thousand litres a week through his pump, obviously, in economic terms it does not justify him in keeping that pump open.

Therefore, it is necessary that he be given a higher commission in that instance. What I am suggesting and what I have asked of the Government on a number of occasions is that it seriously consider a State fuel equalisation scheme, work out a formula where we can have not only commissions involved, but radial distances from their centres, the throughput of petrol through that pump, their isolation, and other factors. I believe that it can be done, and I am sure that there are plenty of other people who believe that it can be done. At least we should get within 1 or 2 cents. At present, where we have 7 cents and up to 8 cents difference in the petrol pricing in this State on this very day, one becomes rather concerned as to what could happen.

Invariably, those people who are paying the higher prices must have petrol. It is not a luxury for those people and they are not in a situation where they can use public transport or some other form of transport or go with friends. Such people must have petrol which is a vital part of their day-to-day living. It is an essential commodity, but they must pay 7¢ or 8¢ a litre more than do their metropolitan counterparts who do not really have to have the petrol (many do, but the majority do not really have to, as they could survive on public transport—and it might be a good thing to encourage greater use of public transport).

The fact that their metropolitan counterparts can buy fuel at discounted rates, obviously at the expense of the country user, is of very grave concern to me. Country people are very concerned about the matter and time and time again

they have raised objections with me. I am sure that, unless the Government takes this matter seriously, it will find that its country supporters will not view the situation very favourably. I support the Bill, but I extend the warning and the caution concerning the use of Loan funds for revenue purposes.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): It is always a pleasure to follow the member for Flinders in a debate.

Mr Keneally: And to precede the member for Stuart.

Mr PETERSON: Yes. The Budget is not a very exhilarating document: I think it is a sad Budget. One hears reference to the doom and gloom in this State, but there is not too much that is exhilarating about the Budget. I am sure there would be people who would read through it and really wonder what we have lost in this State. It seems to me that over the past few years we have lost pride in our State and the urge that we had to get up and go that was prevalent a few years ago.

Mr Mathwin: You should wear an 'It's a great State mate' tie.

Mr PETERSON: The member for Glenelg is a get up and go man; his electorate is nurtured, nursed and cared for, and I have noticed that he always wears a State tie. I am pleased to see that the member for Glenelg is looking much better now after his illness. He must be better because he has not interjected for three weeks! As I have said, it appears that the pride in our State has gone. I think we are losing that, because we are not giving people enough hope concerning where we are going and what we are doing. I think we are the luckiest people in Australia; this is the best State in Australia. We have the best climate as we do not have the variations in climate that occur in other parts of Australia. We have an extremely good lifestyle.

Mr Hemmings: But a bad Premier, though, and a bad Government.

Mr PETERSON: The people elected him, and we are all entitled to our vote. I am sure that when the time comes again the people will make their selection again and the dice will fall where they will.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: What will happen in Semaphore?

Mr PETERSON: Semaphore is represented by an Independent Labor member and it will stay that way. I had a soothsayer down there, and I am guaranteed.

Mr HEMMINGS: Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PETERSON: It is indeed a pleasure when someone thinks that what I have to say is of such interest to the House that he summons a quorum.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The Chair has been tolerant in regard to interjections. The honourable member for Semaphore has the floor, and I ask other honourable members to give him their attention.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir. At this stage the Estimates of Payments are fairly sparse. I am sure that the people of South Australia will be pleased to see that the cost of running the Parliament of this State will increase considerably, to nearly \$6 000 000. I am sure that some people would wonder whether it was worth it. The allocation has been increased from \$4 500 000 to \$6 000 000. That is an interesting aspect. Under the vote for the Minister of Mines and Energy, it is interesting to see the allocation for the petro-chemical project team. Two sites are suggested for the project, one at Stony Point and the other at Gillman. The suggestion of a petro-chemical plant at Gillman has generated quite a bit of resistance. We should have infor-

mation about when the project is planned to commence and where it will go.

Mr Randall interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I want to know what it involves. The Government cannot just say that it is a petro-chemical plant. People want to know what will happen and the effects on the environment and possible pollution. People in my district put up with some of the worst pollution in the State.

Mr Mathwin: What about seaweed?

Mr PETERSON: I can see that I will not get very far in regard to the Budget. I notice that the allocation for the Minister of Environment and Planning has been cut fairly severely. That makes me wonder who will suffer. It will not be the districts of Brighton or Glenelg.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It won't be Semaphore, either.

Mr PETERSON: Semaphore has certainly suffered over the years. I do not see any seaweed at Henley Beach or Brighton.

Mr HEMMINGS: Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PETERSON: The member for Glenelg referred to seaweed. I am surprised that the honourable member has the audacity and the cheek to do that. Unknowingly, he has set back a project in which I know he is deeply interested, and that is lifesaving. I know that the honourable member is extremely aware of the problems that have been caused by seaweed in regard to the North Haven Lifesaving Club in my district.

It used to be the Taperoo Lifesaving Club. It has been brought to the edge of non-existence by the neglect and unthinking actions of the Government, which has not done a thing about solving the problem. To justify that comment, that club has served the State and the electorate very well. It has worked hard over many years to build up a strong club, and has supplied its own equipment. Yet, this year, because it has been forced out of the site in which it has resided for many years because of the seaweed, sludge and gunk on the beach, it applied for a grant from the Recreation and Sport Division to set up at another beach. However, it got nothing—not 1 cent. That is how unthinking and how inconsiderate the Government is. It is not considerate of the groups that have served our community over the years.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation, with honourable members speaking across the Chamber to other members.

Mr PETERSON: That attitude has been shown towards that club, which will now fold unless action is taken quickly to help it out of its problems. I know that the member for Glenelg is interested in lifesaving clubs. I believe he is President of one. To make comments like those that have been made in regard to the beach which has been taken away from the lifesaving club and the electorate shows a shallow outlook in the matter. However, I wish to refer to the Budget in greater detail.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Of course it is. An application was made to the Recreation and Sport Division. It has been brought about by the Department of Environment and Planning not doing its job properly, and by development. It is all relevant.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs has been cutting back severely. I suppose that that bodes well for the people in this State who have been blighted by his accidents over the last three years. Reducing his Budget may help things. The Minister of Public Works vote is cut back, which means more cut-backs in labour. Local government and housing

are holding their own: there is not even an allowance for inflation. I referred earlier to the Minister of Environment and Planning having a \$1 000 000 increase in his allocation. I see the conservation programmes have gone up remarkably. Pollution management has gone up, but most of the allocation is for equipment for pollution control.

I support that aspect. In Semaphore we have a lot of problems with pollution. It is not controlled correctly. If equipment is being bought to support the controlling of pollution, that is a good thing. The conservation aspect of the Department of Environment and Planning mainly involves a transfer. The Coast Protection Board funds are \$100 000 again, as has been the case for years. The money goes down to Brighton and Glenelg, but none is directed to Semaphore. I suppose we will not get too much out of it. However, we will be trying.

The Recreation and Sport Division allocation has dropped back from \$506 176 to \$414 000. I was going to speak about other areas, but I will not do so. One aspect of the Budget I wish to speak about concerns the Minister of Health, and I am pleased that she is in the Chamber. The total Budget has come down from \$237 479 805 to \$226 848 000, a substantial drop. One aspect of health expenditure I wish to touch on while I have the opportunity is domiciliary care, an area of medical care in our community which I believe is imperative.

It is particularly important to my electorate because of the age distribution, social security, and in relation to people in need. I refer to the Community Health Needs of Port Adelaide, a Government report written by Dr Selge, who was sent to Port Adelaide by the Minister of Health to assess the health needs of the Port Adelaide area. Page 17 of that report states:

The other tables and the regional distribution chart which relate to pensions and benefits receipts should finally convince even the most sceptical that the Port Adelaide region is the most socially and economically deprived area in all of Adelaide—an area, therefore, in which by all indicators, preventive medicine and community health should be most active and would be most productive. These tables also show quite clearly that the western sector of metropolitan Adelaide is probably most likely to be the general area in greatest need of innovative intervention programmes.

To support Dr Selge's comments I refer to the level of social welfare payments in the Port Adelaide area. Page 107 of that report shows that Port Adelaide heads the list of areas in the metropolitan area in relation to social service recipients. According to the report, 24.55 per cent of the people in the Port Adelaide region are receiving benefits of one type or another.

In relation to aged benefits, Port Adelaide is fourth on the list of recipients after Norwood, Glenelg and Woodville. Woodville adjoins Port Adelaide, so there is a slight overlap; 13 per cent of the Port Adelaide population is receiving aged benefits; 2.5 per cent of the Port Adelaide population is receiving an invalid pension, which is higher than any other suburb in the metropolitan area. Port Adelaide also has the highest number of widows pensioners at 1.8 per cent of the metropolitan area. Port Adelaide also has the second highest number of recipients of wives pensions at 1.04 per cent, and it is running fourth in relation to supporting mothers benefits at 0.93 per cent. Supporting fathers are fifth on the list at 0.05 per cent. Port Adelaide tops the list in relation to sickness benefits, at 0.7 per cent. Port Adelaide has the second highest number of recipients of unemployment benefits, at 4.6 per cent, after Adelaide, which has 6.2 per cent.

That shows that Port Adelaide has a great need for nursing services, welfare services, and health care services. I am aware of the problems encountered in the Port Adelaide area because I am the Chairman of the Port Adelaide Royal District Nursing Service. The domiciliary care service and

Royal District Nursing work hand in glove. I refer to this Government's policy as declared in 1979, before the election. The Liberal Party's health policy refers to the extended care programme and states at point 4:

We acknowledge that there is a need to care for the elderly within their own homes and surroundings for as long as practicable. Domiciliary care will be further extended under a Liberal Government. We recognise that families should be given every opportunity to strive for cohesion and togetherness, and this initiative is part of our extended care programming for the family.

That is the Government's declared policy. I refer members to what has actually happened. I have the Western Domiciliary Care Services reports for 1978-79 and 1979-80, but I could not obtain the report for 1980-81 (I think I must have been taken off the list.) When I began my term in this Parliament, there was an office for the Western Domiciliary Service at Semaphore. I believe it was a bad move in many ways to relocate that office at Belmore Terrace, Woodville, in an annexe of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I believe that was a retrograde step, but it has been done and I only hope in the future we can get it back. The pamphlet distributed then outlined the help that was available, including home help, chiropodist equipment, sitter service, day centres and one matter I want to look at concerns home help, because that area has been cut back seriously.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It has been expanded.

Mr PETERSON: Not in our area. In fact, just today there was a meeting of home helpers at Belmore Terrace, Woodville. I am not sure how many were there, but I think about 50 or 60 people attended. When they initially signed on as home helpers they had to sign a document saying that they would do at least 10 hours a week, but now the vast majority of those home helpers do one hour, one and a half hours or two hours a week, yet initially they agreed to do 10 hours a week.

Service by people in that area has been cut back and the hours of home helpers has been reduced. I will expand my comments about that meeting, because it seems that something a bit odd that is happening. The meeting was of casual home helpers at Belmore Terrace this afternoon. Most home helpers are now on minimum hours, and one of their problems is that they come from all over the Western Domiciliary Care Service area. These helpers are drawn from Woodville, Plympton, Outer Harbor, across to Churchill Road and Wingfield. The headquarters of this large area is at Woodville.

As part of their duties they are paid a certain amount by the patient they visit. It may be \$1, \$2 or 50c, depending on the level of assessment. These home helpers take the money, which they pay to the Hospitals Department, and they are paid fortnightly. Now, home helpers have been asked every week to personally take those few dollars, perhaps at times only \$1.50, depending on the work they do, to Belmore Terrace. No-one else can do it: no-one can take the money for them because they must do it personally every week. It does not matter how much is involved, and that is what home helpers were told today.

This direction was printed, but unfortunately I did not have time to get a copy. Some home helpers do not have their own transport, and complying with this direction could mean much travel on public transport or bicycle or, if they have a vehicle, they may have to drive from Outer Harbor to Woodville to drop in, perhaps, \$1.50 a week, and that is totally unreasonable. They are not even paid mileage for taking the money to Woodville and, if they did, the mileage payment could be more than these helpers are taking to the centre.

Certainly, there is something wrong with such a system and I am pleased that the Minister is in the Chamber because I am sure that she will look at the situation to see what can be done. The system is totally unreasonable as it is and there is something wrong with any system that requires

such action. I refer to the 1978-79 report, because even then the Medical Director was talking about the cut-back. In that report he stated:

It must be stated there was a disinclination to continue to make people and organisations aware of the services while the Health Commission Manpower Review Committee prevented vacancies being filled. This imposed considerable stress on the depleted para-medical staff who were having difficulties coping with the existing case load.

The Medical Director said this:

We can only guess at the unmet need in the community. Referrals are still received where, on any criteria, help should have been made available at an earlier time.

This is indicating that people were being put off, and put off until it was critical before they got help. The Medical Director goes on:

The policy of immediate response to calls for help has been continued where possible, despite difficulties caused by inadequate staff numbers.

In the 1979-80 report the Medical Director states:

The active case load and new referrals have shown a further increase.

In the same report he states:

Pressure will inevitably arise for patients to be discharged from hospital earlier or to be refused admission where it is considered that they could be managed at home. This may well result in an increase in work load imposed upon community support services, including domiciliary care.

It is very much more expensive now to go into hospital than it was in those days. People are now opting not to go into hospital. It is a policy of the Government now to support home help and many people are opting to stay out of hospital, or get out as soon as they can and be cared for at home. I think that is a reasonable attitude because people's outlooks are much better if they are in a familiar environment.

Mr Keneally: They are charging people out of the hospitals.

Mr PETERSON: I have already said that. I said that it is expensive to remain in hospitals and that people are opting to get out—they are being forced out. That was happening a few years ago, so matters have got worse. The manpower involved in Western Domiciliary care was decreasing even then. For instance, in 1979-80 they had the equivalent of eight domiciliary helpers but by 1980-81 that had decreased to an equivalent of six domiciliary helpers. The staff was on the way down, even then.

This is reflected in expenditure shown in the reports. Paramedical salaries in 1979-80 accounted for 39 per cent of expenses and the year after only 37 per cent, so there was a decrease. Similarly, 30.5 per cent of total expenditure was spent on home help salaries one year and only 28.2 per cent the next year—another decrease in expenditure. Therefore the decreases were starting, even in those days.

This report shows that the vast majority of people referred for domiciliary care are in the age group from 51 years onwards. In 1979-80 about 68 per cent of referrals were people aged from 51 upwards. The next year 93 per cent of referrals were in that age bracket, so this care is needed. The other interesting thing that comes from these reports is that the 1979-80 report shows that 24 per cent of patients came from Port Adelaide whereas in 1978-79 only 22.9 per cent of the patients were from Port Adelaide. That is an increase from 22.9 per cent to 24 per cent. Therefore, there was an increase in need and a decrease in manpower. That is also reflected in the figures quoted.

The decrease in services available was brought home to me recently by a number of people who have contacted me about the decrease in domiciliary care and their inability to get that sort of care. I have had calls from people who have had domiciliary care for twelve years that has suddenly been cut off. A gentleman came to see me the other day whose wife had been ill for many years with arthritis and,

I think, emphysema. All the domiciliary care person had done was vacuum for them which was a job they could not do because of the wife's sickness and the husband's heart complaint. The domiciliary care that they had received for some time was cut off. As a result of that, that man had to put his wife in a nursing home. Therefore, instead of keeping people out of nursing homes and hospitals, in that situation it put a person into a nursing home. That is not the purpose of domiciliary care. I have spoken to the Minister about this matter and make the point now, if I did not make it then, that it seems to me that the principles of home care are being applied so stringently now that people are being forced into a deprived situation in some instances.

People entitled to home care and who should be provided with it are not receiving it. I am aware of a case where a woman who had multiple sclerosis had for many years been receiving home care (although she was probably given too much help initially, but that is not my judgement to make). After some 12 years, that home help was taken away. That does not make sense. If there was too much home help, it could have been cut back and modified, but it was taken away and that is wrong.

I had a call from an old lady who had emphysema and was receiving minimal help in hours per week to vacuum, as she could not use a vacuum cleaner for some reason and she was told that there were people worse off than her and that she could not get help and if she wanted home help she would have to get somebody from one of the professional home help services.

I know that these problems are occurring, as they have been brought to my attention and I know people are being referred to private home help. Obviously, to a person on a reduced income, a person having problems living on a pension, being restricted in their movements, not being able to get around and having no family to help, this is a large burden and a large slice out of their pension or income to pay for private home help.

The whole purpose of domiciliary care is to help people who are not able to care for themselves completely. In many cases this only amounts to an hour or so a fortnight, which is a very minimal time, hardly worth thinking about in our terms, but it is very important to somebody who cannot do their own work. I ask the Minister—and I am pleased to see she is here—if she would look at that because it is causing great hardship for some people in the community, although probably not enough to make a large outcry, but enough for me to be concerned about. I would be concerned if only one person was affected, but many more are being harmed by this, and it is not right because people need help and should have it. It is a minimal outlay and is a very small—

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That the time for adjourning the sitting of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (15)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Crafter, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pair—Aye—Mr Evans. No—Mr Corcoran.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.
Motion thus carried.

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): A point has been made two or three times in this debate that I believe bears repeating, and that is the surprising fact that so few of the Government members either feel compelled to defend this Budget or have been allowed to defend it. In fact, we have had two contributions: the member for Eyre made a quite forgettable speech last night, and earlier this evening the member for Hanson spoke for about seven minutes. I might say that the member for Hanson said more in those seven minutes than the member for Eyre said in his half-hour, which was rather surprising because I do not think that the member for Hanson said anything at all. However, I do concede that the member for Hanson did provide a service to the House by holding the fort to allow this debate to go on, but why he should do that is rather surprising, because this Budget has sunk without a whimper.

There are a number of reasons why Governments do not want their back-benchers to contribute to a debate of this nature. The first is that the subject matter is indefensible, and I believe that this Budget is indefensible. Secondly, if the back-benchers contribute to the debate they can say things that might be somewhat enlightening, because they do not have the inside knowledge that their Ministerial colleagues have. Therefore, to prevent there being an unfortunate leak of information, back-benchers are kept quiet. However, that does have a very bad effect upon a Budget debate because, in truth, this debate is now becoming somewhat painful. I readily admit that I will in my way contribute somewhat to that pain. The actual value of this debate stopped some time ago, although there have been one or two quite significant contributions.

I did say that this Budget has sunk without a whimper. A constituent of mine wanted to know whether it was a Budget at all, because in his memory—and certainly in mine—a Budget has never had such little impact upon the community. That is because this is a Budget without imagination, and I will get to that point in due course.

I point out that my comments will be of a general nature, directed at the Budget as a whole. I shall wait until the Estimates Committees before I ask the questions relevant to the portfolios for which I have responsibility as shadow spokesman for the Opposition. Therefore, I will not be delving in any depth into the area of water resources and those for which the Chief Secretary is responsible.

Three years ago the Liberal Party in South Australia went to the people with a promise, amongst other things, to reduce taxation and unemployment. Also, there was an undertaking that there would be jobs for all who wanted to work. Further, the Government promised to reduce the incidence of increasing service charges; it was to reduce the level of serious crime; it was going to ensure the viability of small businesses; it was going to invigorate the building industry; and it promised to reduce Government activity. As I will point out in due course, the Government did achieve some results with that last promise, but its performance in the others that I mentioned bears commenting on.

There is no doubt that the Liberal Party believed that those programmes could be achieved and that its political philosophy, manifested in legislative and fiscal action, would have the South Australian economy booming. The Liberal Party was confident of the support from the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufactures and from other employer groups—and why not? The third party political advertising from those people in 1979 was so strongly pro-Liberal that even the members of the Liberal Party started to believe its own rhetoric. The electors of South Australia were urged by the conservative Parties in this State to sack

the Labor Party and replace it with a Party, so called, ready, willing and able to work the inevitable economic miracle.

There was no question of equivocation: a vote for the Liberal Party was a vote for less unemployment, lower taxation, economic growth, and a reduction in serious crime. So the promises went on and on. History shows that the electorate was impressed with those promises from the Liberal Party, and the Party that I represent was unceremoniously dumped from the Treasury benches. As a result, a whole new group of Liberal members of Parliament was elected to this House, committed to ensuring the implementation of the so-called better deal for the now marginal electorates that they represent. For instance, the previous Deputy Premier, the highly respected Hugh Hudson, an educationalist and economist of renown, was replaced in the electorate of Brighton. The best local member that any electorate could have (I refer to Mrs Molly Byrne), was replaced in the electorate of Todd. Also, the electorate of Henley Beach, which had been assiduously represented by the Labor Party through the Hon. Glen Broomhill for some 16 years, decided to opt for Liberal representation.

Mr Randall: He retired, don't forget.

Mr KENEALLY: Yes, he retired.

Mr Randall: He wasn't dumped.

Mr KENEALLY: But the electorate opted for Liberal representation. Three years and four Liberal Budgets later, it is well to consider whether those members in the marginal electorates have honoured their promises to their electors and whether the Treasurer has in any way lived up to his and his Party's pre-election rhetoric. The simple answer to those questions, of course, is that they have not—they just have not delivered the goods. They have let down the people who placed their faith and their future in the hands of the Liberals.

That the Tonkin Government has failed should not surprise any person with even a passing interest in this nation's political history. Conservative politicians have always failed this country in times of crisis, and they have done so again. We are now in a period of such economic crisis; it is foolish to try to persuade the electorate otherwise. The Government should acknowledge the critical circumstances facing South Australia, should take the people of South Australia into its confidence, and let us know what it is doing to overcome these very apparent difficulties, for the people of South Australia are not fools and should not be treated as such. Yet that is exactly what this Budget document attempts to do.

Where is the new direction that the Premier promises for South Australia? Where are the imaginative policies that this State needs? Where is the evidence that this Government's policies are working? Have the unequivocal guarantees given to the electorate in 1979 been honoured? The answer to all of those questions must surely be in the negative. During this Budget debate, the Parliament should consider very carefully who is to blame for the obvious failure of this Administration.

The Government would have us believe that the blame lies with overseas influences, the Fraser Government, and wage increases. In fact, in its thrashing around looking for scapegoats for its own inadequacy, the Government lays the blame everywhere except where it belongs. The responsibility for the parlous economic situation that is facing South Australia lies with the Tonkin Government and, of course, with the Fraser Federal Government. Seven years of Fraserism plus three years of Tonkin's tokenism have proved to be disastrous for our State.

That the Government does not have a clue how to confront the vital economic questions can clearly be seen from its conflicting rhetoric. It has claimed credit for every development, and one can remember the Colonnades issue in

1979. That was an example of the new Liberal Party's policies. The Government has gone from urging South Australians to vote for Malcolm Fraser for the sake of the State to denying responsibility for almost everything that happens, and certainly it has denied Fraserism itself. All we see from this Government now whenever a question is asked about what it is doing to assist the State for which it has responsibility is the Pontius Pilate act of washing its hands and placing the blame elsewhere.

One of the most frequent responses that we hear now (and it is the response of a bankrupt Government, a Government that has absolutely nothing to offer), when economic policies are challenged, is the question, 'What would the Labor Party do in office?' That question was asked in the only contribution last night from a back-bencher opposite. His plea was, 'What can the Labor Party do?' The Minister of Health is now taking the same line.

It is a fact of life that this is a Government in opposition. It lacks ideas and is desperate to know our solutions to its problems. That is not good enough. The problems that this State faces now have been brought to bear by this Administration, so this Administration should face up to its responsibilities. There will be a time and a place for the Opposition to unveil its economic policies, and we have a whole list of responses to this Budget that will be released at the appropriate time.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: I take the point that the Minister has made, but if she thinks that all of the Opposition's eggs are in one basket, she is sadly mistaken. I challenge the Minister of Health and her colleagues to go the an election on this Budget. Let them make this Budget the issue for a State election. If the Government wants to know the Opposition's responses to a whole series of questions, the answer is in its hands: it should call an election. I challenge the Government to do that.

The Government brags that it has served for three years, and it can now go to an election. We know that there are some problems in that the Federal Liberal Party wants to select the most appropriate time for a Federal election and that affects the Premier's flexibility. But, if this premier is so certain that this is the Budget that he claims it to be, he could take us to an election and we could fight the election on that issue. Of course, he will not accept the challenge, because he really has nothing to offer.

A number of specific promises were made in 1979. I have referred to some of them, but I would like to speak about many of them in somewhat more detail. The Premier promised to reduce taxation. The Government had a mandate, on coming to office, to abolish succession duties, gift duties, and land tax on the principal place of residence. No-one denies that. I believe that those simple measures, which this Government introduced in its very early days, have had a dramatic and adverse affect on South Australia.

The Premier feels free to brag about honouring those promises. They are probably the only promises he has honoured during the three years he has been in office. I want him to enumerate for this House and for the people of South Australia just what benefits have flowed to the community as a result of abolishing the taxes upon his friends. That is where those taxes were levied. In the main they were wealth taxes. Gift duties and succession duties were not taxes that the overwhelming majority of citizens in the electorate of Stuart were called on to pay. It is a difficult fact of life for the Premier, as it was for the Prime Minister and his wife, to realise that there were estates in Victoria valued at under \$250 000. They believed that all estates in Victoria were worth \$250 000 000. They believed that anything less than that was in the nature of pauperism.

The fact of life is that in South Australia, under the proposals put forward in vain in 1979, 90 to 95 per cent of people in the electorate of Stuart would not be called upon to pay succession duties. There is absolutely no doubt about that. The very action of abolishing those taxes means that the Premier and the Treasury had to recoup that money from elsewhere, because \$40 000 000 was wiped off Treasury funds in South Australia. They had to recoup those funds from elsewhere. The Premier has boasted about abolishing those taxes. He has not been able to point to one benefit that has accrued to the State as a result of that action.

I will refer to the real effect of that decision later. It is patently clear that this Government is the highest taxing Government that South Australia has ever had. The facts are clear. I know that the Government, in its trickery, has changed what is a tax and what is a charge and has tried to hide various figures within its Budget documents. However, the facts are clear. In 1978-79, when this Government came to office, taxation was at \$384 000 000, which was \$296.10 per capita. In 1981-82 it was \$495 500 000, which was \$373.75 per capita. Research of the documents would prove fairly accurately that for 1982-83 taxation will be \$552 000 000, which is \$413.85 per capita.

The total increase in tax collection is 43.5 per cent, which is far in excess of the inflation rate over the three years that this Government has been in office. It is a 39.8 per cent increase in the per capita taxation paid by the citizens of South Australia. This is the Government and the Premier that promised the people of South Australia that, to elect a Liberal Government, would result in lower taxation. It has not. On that count the Government has failed and failed badly. We also had promises to reduce unemployment. There were going to be jobs for all those people who wanted to work.

The incidence of unemployment in South Australia is tragic. Despite the hiding of the figures or the manipulation of employment and unemployment figures in the usual statistics and comparing one month to another, the facts are clear. The captains of industry in Australia have said over the last week or two, and it was even repeated by a leading Australian industrialist tonight, that unemployment in Australia will increase; and a figure of up to 14 per cent is now being quoted. This is the result of the combined efforts of the Fraser Government in Canberra and the Tonkin Government in South Australia. However, we are told to vote for the Liberal Party, that the private enterprise philosophy is what will get the economy going. The examples that I have quoted are classic in the refutation of that claim.

Unemployment remains a very serious factor in South Australia. This Budget document will do nothing to stimulate employment. In fact, it will increase the incidence of unemployment. We will have increasing unemployment, which is a deliberate policy of the Premier and his Financial Statement. The Government promised to reduce the incidence of increasing service charges. What a joke! I am the Opposition spokesman for water resources and in that area there has been a 54 per cent increase in water sewerage charges in South Australia during the term of the present Government, which is an increase far in excess of the inflation rate. The other day I referred to the simple example of the Port Pirie Yacht Club, which has had its lease rental increased by 1 200 per cent by this Government.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: It bears repeating, because this Government promised to reduce taxes and charges. Over the last three years charges have increased at a higher rate than for any other three-year period that the Premier would seek to mention. In fact, we had the strange performance of this Premier, in replying to a question, saying that the Labor Party was irresponsible in not increasing the rate of charges

in South Australia in line with inflation. He said the Labor Party was irresponsible. The Premier claims responsibility when he says that he has reduced taxation—of course, that is not true. The Premier said that the Opposition was irresponsible when it did not increase charges. Of course, when things are different they are not the same. Another claim by this Government when it was in Opposition—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister of Health should listen to this very closely, because she was one of the perpetrators of this myth prior to 1979, when the then Opposition stated that there would be a reduction in the level of serious crime in South Australia. I will not make a big issue of this, because the Opposition has been very careful to stay away from trying to score points in the law and order area. That is something that members opposite should practise. I am pleased to see the figures for the Police Force in the Budget lines. We must acknowledge that there is serious crime in South Australia. We ought not to be trying to take political advantage of each other in relation to this very critical facet of our society. We ought to be trying to do something about it.

In 1979 we had that absolutely disgraceful performance, led by the Minister of Health, who said so many times that rape under a Labor Government was despicable. Obviously, rape under a Liberal Government is acceptable, because we have not heard anything from her on that subject for three years (one would have thought that that was because there has been no reduction in the incidence of that violent crime, just as there has been no reduction in the incidence of other violent crimes). I will not stay with this subject, except to say that I am pleased that resources are being provided for the Police Force. I will be trying to search that out in the Estimate Committees debates. If we want to hold the line in relation to serious crime in South Australia, the people who are able to do that for us are the members of the Police Force. They need our assistance and they need resources.

This Government was going to invigorate the building industry. What a joke! We have a Government which, in Opposition, criticised the transfer of \$5 000 000 from capital works into the Revenue Account, although it was replaced immediately in the following year. This Government has transferred out of building and capital construction in this State more than \$100 000 000, which has had a dramatic effect upon not only employment but also the building industry itself.

Bankruptcies within that industry during the term of this Government have been high. I do not know whether they are the highest of all time, because I do not believe that that is important. What is important is that the building industry has been depressed as a result of this Government's taking \$100 000 000 of capital funds away from that important economic indicator in South Australia. There has been no invigoration of the building industry; it has been depressed under the deliberate policies of this Government.

Where I am willing to acknowledge that this Premier has succeeded in a promise is in regard to the reduction of Government activity. I am continually amazed that Liberal Party members are all very keen to reduce the degree of Government spending and Government activity, yet each member opposite goes to the Ministers and the Premier asking for more money to be spent in his district, but they cannot have it both ways. Either they are against public funding, and so they would seek to have less of it spent in their own districts, or they support it. Government members cannot be opposed to reducing the total cake that is Government involvement in our economy in South Australia and, at the same time, seek to increase their share of that reducing cake.

Mr Trainer: Each of them wants it reduced in 46 electorates!

Mr KENEALLY: As the member for Ascot Park has said, they want expenditure reduced everywhere else but in their own district. I am sure that the same argument obtains in Cabinet, where each Minister tries to get a greater share of Treasury funds to finance programmes, at the same time arguing that there should be a reduction in the incidence of Government activity.

What this Government has been able to do is take away from the total South Australian employment base 4 000 jobs, and this Budget seeks to increase that to about 5 000 jobs. That is one promise that the Premier has been able to honour: he has reduced the number of employment opportunities in South Australia. My Leader described this Budget document as one that acknowledges failure.

There is no new direction, there are no new initiatives, and there is just no hope offered to the people of South Australia. What we have is a Government that professes *laissez-faire* policies, that the *status quo* will do: the *status quo* is not good enough for the people of South Australia. The *status quo* means that we are going to get more of what we have had over the past three years.

There is not one person in South Australia, if members opposite would take off their blinkers and go out into the electorate and find out what is going on, who would say that the economy is better today, in August—September 1982, than it was in September 1979. Yet, that was the clear promise that this Government held out to the citizens of South Australia, but it has been unable to honour that commitment, and it seeks to blame everyone except itself. A well-known quotation says, 'If you cannot shape up, then ship out!' That quotation is singularly apt when applied to this Liberal Government. I will finish my remarks there. I did point out earlier that this Budget sank without a whimper some time ago, and this debate also sank without a whimper some time ago.

I said that my contribution might just add to the pain of those long hours that we have spent talking and getting no response. Hopefully, the Premier will now do his best to respond to some of the points that have been made, although I rather doubt that he will be able to do so. This is a bad Budget. It will do nothing for the citizens of South Australia, and absolutely nothing for this Government's chances in the election which, hopefully, will be brought on in the immediate future. We would like to fight an election on this document, because we would win, and win very easily.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): It is quite remarkable to me that most of the contribution that has come from the other side of the House has been repetitive and has added little to the debate. It has demonstrated a degree of isolation from the rest of the community which is quite alarming for any political Party, let alone the A.L.P. It seems to me quite remarkable that there has been all this jumping up and down. I must say that it says a great deal for the efforts of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition, who have been churning out the speeches members opposite have made, with the exception, of course, of that of the Opposition spokesman on education, who wrote his own.

It seems to me that those officers, and the Opposition generally, are curiously at odds with opinions expressed by the media, the business community, and the average man in the street (if there is such an individual), because it is only the people opposite who seem to have any desire to make any contribution and that contribution is totally at odds with the facts. I do not intend to answer very much of what the Leader had to say, because we have heard it all before. I could refer honourable members to various speeches the Leader has made in response to the Budget in 1979,

1980, 1981, and now, again, in 1982. Perhaps it might be as well if I found the *Hansard* reference for those years for honourable members.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It is political tenosynovitis—repetition injury.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think that sums matters up very well. I will, therefore, take the pains to find these references for honourable members. I do not have them with me at present, so, accordingly, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): It is a privilege to have the opportunity at the close of a days activities to speak in the grievance debate. Whilst beginning to formulate some ideas for this evenings speech, I thought of a couple of topics I could inform the House about that might be of some value to the district I represent.

Activities for young people on the western side of the city have always been of concern in my district and in the districts of Hanson, Morphett and Peake. Comment has been made, and concern expressed to local members, by people within the area about the lack of facilities for young people in that area. I do not deny that, on coming to office, and after having looked at the planning for the western side of the city, the old established areas, I realised that those areas have missed out on Government spending in years gone by and, therefore, on Government facilities. We are lacking in Government facilities on the western side of town.

Primary and high schools in my electorate have been developed over the years but other facilities, including recreation halls are sadly found wanting. Therefore, I am pleased to see that the Henley and Grange council is encouraging private enterprise to take up the initiatives which former Governments have not been able to take up and which presently, in this time of economic stringencies, this Government in no way could take up. Private enterprise is prepared to develop our local swimming pool, which I believe is the only seawater swimming pool in the State, if not in Australia. Private enterprise will get the pool up to a good standard and will even heat it during the winter. I look forward to spending some hours, when I have the leisure time, in the heated pool, which will no doubt be a heated salt water swimming pool.

It is unfortunate that some of my friends opposite from the A.L.P. are not in the Chamber to be advised of this future development in my electorate, as I am sure that they, too, would be keen to participate in the sorts of activities that are provided in the area. Swimming in the winter is quite a relaxing experience.

Private enterprise will develop, we hope, with the support of the local council, a form of lifestyle type development in that area which will be of benefit to the community at Henley Beach. Local people will be pleased to see that sort of facility come to the area so that not only young people, but also older people, can benefit, as they have plenty of leisure time to spend on those sorts of activities. I recently attended a pleasurable evening in the St Clair Youth Centre in the company of about 600 young people, when the first Blue Light Disco was held on our side of town.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: They are a good idea, aren't they?

Mr RANDALL: Yes, there have been several Blue Light Discos throughout the metropolitan area, and I think the first one was in the southern suburbs. The disco at St Clair was not the first one, but I am sure that the police officers who spent some time planning it in conjunction with the local council learnt from the experience of the first few. Consequently, the disco that I attended went off very well.

It was pleasing to see parents confidently bringing their children to the location, knowing full well that those children would benefit from the experience of that social occasion. The music was good, although somewhat louder than what I am used to. Certainly, it was an experience to see how young people fill in their time in relation to musical entertainment. This experience was worth while and helped me understand the aspirations of our young people and the aspirations of parents for their young children.

Parents know that when young people go to Blue Light Discos, which start around 7.30 p.m. or 8 p.m., they will be well catered for. Should any person want to leave the disco after 9 p.m., they are not permitted to come back in. Therefore, there is not constant traffic in and out, which in the past has caused problems in relation to drinking and other activities outside disco halls. At these Blue Light Discos young people are well controlled. Strict guidelines laid down by the police—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And the young people like the discipline of a well organised function.

Mr Becker: They like to know their guidelines.

Mr RANDALL: As the Minister quite rightly said, once young people are given guidelines and know where they are going, they enjoy themselves, because they know full well that they will get the maximum benefit out of the activity. I am sure that that is one of the reasons why parents are reflecting in our community a desire to see discipline reinstated in our schools. If a school is not prepared to grapple with discipline, parents say that they will take their children from that school and put them into a private school.

That is a clear reflection that keeps coming back in to my office from personal experience that I had from meeting with parents. One of the main reasons that parents are taking their children from public schools and putting them into private schools is to get the sort of education that they want, to have some guidelines given to them, to have some moral or religious teaching presented to them so that the young people can make up their own minds in the community that we have.

Mr Hamilton: You would get some a good argument in the public schools about the need for discipline and whose responsibility it is.

Mr RANDALL: I have never in this House sought to denigrate public schools. I personally support them. I believe that they have the potential and the capability of providing the best educational service to the State, provided that we grapple with some of the problems. Some of the problems are the parental expectation of the school, the parental expectation of the school council, saying to the principal of that school, 'We want to see stronger discipline enforced in this school.' The principal then has the dilemma and the problem to face of having the backup to enforce the guidelines that he wants in that school. That is where the State school system seems to differ somewhat from the private school system. The private school system has the ability to choose the type of teaching staff that it wants. If the guidelines and the standards are not met, that teaching staff is released from its job responsibility and somebody else is employed who will meet the standards. Unfortunately, we have not got that system in the State school system, so there must be some other means whereby that can be enforced. As I have said before in this House, another reflection of the

discipline that is coming back is the concern of parents that they see the children or young people wearing school uniforms. Again, whilst there are arguments both for and against school uniforms, the perception is there of parental support, that parents who can see that their children are given guidelines as to the sort of dress that they are to wear to school and that that is enforced, are happy to see their children going to that State school, but where the sloppy type of dress occurs—

Mr Hamilton: What happens where the parents do not have the ability to pay for those uniforms?

Mr RANDALL: Well, they are a lot cheaper than the Levi jeans and some of the T-shirts are.

Mr Hamilton: But if they have not got that ability to pay for those uniforms?

Mr RANDALL: That raises the exact point that a school council I was on recently grappled with. They did not have the ability to pay for the school uniforms in some areas. So what they did as a school council was that they went out and did bulk buying direct from the manufacturer, and they got the school uniforms quite cheaply and were able to pass them on to the students at a much reduced price. The other area is that they have diversified. They have allowed them to wear Exacto t-shirt type jackets with school motif on them as sort of the school uniform. They have permitted Levi type jeans of a particular colour. In diversifying and buying articles that are readily available in the market, the price is kept down. The school uniform has had to change. They have had to change the form that the school uniform takes, but there is still an advantage in seeing everybody wearing the same sort of clothing to the school and some form of uniform being implemented in the school. I support quite strongly the move by the parents in my own electorate to see the State schools returning to the school uniform as part of a return to the sort of discipline that we need in our State primary and high schools.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I was going to talk on another issue tonight, but the member for Henley Beach has prompted me to talk to this question of school uniforms. In a number of schools that I have visited in my electorate the issue of school uniforms is a very vexed question. When I look around my electorate, which is a diverse electorate and which encompasses the needs of the disadvantaged, the so-called middle-class and so-called upper class, I see such a diverse range of needs in that community. Within my electorate I have three areas that have South Australian Housing Trust estates. They are in the Woodville West, Seaton and Semaphore Park areas. Whilst I am cognizant with what the member for Henley Beach said about those uniforms, I do not believe personally that a uniform is a criterion by which we have discipline in schools. Discipline, I, believe, starts in the home.

I recall talking to many of those teachers and principals in my area about the question of school uniforms and about whether the more flexible standards concerning the wearing of a school uniform was one of the reasons why there is this so-called lack of discipline in the schools. I do not believe that that is the reason. I recall the occasion when the member for Henley Beach and I attended a meeting at the Woodville council chambers some time ago which concerned the shooting that had occurred within the member for Henley Beach's electorate. The statement was made that open-space schoolrooms led to many problems within the community. The member for Henley Beach may or may not recall my response, which was that the problems we have within the community are due to a multiplicity of reasons and not necessarily due to factors within schools.

I am a strong believer in the argument that discipline begins at home. Teachers are the people who, for eight hours

a day, five days a week, have to try to instil discipline into their students; nevertheless, it all comes back to the focal point, namely, the home. It is up to parents. If they do not have the ability to instil discipline, they need assistance. I think that that is one of the questions that we as Parliamentarians must come to grips with, namely, the need for back-up support for those many people in the community who are less fortunate than ourselves, and I refer to sole parents, single mothers and the like.

I have seen many people who fall into these categories whilst I have been door knocking in my own electorate over the past three years. I have seen the children of sole parents playing on the streets while their parents have been out at work. Such parents do not have the facilities or the assistance of the rest of the community to assist those children. We do not have people who can go out and knock on doors and find out what the problems are in those disadvantaged areas in the community.

I can vividly recall that shortly after I came into office there were two public meetings at the Semaphore Park housing estate, in particular, in the Bower Cottages, where there were major problems concerning vandalism and petty crime. A local police inspector, Inspector Phil Cornish, attended one of those meetings at which some of the local residents tried to level the blame at police officers because they had not cracked down on vandalism in that area. I can recall, listening to those comments for half an hour, standing up and saying that it was the responsibility of parents to know where their children are going, who they are going out with, how much money they have and what time they are coming home.

Unless there are back-up supports within the community, it is of no use telling parents what should be done. We must provide those back-up facilities, which are most important for those children. One way or another the community will pay for the petty crimes and so on committed by children which the police detect, whether it be for the processes of going through the juvenile court or for the consequences of crimes committed by those children later in life when they are adults. We must provide sufficient support for children in need.

I am reminded that the member for Henley Beach made a statement in this House some time ago about his going out with police officers touring his electorate. Shortly after I was elected to office I went on two eight-hour shifts, two months apart, with Inspector Peter Meldrum of the Port Adelaide CI Division.

The problems I saw on those two eight-hour shifts (and I thought that I had seen a bit) really astounded me. One example clearly sticks in my mind. A child was found at the Parks Community Centre, pie eyed on drugs or glue sniffing. He was taken to the Port Adelaide cells. The police officers tried to find his parents, and eventually they were tracked down to the local hotel. When the police officers asked whether the parents would take the child home, the response was, 'Leave the little bastard there. We will pick him up in the morning.'

That sort of problem is occurring in the community, and we must come to grips with it. The question of discipline does not involve two, three, or four words: it involves many aspects of society. Unless there is back-up support, we are the ones who will have to pay. I was rather astounded earlier this year, in regard to the need for a community centre in my district, that I could not find one building in which a public meeting of 1 000 or 2 000 people could be held. I was disgusted, in February of this year, when the Government sold off Education Department land on Delfin Island.

I wonder what surveys were done by this Government in respect of community needs in that area, taking into account

the projected population of the West Lakes area alone, which is about 20 000 people. Those facilities are not available and in five, 10, or 15 years hence, I can imagine that people in that area will cry out for a community centre. But the opportunity has gone wanting and those people (a small minority) are now asking why that land could not be set aside for the future needs of the community. We come back to the question of facilities not only for teenagers and adults but also for senior citizens.

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

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I, too, would like to take up the theme of discipline. I concur wholeheartedly with some of the comments of the member for Albert Park and the member for Henley Beach. It is interesting to note that the member for Albert Park said that, when considering an issue such as this, one has to look at a number of variables. I believe that the Opposition would do well to keep that sort of principle in mind when it discusses other matters pertaining to Government or social issues, because too often we see people trying to hone in on one specific variable and say that that is the root cause of a problem.

The Opposition candidate in my district some time ago stated quite strongly that the root cause of all evil in my district was unemployment. A social worker in my district presented a report to the Minister in which he listed a number of variables that had to be considered to assist the young people in my area.

On top of the list was entertainment, and lower down the list was unemployment. Yet, oddly enough, the week after that report was brought down my opposition candidate came out and stated in the press that we need more entertainment in the area to help our teenagers. She obviously wanted a 50 cent bet each way. One week she was saying that unemployment was the root cause of all the problems, and the next week she was saying that it was entertainment. Full credit should go to the member for Albert Park when tonight he finally realised that a number of variables are to be looked at.

When I look at the problem of discipline within our schools, I agree wholeheartedly that we cannot, as a society, put the whole onus on the school and say, 'You must improve on the discipline aspect.' A school is there as a reinforcer, and, in some instances, as a leader. Surely, if we are looking at a district, it may be pertinent for that school to determine whether or not that may be an issue in that area. It may be something that the school can take up as being an instigator or a leader in the community in providing discipline. In other cases, the school will act as a reinforcer.

Quite often parents come into my office who wish to have their child transferred from one school to another because they believe that the discipline within a school is not to the standard that they would like to have their child brought up under. Again, discipline is a subjective matter and naturally enough, one school would not always fully meet the requirements of all parents who sent their children to that school. When we look at some of the arguments for discipline, we see that one is in regard to the provision of a school uniform. The school uniform *per se* is not the forerunner of discipline and will not guarantee that there will be discipline. However it assists in generating pride in the place to which one goes. It can also assist as a deterrent factor. I have looked at the problem of vandalism in my area in regard to public transport. It is no hidden secret. I looked recently at some buses where seats had been slashed and graffiti drawn all over the seats. When one considers that some of the best buses that the S.T.A. has, service my area, it is a crying shame to see that sort of attitude and approach towards such valuable equipment.

It is not only a problem of the school or the child: it is a problem of the total community. It is distressing to see that an adult could be sitting on the bus next to a child and yet make no comment to that child if they see it taking part of the seat off and throwing it out the window.

Mr Randall: Sometimes the whole seat is thrown out.

Mr SCHMIDT: That is correct. Members of the community are abrogating their responsibility in checking the discipline of other members of the community. That does not mean that we should all be little Hitlers or little policemen, but surely we should be adult enough to draw to the attention of the offender the offence that they have committed. Similarly, if the child wears a uniform, it immediately reflects on the school that that child attends.

At the moment I know that the principals in my area have made every possible effort to drive home the message to their students that they should treat all public equipment—be it public transport equipment, any other public equipment, or their own personal equipment—with due respect. One can only hope to encourage young ones to adhere to that message. If it does not want to take this on board, one cannot necessarily force a child into some form of behaviour unless it can be coerced in a positive manner. So, by wearing a school uniform members of the public and other peers from the child's group can report to the school and say that it involved someone in that area. It does assist in trying to track down from where the problem is coming.

The member for Albert Park referred to the fact that there should be many back-up support systems within our community to assist particularly single mothers or, to put it in its proper context, single parents. One does not deny that it is rather difficult for single parents who have to assume responsibility for being the breadwinner. A single parent must provide a home; to some extent a single parent must provide a child with a mother and father figure simultaneously; and to some extent a single parent must provide a child with all the guidance and discipline it requires.

Once again, one must ask such a parent very carefully to what extent that parent endeavours to abrogate that responsibility from themselves and thrust it upon some other external authority such as a school or department office. Similarly, one might even ask to what extent the Opposition,

which is not even represented in the Chamber at the moment, takes its responsibility in trying to further debate and come up with positive ideas to encourage the community in relation to its own guidelines.

The parents themselves must determine how they want their children to develop and how they will encourage their children to develop. If they sit back and say that their child is never out of step, that it is the rest of the army that is out of step, that makes life very difficult for authorities such as the police, welfare workers and teachers who are trying to encourage children to do the right thing.

Some parents have come to my office after their children have found themselves in trouble. Those parents have taken astronomical steps to give such a child the correct guidance by providing the correct facilities at home or by providing facilities and activities to bring the child's peers to the home and play rather than wander the streets.

Alternatively, other parents take a completely opposite stand. They approach the situation by saying that it could not be their child, because he would not do that. However, at that same time the child might be shoplifting, breaking into a vehicle, or performing some other misdemeanour. In that situation the parent has reached a stage where he can no longer comprehend how to guide his child. In that situation, in their dilemma, the parent abrogates all responsibility and leaves it to someone else. We can provide some back-up support through welfare agencies or voluntary groups by giving parents classes to help them in their parenthood.

I know that many community bases, particularly churches and community health centres, make these courses available to give parents assistance and guidance in parenthood. No-one denies that being a parent is not the easiest task in the world. One must give parents credit for the mammoth task they undertake when they decide to become parents. Once again, I endorse the previous speaker's remarks, that is, that we need to give as much support as possible. In so doing we need very carefully—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 2 September at 2 p.m.