

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 2 September 1982

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

### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

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

### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, informed the House that Royal assent to the Bill had been proclaimed on 2 September.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Licensing Act Amendment (No. 2),  
North Haven Development Act Amendment.

### PETITION: PUBLIC TRANSPORT

A petition signed by 109 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide a public transport service along Tapleys Hill Road between Trimmer Parade, Seaton, and Target shopping centre, Fulham Gardens, with a view to extending that service to Glenelg, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

### QUESTIONS

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

### EYE CLINIC

In reply to Mr **TRAINER** (11 August).

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON**: In my interim reply to the honourable member I promised to provide him with a report on the situation relating to waiting times for appointments at the eye clinic, Flinders Medical Centre.

Currently the waiting time at the Flinders Medical Centre for an eye outpatient appointment is almost eight months and the major reason for the delay is due to the numbers of referrals of eligible patients for the provision of free spectacles.

However, I assure the honourable member that in urgent cases early outpatient appointments can be obtained by the referring practitioner discussing the referral with either the eye specialist, the eye registrar or the sister-in-charge of the eye outpatients clinic. The system of referral is the same for both inpatients and outpatients at the hospital.

The waiting time for eye outpatient appointments at the other major teaching hospitals, namely, the Queen Elizabeth and Royal Adelaide, are in excess of six months.

As I have already indicated to the honourable member, I will make an announcement soon regarding substantial reductions in waiting time for appointments at the eye clinics of the three major teaching hospitals.

### URANIUM

In reply to Mrs **SOUTHCOTT** (12 August).

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: The Commonwealth Government requires the joint venturers to complete the e.i.s. procedures before export approval and Foreign Investment Review Board approval are given. The joint venturers will seek such approvals before they will be prepared to commit to the project.

The Environmental Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act, 1974-1975, is a Commonwealth Act and stands alone from the South Australian Government's Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act, 1982. Nothing in the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act can upset the normal process of public review contained in the procedures to the Commonwealth Act.

Under the Commonwealth Nuclear Codes Act the Commonwealth and the States have worked to produce jointly agreed national codes covering the matter of standards. The codes will set the national standards. The standards will not be set as a result of 'public comment' under the e.i.s. review as the honourable member's question seems to suggest.

Clause 10 of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act requires the joint venturers to comply with the national codes of practice.

### OVERHANGING TREES

In reply to Mr **HAMILTON** (28 July).

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: Under section 361 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1982, a council has power to serve a notice on the occupier of premises to remove or cut back branches so that they do not encroach on to council-owned property. In default a council may carry out the work and recover the cost from the person making the default.

As regards street trees, the council has a general power under section 315 (1) (2) of the Local Government Act to plant trees and shrubs in any street or road within the area, but in no case so as to obstruct unduly the public traffic. Therefore, the council has an obligation during the course of a tree's growth to maintain the tree in such a condition that it does not obstruct either vehicular or pedestrian traffic.

The Department of Local Government will bring the problems raised by the honourable member to councils' attention. A notice will be placed in the next issue of the bulletin seeking councils' co-operation in carrying out a survey of street trees and overhanging trees from properties and, where appropriate, taking action to correct any obstructions.

### EMERGENCY HOUSING OFFICE

In reply to the **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (10 August).

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: It is acknowledged that a prospective private sector tenant can miss out on a private tenancy because he must return to the Emergency Housing Office to obtain a bond cheque. In some circumstances this situation is unfortunately unavoidable because it would clearly be administratively and financially irresponsible to provide emergency housing clients with blank cheques before they contact a prospective landlord. Apart from the possi-

bility of fraudulent conversion of a cheque, it is appropriate to avoid situations where prospective tenants could use Emergency Housing Office bonds to secure accommodation inappropriate to their needs or accommodation for which they could not afford the weekly rental. It is also necessary to avoid the Emergency Housing Office inadvertently becoming a party to a situation where more bond money is required than is permitted under the Residential Tenancies Act.

The trust and the Emergency Housing Office are aware of this problem and every effort is made to ensure that tenancies are not lost in this way. Close liaison has been developed between the Emergency Housing Office and many private landlords and agents so that they are willing to accept the Emergency Housing Office's undertaking that bond money will be provided. In many cases the Emergency Housing Office makes initial contact with the landlord on behalf of the prospective tenant and advises the landlord that, if a tenancy can be arranged, bond money will be provided. Often private landlords will hold a vacant flat for an Emergency Housing Office's client. Where this type of liaison is not possible, Emergency Housing Office's clients are encouraged to ask the landlord to accept some rent in advance as a deposit pending their return with an Emergency Housing Office bond cheque.

The second issue raised by the honourable member concerned a trust applicant living in a motor vehicle with his family. The trust has no record of any contact with this applicant at which he was told to attend another trust office.

The applicant in question, Mr M. P. O'Brien, applied for trust accommodation in the Elizabeth or Salisbury North areas on 9 March 1982. At that time he was employed and living with relatives in Kapunda. In March 1982, Mr O'Brien advised the trust that he, his wife and one daughter were boarding with friends at Salisbury North and that he was unemployed but earning some small additional income cutting lawns. On 4 August 1982, the O'Briens were interviewed at your request at which time you advised the trust that they were now living in their motor vehicle. During that interview the O'Briens stated a preference for country living and asked about housing in Whyalla. They subsequently transferred their application to Whyalla and I am pleased to advise that they now have been housed in a three-bedroom accommodation at 70 Mortimer Street, Whyalla Stuart. At no time during a number of interviews with the O'Briens has any trust officer recorded any indication from the O'Briens that they had received unsatisfactory treatment from any trust office.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Betting Control Board—Report, 1981-82.
- ii. South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on Abortions Notified in South Australia—Report, 1981.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JULIA FARR CENTRE

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):**  
I seek leave to make a statement.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** In his Budget speech in another place yesterday the Opposition spokesman on health, Dr Cornwall, made a series of serious allegations about the Julia Farr Centre, formerly known as the Home for Incurables.

His attack under Parliamentary privilege on the Julia Farr Centre is the latest in a series of attacks on South Australia's great voluntary institutions ranging from the St John Ambulance to the Adelaide Children's Hospital and a large number of other health organisations.

He alleged that 'incompetence, intrigue and exploitation' have marred the administration of the centre in recent years. His charges against a board of South Australian citizens working in an honorary capacity for a voluntary charitable organisation were both cowardly and in many respects incorrect, and I wish to set the record straight.

The broad outline of this Government's relationship with the Julia Farr Centre is set out in a letter which I wrote to the President of the centre dated 27 August 1982, and which I now table. This outline demonstrates the dramatic difference between the approach of this Government to the centre and that which existed under almost 10 years of Labor Administration.

During this time the Labor Government simply paid taxpayers' funds to the centre without any guidance as to accountability for those funds or the need to administer the centre in the context of an overall health policy. On assuming office, and recognising the inadequacies of the relationship which had existed between the centre and the Government, I had a series of discussions commencing in late 1979 with successive Presidents of the centre's board. I also set in train a series of investigations so that the Health Commission could obtain the necessary information on which future administrative and policy decisions could be based.

I stress that, in initiating these investigations, I was at all times conscious of the fact that the Government was dealing not with a public organisation, but with a private charitable organisation which received some of its funding from the Government. For this reason, I believed it important to preserve the independent nature of organisations such as the Julia Farr Centre and that its board be given the first opportunity to respond to inquiries, investigations and studies rather than to have the Government intervene and issue directions.

When I initiated the cost allocation study at the centre in April 1981, it was on a co-operative basis with the board's full agreement. The Health Commission was at all times at pains to ensure that the study was carried out in a spirit of full co-operation and honoured its agreement with the centre that the report of the study be jointly reviewed by the board and the Health Commission in draft form prior to its presentation to Government.

Thus, although the officers undertaking the data collection for the study left the centre towards the end of 1981, a first draft of the report was not completed until February 1982. This report was reviewed by officers of the commission and the centre and a number of drafts were prepared leading to a final report which was presented to the Chairman of the Health Commission and the President of the centre in early June. They met to discuss this report in July and agreed to the report.

The commission was not carrying out an audit or trying to score points. It was, however, trying to establish information which could be used for the proper management of the centre and for sound planning for the future. A number of matters dealt with in the earlier report were either not of major substance and were corrected progressively, or were drawn to the centre's attention in correspondence during the course of the review.

The final draft report was presented to me at the end of July, not before Christmas last year as alleged by Dr Cornwall. There was no mention in the draft report which I received of Raylen Pty Ltd, the broking organisation with common directorship of A.E.H. Evans and Company, which handles the centre's insurance. The first I knew of this firm was when I provided answers to questions asked by Dr Cornwall in the Legislative Council. Health Commission officers had been aware of the general broking arrangements but had no information which suggested anything improper in these arrangements.

I now turn specifically to Dr Cornwall's allegations in four areas. They were, first, the employment and method of payment to two senior partners of the accountancy firm of A.E.H. Evans and Company as the chief executive officer and the accountant at the Julia Farr Centre. This arrangement, as Dr Cornwall himself said, has existed for a very long time, was well known to Labor Ministers of Health, and was allowed by them to remain undisturbed for 10 years.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** It wasn't known to me.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** You did not attend their annual general meetings, obviously. Dr Cornwall's description of the arrangement as employing Mr Raymond Griffith Rees as administrator and chief executive officer and Mr Brian Curtis as assistant secretary and accountant is incorrect. The reality is that the firm has contracted to the centre for the provision of a management and accounting service, including a provision of a nominated secretary and assistant secretary. This included provision of adequate staff to provide these services, including servicing the board and many subcommittees of the board, providing cover for long-service leave, superannuation and board room and other facilities to the centre.

When the above is taken into account, Dr Cornwall's claim that Mr Rees received \$50 000 per annum for only 30 hours work per week is obviously wrong and makes no allowance for any out-of-hours work by the partners of A.E.H. Evans and Company. As the Chairman of the commission indicated to the President of the board at the end of July, and as I confirmed in my letter to the President on 27 August 1982, this arrangement is not regarded by the Government as acceptable for the management of a large health institution. Accordingly, the board has been asked to create and advertise the position of chief executive officer.

Secondly, Dr Cornwall alleges that there have been irregularities and financial mismanagement in the provision of insurance cover for the centre and that I was aware of this late last year. As I have indicated, I knew nothing of the insurance arrangements until A.E.H. Evans provided information for answers on Dr Cornwall's questions in the Legislative Council last week. I have since been advised that Raylen Pty Ltd was formed in 1965 to provide an insurance brokerage service for other clients.

The Chairman of the finance committee of the then Home for Incurables sought to have the home included in this arrangement in the belief that a better and more cost-effective service would be achieved. It is normal business practice in an organisation the size of the centre to employ a broker to advise on the type of cover, to obtain cover at best advantage, and to attend to all claims on behalf of the organisation.

Instances of claims averaged 250 per annum and thus have to be handled by the broker. It is wrong for Dr Cornwall to suggest that there was little or no work involved in handling the centre's insurance, and it is certainly wrong for him to suggest it was established to maximise profit for A.E.H. Evans and Company. Dr Cornwall's calculation that the centre's premiums amounted to 90 per cent of Raylen's premium income is incorrect. In comparing Raylen's income with the premium payments made by the centre, Dr Cornwall

has confused two financial years. A more realistic estimate is that the premiums bought by the centre amounted to approximately 50 per cent of the premiums for the business handled by A.E.H. Evans on behalf of its clients.

Thirdly, Dr Cornwall criticised the accounting of the fund-raising efforts of the Miss Industry Quest. The practice by which the centre has transferred the gross proceeds of fund-raising to its furnishing and building account, while the costs of that fund-raising are met from the centre's operating budget, dates back to the early 1970s, when the Labor Government of the day agreed to this arrangement. It needs to be understood that, unlike other organisations, the Julia Farr Centre has a practice of crediting bequests to operating revenue. Other charitable organisations in receipt of Government funds generally accumulate bequests as capital reserves.

In 1980, bequests amounted to \$429 478, compared with the fund-raising expenses of the Miss Industry Quest of \$230 205. Therefore, it cannot be suggested that the centre has inappropriately gained from this unusual arrangement. This accounting treatment of fund-raising income was changed by the centre in September 1981, with effect from 1 July 1981, as a result of the commission and board's response to the cost allocation study.

Fourthly, Dr Cornwall alleges misrepresentation of the profit and loss account of the centre's kiosk. Payments and receipts in respect of the kiosk's operations have been only partly matched, and it is true that the kiosk has run at a loss when indirect costs are taken into account. Dr Cornwall's implication that the gross proceeds of the kiosk have been transferred to a capital fund is not correct.

Providing a kiosk service in an institution such as the Julia Farr Centre is a necessary part of the life and functioning of the institution. It is not unusual for such kiosks to make a loss and for this loss to be borne from the operating funds. The cost allocation study has drawn attention to this matter and in future the centre will adequately relate receipts and payments of the kiosk's operations, and by doing so will be better able to manage that function.

From what I have said, it is clear that Dr Cornwall's allegation that little has been done since the cost allocation study, which I initiated, has become available, is completely wrong. In his vicious attack on the Julia Farr Centre, made in the hope that the Government would somehow be smeared by association, Dr Cornwall has used Parliamentary privilege in the unscrupulous way—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BANNON:** I rise on a point of order. Under Standing Order 154, which states, in part, that 'all imputations of improper motives and all personal reflections on members shall be considered highly disorderly', and also in terms of practice in this House, I would suggest that the words just uttered in this gross abuse of a Ministerial statement by the Minister and words which are to come are out of order. I request that you, Mr Speaker, ask the Minister to terminate her explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** Would the Leader give me the words just stated to which he takes exception?

**Mr BANNON:** I realise by doing that that I am giving further publicity to this scurrilous action—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**An honourable member:** It wasn't scurrilous.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is quite a legitimate request by the Chair, because the Chair, on this occasion, does not have the benefit of a copy of the statement being made.

**Mr BANNON:** I understand that nobody else does, either. The words so far uttered by the Minister (and there are more to come if she is allowed to have her way) are, 'in his vicious attack on the Julia Farr Centre, made in the hope that the Government would somehow be smeared by asso-

ciation, Dr Cornwall has used Parliamentary privilege', and so on.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** The truth hurts.

**Mr BANNON:** You people are really—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I uphold the aspect of the point of order, even though I acknowledge that there is no specific point of order in this matter. The Leader has referred to Standing Order 154. The situation in this matter relates to the practices of this House and the precedents in this House and as described in Erskine May. In that sense the request made by the Leader of the Opposition is upheld. Members, more particularly Ministers, would appreciate the situation which arose in this House earlier in this Parliament, relative to the alleged abuse of the opportunities made available by a Ministerial statement whereby there was, by imputation or otherwise, an attack on a person either in this House or in another place. After very clear and close consideration of the matter it became the practice of this Parliament—this Parliament of which we are a part—that such procedures and practices would not continue. I would ask the Minister to continue her Ministerial statement, but not to reflect or to impute upon a person elsewhere.

*Members interjecting:*

**THE SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Yesterday Dr Cornwall used Parliamentary privilege to attack an institution, the board of which has no right to respond.

*Members interjecting:*

**THE SPEAKER:** Order! I have asked the Minister to continue with the Ministerial statement. The matter, unless there be a substantive motion before the Chair, is not open for debate. The honourable Minister of Health.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Dr Cornwall's action on this and other issues and his approach to his responsibilities as Opposition spokesman—

**Mr BANNON:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I take exception, in terms of your ruling to the Minister's continuing to refer to Dr Cornwall and his motives. In the statement to come there are clear ways in which you can avoid it—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BANNON:** —and if you have got any—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will be monitored in respect of what is being said. I make the point, which I have already made quite deliberately, that the Chair does not have the advantage on this occasion of a copy of the document that is being read.

**Mr McRae:** Why not?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that the period of time for leave has expired. If the Minister is to continue she will need to seek leave to obtain further time.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I seek leave for an extension of time to continue.

**The SPEAKER:** Is leave granted?

**Opposition members:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is not granted!

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YATALA C.F.S. UNIT

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**Mr Ashenden:** Why don't Opposition members stop him, too!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chief Secretary has the call from the Chair.

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** I wish to advise the House that the Yatala C.F.S. unit has been reinstated as from today, following a review of all prisoners participating in the programme. The department has established new guidelines for prisoners taking part in all outside activities, including the C.F.S. programme. This will allow greater objectivity in the determination of a prisoner's suitability to participate in these programmes. Under the guidelines, a prisoner serving a life sentence or indeterminate sentence will no longer be permitted to take part in such activities unless he has served a minimum of seven years of his sentence.

Prisoners who have committed offences with a high notoriety factor will be assessed independently by the Executive Director. A prisoner serving a fixed sentence must have completed 60 per cent of his non-parole period and, where a non-parole period has not been set, he must have served one-third of his total sentence. As a result of the review, three prisoners have been removed from the Yatala C.F.S. programme because they do not meet the eligibility criteria.

I believe that these guidelines are necessary to minimise the risk of escape and consequent threat or danger to the public. The guidelines will be closely monitored by the department for their effectiveness. The C.F.S. programme has provided a valuable service to the South Australian community in its 25 years of operation. It has been successful as a rehabilitative measure, and I accept the department's recommendation that the programme continue. The unfortunate escape of prisoner Smith last Sunday week was the first incident in which a prisoner has escaped whilst participating in the programme.

It has to be appreciated by the public and the media that it is impossible for any Government to guarantee that there will not be another escape from a correctional institution. However, let it be said that this Government has made every endeavour to ensure that our two largest institutions, Adelaide Gaol and Yatala Labour Prison, are more secure, by installing surveillance equipment, establishing a dog squad, providing the necessary duty staff to maintain security effectively within the institutions, so that the risk of escape is minimised.

It is interesting to note that the number of escapes from South Australian institutions has fallen dramatically in the last two years. In this respect, South Australia has the best record of any mainland State in Australia, and every endeavour will be made to maintain this record.

## QUESTION TIME

### TAX AVOIDANCE

**Mr BANNON:** Will the Premier give an assurance that the report by the Corporate Affairs Commission into the extent of tax avoidance in South Australia will be made public, and if not, why not? Last Tuesday, in response to my call for action on tax avoidance, the Premier revealed that he had asked the Attorney-General to inquire into tax avoidance in South Australia. The Attorney later said that the request had been made some weeks earlier, although there was no announcement at the time. Today's *News* contained a story under the headline 'Tax Report may be shelved', in which article the Attorney-General was reported as stating that the report on the extent of tax avoidance may not be made public.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am not at all sure of the report in the daily press to which the Leader referred. I have asked the Attorney-General to give me his department's assessment of the extent of tax avoidance in South Australia. When I receive that report of his assessment of the extent of tax avoidance in South Australia I would decide what

action to take on the matter. I think it is quite ridiculous for the Leader to imagine—

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The honourable member is talking about a cover up—

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think once again the Leader of the Opposition is jumping to conclusions and grandstanding. Quite obviously the Leader wants it to be generally thought in the community that widespread tax avoidance is occurring in South Australia. I am quite certain that members of the business community and others in South Australia will be delighted to know that that is what the Leader thinks of them.

When we see exactly what that assessment contains we will see what further action is necessary. However, it would be far more likely that that material will be taken some time later this month to the meeting of all Treasurers with the Federal Treasurer, together with the Commissioner of Corporate Affairs and the Commissioner for State Taxation and their opposite numbers from other States. Following that, the Government will be in a position to do something positive and reasonable about the whole question of tax avoidance, instead of jumping up and down as the Leader is doing, trying to make political capital out of something about which he does not have the slightest idea as to how much it is affecting the business community of South Australia.

#### SEATON SHOOTING

**Mr RANDALL:** Will the Premier call for an urgent report from the Attorney-General concerning the suspended gaol sentences imposed on four youths and a man who were associated with the Seaton shooting? A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states, in part:

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, said yesterday the State Government would consider whether an appeal was warranted against the suspended sentences. He said he had instructed the Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, to examine the case, as he normally does, with a view to determining whether any appeal against the leniency of the sentence is warranted.

Because of the number of calls made to my office this morning expressing deep concern about this case, I believe that there should be consultation, that a report is urgently needed, and that corrective action should be taken. The reason for the number of calls, I believe, is the information contained in the *Advertiser* article, which I will quote to the House so that this question may be put into context. It states:

During the youth's trial the Crown said he was one of five people in a car which pulled alongside the victim as he walked. One of the youths shot the victim four times with a .22 rifle.

The group knew there could be trouble that night and had carried a rifle and ammunition. It was almost murder, Mr Justice Mohr said when passing sentence yesterday. If the victim had died, there is no doubt that these five young men would now be before the court convicted of murder.

It was 'only chance' that had saved the victim's life. The victim had got up after being shot and the youths had driven past again and he had been shot again. The judge said he saw no reason to differentiate between them. They had all been in it together. He would sentence them as adults to mark the community's disapproval.

'If the victim . . .

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Mr Speaker, I wish to take a point of order. It seems to me that this matter may well be *sub judice*, because it is subject to an appeal time which has not yet expired, and therefore the matter is still before the court. In those circumstances, I would have thought that the provisions of Standing Orders should be applied.

**The SPEAKER:** It has previously been established without any concern at all that the period between the decision and the lodging of an appeal does not substitute *sub judice*. If an appeal was lodged, the matter would become *sub judice*.

**Mr RANDALL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. People contacted me because of the article, which further states:

He would sentence them as adults to mark the community's disapproval. But he would suspend the sentences in the hope they would realise they could not commit unlawful and criminal acts and get away with it.

That article motivated many people to contact my office. I find it interesting that a point of order should be—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will explain the question, not refer to a decision of the Chair that has already been given, and he may not comment.

**Mr RANDALL:** Thank you, Sir. I hesitate to know where to go. I know full well that the Opposition will be asking the same questions in the Upper House.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think everyone who saw the report that appeared yesterday afternoon shared the feelings which the honourable member has expressed and which I certainly had when reading the article. I immediately asked the Attorney-General to examine the issue as a matter of some urgency to determine whether or not the appeal provisions, which thankfully were brought into operation by this Government for circumstances such as this, should be exercised on this occasion and whether the Crown should appeal against the leniency of the sentence. The Attorney-General tells me that the matter normally would be examined in the usual way, but that he will obtain a report as soon as possible and take whatever action is necessary.

I should emphasise that it is not always possible for members of the public and, indeed, members of Parliament to form a clear and exact judgment on matters as they are reported in the press. I think that is one of the points that has to be kept firmly in mind. At all times we must recognise that the Judiciary and the courts are there to examine all of the facts that are available and that occasionally and, indeed, probably more often than not, the determination and the sentences of courts are made with full consideration of the facts, which are not available to members of the community. Be that as it may, that is why the provision for appeal against a possible leniency of sentence has been introduced by this Government, and I think certainly if nothing else than to allay disquiet on the matter, in a necessary action that should be taken. Again, the matter is in the hands of the Attorney-General, and I await his detailed report.

#### Mr BOB GREGORY

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Why has the Liberal Party chosen to make a personal attack on Mr Bob Gregory, the A.L.P. candidate for Florey, in the leaflet circulated in the present by-election campaign, given that the Government and the Federal Liberal Government have chosen to make use of Mr Gregory's skill on a number of boards and committees, and given the high regard that the Premier expressed for Mr Gregory in this House on 18 February last year?

Since coming to office, the present Liberal Government has appointed Bob Gregory to the State Transport Authority Board, the Forestry Board, the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, and also the South Australian Council on Technological Change. As well, Prime Minister Fraser made Mr Gregory a member of the National Training Council, the National Aboriginal Employment Development Committee, and the Occupational Safety and Health Subcommittee of the National Labour Consultative Council. Finally, on 18 December last year, when the Premier felt it

might have been thought that he was accusing Mr Gregory of improper practices concerning State Transport Authority files, the Premier said, in a personal explanation to the House, the following:

That is not at all true. It was certainly not my intention. I have far too high a respect for that gentleman to make any such suggestion.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have a great respect for the integrity of Mr Gregory: I said that in the House, and I say it again. I do not think there is anything—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** You did not say that in the pamphlet.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not believe there is anything misleading in the pamphlet. Mr Gregory is the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, and has been for some time. He was at the head, I think, of the left-wing ticket in the recent elections of that body, and I do not think that anyone could possibly deny that. He has been classified by the national press as a member of the left wing of the Labor Party. That opinion is held very widely by members of the media and members of the community and, indeed, I must say that I looked on with some admiration, when Mr Gregory was chosen as the A.L.P. candidate for Florey, at the remarkable footwork which took place and which transformed him from being a left-winger to a moderate.

It was an extraordinary performance. The A.B.C. ran it six times. That is no reflection on any reporter from the A.B.C., because the reporter only provides the copy and a sub-editor puts the matter to air. I think, under all those conditions, one must accept that Mr Gregory is a member of the left-wing of the Labor Party. In fact, I think he is more closely aligned to the socialist left of the member for Elizabeth than he is to the present Leader's position in the Labor Party.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** He is going to stay with the strength.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** He obviously must stay with the strength. I was fascinated to see all this manoeuvring. All that we have said is that he is a member of the left-wing, and he is a member of the left-wing. He is associated with the left-wing. Nothing could dissociate him from the left-wing of the Labor Party. If one asked Mr Gregory reasonably, I think he would say that he was proud to be associated with the left-wing.

**An honourable member:** Has he told you?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes, he has told me. Regarding the various positions that Mr Gregory has held, he has served on those boards and committees with some distinction and has been chosen for the positions because he is Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council and has made quite a contribution in that position, but that does not change the fact that he is a member of the left-wing of the Labor Party and holds extreme views on some things.

Let me remind members of the evidence he gave to the Legislative Council Select Committee on Uranium Resources. As I recall, when he was asked about Roxby Downs, he said that he would do everything possible to stop the sinking of a shaft. When asked whether he believed that uranium should be left in the ground, he said, 'Yes, it should.' In general terms, I refer members to the report of that select committee.

Mr Gregory made quite clear that he does not want to see those 18 600 jobs, estimated by an independent university inquiry and reported in the *News* today, created in South Australia. He made absolutely crystal clear that he is not interested in employment, and I think that he is going to back the member for Elizabeth in his total opposition to uranium and anything to do with it, regardless of whether

it costs money and jobs for South Australia. I think the pamphlet is an eminently fair one.

## ROXBY DOWNS

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether he is aware of a report published by Monash University regarding the Roxby Downs project? Reports in the *Australian* and the *News* today headed 'Roxby Study Tips 18 600 new jobs' describe the finding of a study conducted by the Monash University into Roxby Downs. The article suggests that the Olympic Dam project will be of substantial benefit to South Australia.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, I am aware of the report. I have had a brief look at that. It sounds, from the noise emanating from across the Chamber, as though members opposite are aware of the report. Let me commend it for their thorough study. Let me also commend it to Mr Gregory, the A.L.P. candidate in Florey. I think he will find it interesting reading as it is from an august body such as a group from Monash University. The report says some interesting things about Roxby. The honourable member certainly will be interested. If we can get enough copies we will certainly see that members of the Opposition are not starved of copies.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It appears, from the brief look I have had, that it is a comprehensive study of the various scenarios for the Roxby Downs project. In regard to employment, it concludes with these words:

During the construction phase Olympic Dam will provide between 9 000 and 18 000 jobs per annum in South Australia. Total State output during this phase is projected to increase between \$230 000 000 and \$638 000 000 annually. In the production phase at Olympic Dam between 5 500 and 8 000 new jobs would be created in South Australia. Total output during this phase would increase by \$88 000 000 to \$213 000 000.

It was good that one former member of the A.L.P., the Hon. Norm Foster, had the courage of his convictions. It is unfortunate that the minority within that Party does not have the same courage as that man has in relation to this project. It is also interesting to note that the range of royalty projections in the report of Monash also indicates considerable benefits to the public of South Australia and is in the same range as the indicative royalty figures which I gave publicly and which have been misrepresented continuously by Labor spokesmen and their fellow travellers. The report says that the *ad valorem* royalty, let alone the surplus related royalties, should go from \$11 300 000 to \$15 000 000 in the first year. However, that depends on the Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Honourable members opposite had better read the indenture to ascertain the time commitments. Let them read the Monash report to see how to define the first year in relation to that. It is predicted to reach \$34 700 000 to \$52 000 000 in year 25. That is simply the *ad valorem* royalties, let alone—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The buffoonery and jocularly opposite would indicate that these people are prepared to turn their backs on the greatest mining project that this State—

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park will assist the House by remaining silent.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It simply highlights the attitude with which members opposite approach the question. The fact is that the State will gain something of the order of \$15 000 000 in the first year (and if they are

familiar with the indenture they will know what that means), rising to enormous royalties within 25 years. If they laugh at that there is no hope for them at all and precious little hope for the development of this State if ever their aspirations to come to office are fulfilled any time within the next decade or two. The royalty estimates indicate that everything that has been said authoritatively by the company and others in relation to this project and in relation to royalty projections indicates that it will put South Australia in the league of the other major resource States in this nation. The report indeed is an objective appraisal of the indenture, despite the innuendo by honourable members opposite in suggesting that maybe the report had been commissioned and paid for.

The implied slur in the honourable member's interjection is clear to us all. However, the fact is that it is a authoritative objective appraisal by a group of people from Monash University. For the honourable member's information, I point out that I understand that the Hon. Hugh Hudson is a part-time visiting fellow of this very group which wrote the report. Therefore, let the honourable member talk to his former colleague. Of course, we know that his former colleague's talents are no longer valued by the Labor Party, because it decided to send Mr Gregory over to the Federal Executive where he could vote against any change in uranium policy, which would have closed down Roxby Downs like a curtain dropping at the end of a performance on the day it came to government. At the same time that the Labor Party sent Mr Gregory with that majority of left-wingers to vote against the policy, it also sacked the Hon. Hugh Hudson from the State Executive along with the Hon. G.T. Virgo—it decided to unload the real talent it had in the Party. Nevertheless, if members opposite are still on speaking terms with the Hon. Hugh Hudson, I suggest that the member for Mitchell have a conversation with him and find out whether Mr Hudson believes that this report is anything but objective and accurate.

#### MARALINGA LANDS

**Mr CRAFTER:** Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether it is the intention of the Government to proclaim the Mining Act in regard to all lands under the control of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and, in particular, to proclaim the Mining Act to apply to the Maralinga lands at the time of the vesting of these lands in the Lands Trust and before agreement is reached between the Yalata Community Inc. and the Government on the rights that that community will enjoy as traditional owners of those lands?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Negotiations are presently proceeding with the legal representative of the Yalata community, Mr Hiskey. In fact, I had a meeting with him at 12 o'clock today. He will be having further discussions with me next week and within a week or 10 days we hope to be in a position to proceed on this matter. There will be a proclamation made which will set out the provisions of the Mining Act.

**An honourable member:** Just answer the question.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Just be quiet for a moment, and you will get the answer. The proclamation is in the process of being prepared. It was discussed at length during my visit to the Yalata community. The community expressed quite clearly to me, in the presence of Mr Hiskey, what its concerns were. The appropriate proclamation is in the process of being drafted. If the honourable member bides his time and keeps out of it he will find that a satisfactory agreement will be reached with the legal representative.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Why should he keep out of it?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** It is a matter of whether the honourable member wants to see a satisfactory conclusion reached or whether he wants to see the matter—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:**—continuing in dispute. I am suggesting to the honourable member that the matter be left to the legal representative of the Yalata community, to negotiate with me, and thus we will reach a satisfactory conclusion.

#### GILBERTSON GULLY

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Will the Minister of Environment and Planning inform the House whether the Department of Environment and Planning has been requested to assist the Brighton City Council concerning the treatment of Gilbertson Gully, Seacliff Park, and in making suggestions for the environmental treatment of the reserve? Expressions of concern have been reported to me by residents of Seacliff Park concerning the treatment of an area of recreational land commonly known as the Gilbertson Gully.

Some residents have been told, and expressed concern, that the area is to be filled in with car bodies and rubbish and is to be levelled off and eventually sold off as building blocks. Others have expressed concern that if the gully is left in its current state certain hazards, through poor drainage, which at times causes erosion resulting from excess storm water, on its course to the closest drain, will get worse. In view of these concerns, I seek the Minister's response.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** I am aware of the matters that have been raised with regard to Gilbertson Gully. In fact, I have had the opportunity, with representatives of the Brighton council, to visit the gully, and those arrangements came about as a result of the member for Brighton's interest in this matter. A report has been prepared by my department and it will be made available to the Brighton council. I do not have the report with me but I know that it recommends that the council appoint consultants to look more closely at any form of development that might take place in this area and, in particular, in the gully. It was suggested that the consultants should be appointed by the council but that in matters relating to subjects such as drainage, for example, there should be closer consultation with the Highways Department and, of course, the Department of Local Government.

I am not aware of any decision that has been made or considered by the Brighton council to fill that area with car bodies or anything else, or to subdivide the area. The discussions I have had with the council would indicate that it is anxious to keep the area in its natural state, but it also sees the necessity to be able to adequately maintain the area. At present, various parts of the gully are very difficult to maintain because of the undergrowth, etc., and I know that they are the areas that are being looked at. However, I am certainly not aware of any thoughts the council might have to fill that area. I can give an assurance to the member for Brighton that my department will offer any assistance that it possibly can in regard to further suggestions that might be made regarding improvement of that area.

#### DRIVING SCHOOL TUITION

**Mr TRAINER:** I direct my question to the Minister of Education, on the understanding that part of the question may be relevant to the Minister of Transport. What financial cutbacks have taken place with respect to student driver education courses at the Road Safety Centre on Oaklands

Road in my electorate and are these financial restrictions responsible for the lengthening waiting lists for these school holiday courses for young student drivers? I am advised that high school students who have applied for these driving courses held at the Road Safety Centre during school holidays have not been able to receive instruction owing to a lack of instructors a situation which did not, it seems, prevail in the past.

Previously, with an adequate number of instructors, it was almost unheard of for a student to be excluded from these valuable driving courses, which could save lives on the road.

In recent years, the cost of the courses has increased from \$10 to \$40, presumably to make the courses self-supporting, covering such items as fuel and driving instructors fees. I understand that General Motors-Holden's supplies the vehicles as a community service.

Instructors privately able to receive fees in the range of \$14-\$17 per hour were accepting \$10.30 per hour in order to assist in the training of young drivers through these courses. I am advised that the Public Service Board has now cut their hourly payment to \$7.03 per hour, an amount that provides little financial incentive for the instructors to participate in this scheme. As a consequence, the number of instructors has dropped by about 50 per cent, with a drastic lengthening of the lists of students, who are now unable to receive instruction during the holiday periods such as that which is occurring at the moment.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** There have been problems with that particular course, much to my regret. I regard student-driver training as one of the most important initiatives. In fact, there was a dispute over the question of the hourly rate for the instructors, and the Public Service Board advised that a serious industrial anomaly was present at the particular rates that the honourable member mentioned. We advertised for extra instructors to try to meet the demand, but we received no applications. On that basis, I then made some administrative arrangements to transfer some of the Road Safety Council inspectors to the course in order to increase the number of students that could be taken during the September holidays. I am in the process, at this stage, of trying to ensure that when the next course commences in the January holidays that we have a full complement.

## URANIUM MINING

**Mr MATHWIN:** Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware of further moves by the Australian Labor Party to prevent mining and export of uranium? The Minister would be well aware of the many varied reported attempts by the Labor Party to scuttle Roxby Downs, other ventures and any other mining of uranium? The Minister will also be aware of the neat footwork by the Leader that at times can be termed—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** There have been some moves within the Australian Labor Party which, of course, have some significance for the South Australian branch, whose members are keeping their heads well and truly down in relation to their vote at their Federal Executive. The State branch of the A.L.P. in Western Australia voted within the last couple of weeks to take a harder line against uranium mining. It agreed that that State under a Labor Government would 'allow no new mining—

**Mr CRAFTER:** Mr Speaker, I wish to take a point of order. This is a matter not within the competence of a Minister of the Crown of this State. The Minister is referring to a matter in another State and, besides that, the general topic is outside the competence of a Minister in this State.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member is correct in his interpretation that the Minister is referring to an action within the competency of a Minister in another State but the Minister has done so, as I perceive it, in answering a question relative to the influence or the effect of a similar situation on the South Australian economy. On that basis, I do not uphold the point of order.

**Mr CRAFTER:** On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, the sequence of events leading up to the answer which the Minister is attempting to give the House at the moment is purely hypothetical.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. I considered very carefully whether the question was permissible, that is, whether it had an impact at all upon Ministerial responsibility. On balance, I believed that it was permissible and on that basis, as I have indicated to the House on many previous occasions, a Minister has the right to answer the question in whatever way he or she may desire. There are relatively few occasions on which a Minister, when replying to a question, is called to order on the matter of relevancy. It has been clearly indicated that this is an area of Standing Orders requiring urgent attention, but only if it were agreed to on the floor of this House by a substantive motion would there be an alteration to what is the present practice of this House. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member is obviously hypersensitive, as well as not being well versed in the practice of the House. Let me point out the relevance, because this A.L.P. policy in Western Australia could well have significant benefits for us in South Australia. That policy states that a State Labor Government (in Western Australia) would allow 'no new mining developments to commence or come on stream'. Of course, that means the end of the very venture in West Australia which gives added impetus to the uranium developments in this State. Last weekend a special conference was forced on the Victorian branch of the Labor Party to harden up its attitude. The socialist left in Victoria was obviously very disappointed with what they perceived as some weakening of the hard line of the Federal A.L.P. Executive.

Of course, the Leader of the Opposition is keeping his head well and truly down, as are his colleagues, in relation to what implications their so-called revised policy would mean for the Roxby Downs venture to which I referred earlier. However, we do know this: it would be the death knell of the Beverley project, which is a \$500 000 000 project. If members opposite are prepared to turn their backs on that \$500 000 000 project, let them stand up and say so. We know that it would also sound the death knell for the Honeymoon project, a rather more modest development.

The A.L.P. policy is a recognition of the fact that the Labor Party wasted considerable sums of taxpayers' money between 1973 and 1979 when it set up the Uranium Enrichment Committee in South Australia. Members opposite encouraged that, and sought national publicity that indicated that we were at the forefront of the race to get a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. We know that it is a recognition by the Labor Party that it wasted taxpayers' funds in that exercise, because its policy now would indicate that such a project could not proceed in South Australia. I believe that all of those movements interstate indicate just what the A.L.P. policy means.

It is unfortunate that members opposite are not prepared to stand up and be counted and indicate quite clearly to the public just where they stand in relation to these developments, particularly Roxby Downs, because the Leader is just not prepared to say whether A.L.P. policy would allow that project to go on or whether it would stop the project. The Leader has very carefully, by dint of some fancy footwork, dodged that issue consistently. In one sense we can



look with some concern at what is happening interstate, but on the other hand I suppose that, if we want to look to our own State's interests, it probably gives a boost to our uranium developments, and we are getting on with those at some speed.

### POLICE HARASSMENT

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** What steps will the Chief Secretary take to ensure that people who are fined by courts of summary jurisdiction and who are properly absent from the courts when a fine is imposed are not arrested without being given due notice of the fine and reasonable time to pay following notice of the fine? I have received a letter from a gentleman in the Riverland, who has written to me expressing his concern about an incident involving his son. His letter states:

Our family has been extremely concerned over a . . . case that occurred up here approximately three weeks ago, and any action you can take to help prevent this sort of thing would be very much appreciated indeed. The fact is that when it happened to us we rang the court and Barmera and Berri police without any satisfaction, and we really just did not know what to do. We feared reprisal from the police in the end so we had decided to drop the matter. It is, in my view, very important that this 'Gestapo' type action be obliterated if the law is to maintain a good and useful relationship in the community, and of course in Mr McLaren's case—

—and I raised that matter in the House previously—

he should be entitled to at least an official apology and really some compensation. Anyway, briefly what happened to us is that we have an 18-year-old son who approximately six months ago had been caught for speeding . . . in a small town called Glossop. When the plain clothes officer booked him he was fairly abusive to our son regarding not wanting to know our postal address as he could not deliver a summons there. We live out of the town of Berri but have a post office box at Barmera as well as our very wellknown business address in the main street of Barmera. Quite some months after being caught David received a summons by way of our 17-year-old daughter who was the only one home at the time. When she was asked if David was home she replied 'No', but the police asked if she was sure he was not hiding. I take great offence to this and I fail to see how this sort of behaviour by the police can create any good impressions and gain respect.

David pleaded guilty on the back of the summons and returned it with his residential address, because he had been told in no uncertain terms that this was the only address the police wanted and the summons merely asked for 'address'. How was he supposed to think any differently? Well, a couple of months later David arrived home from work to find two police officers waiting for him to take him to gaol for non payment of a fine of approximately \$100 (first offence . . .) which he knew nothing about. Fortunately he had been paid a few hours earlier and was able to offer payment. This appeared to catch the police unawares as they did not have any receipt or provision for such circumstances. However, when David insisted upon a receipt he was permitted to pay the fine (including \$6.80 for non payment) and freed. The police did write out a note on a scrap of paper that was supposed to be a receipt but in fact it stated that David had received the money from the Berri police, not that he had paid it. At about 9.45 p.m. that night a young police officer did return with an envelope containing a proper receipt. I was boiling and I had every right so I took the envelope from the police and told him that if he ever threatened to gaol my son again without fair warning he had better watch out. I then slammed the door and left him standing there as he told me I could not speak to him like that. What do they expect?

David rang his mother at our business where we both work after the first call the police had made when they intended to gaol him. My wife contacted the Barmera police sergeant for any advice and help and he explained that it was a bit incredible and it would not happen here [Barmera] because they would first call and inquire from the defendant as to the circumstances and then in such a case give more time to pay. On phoning the Berri police sergeant (the ones responsible) she was told that David was guilty because he had been speeding and they were used to dealing with hardened criminals and anyway it was his fault because he put his residential address on the summons.

We rang the Berri post office, which had no letter being held for David that might be advising any fine. The following morning

we rang the Clerk of the Court who was a very rude unconcerned fellow. I am sorry I cannot use better terminology, but I was sitting by my wife when she phoned and she was most polite and courteous and did not deserve the sort of answers she got. It turned out that the court had sent a letter to our residential address knowing full well it would not be delivered. It had been returned to them by the post office anyway, so they were aware that David knew nothing of any fine. They also knew who we were but did not intend to contact us. It was up to David to contact them. I ask you, how was he supposed to know that, or indeed have any idea of when, as the thing had taken about six months to process anyway.

In our view gaol is no joke and is a very real disgrace. This sort of treatment cannot be accepted lightly by respectable citizens. My wife and I have run this business for approximately eight years in a very respectable fashion. I have served on the church board as a Deacon. My wife is very involved in community work. We do not like the insinuations that we are criminals because David was speeding. How long since a traffic offence was a criminal offence anyway?

So it goes on. I will not delay the House any more than is necessary. I believe that this raises an important matter of principle and the Minister should introduce some mechanism as soon as possible so that such incidents do not take place in the future.

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** I assume, with the long explanation that the honourable member has given, that the majority of details pertaining to the case have been outlined. I give the honourable member an undertaking that I will review the procedures to which he has referred and give a considered reply in due course. If there are any other relevant details, I would appreciate the honourable member making them available to me. I will reply to the honourable member in due course after looking at the procedures.

### JULIA FARR CENTRE

**Mr EVANS:** Will the Minister of Health say what actions have been taken or will be taken by the Government in respect of the Julia Farr Centre? The centre was the subject of allegations in another place yesterday, and some people have contacted me saying that the A.L.P. spokesman on health was reported as saying yesterday that South Australians will want to know whether their confidence in the centre is justified and whether the allegations are well founded. I seek information from the Minister.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I am happy to outline to the House the actions that I have taken. I think the most important thing is that the House and South Australia should be aware of the basis for these actions. They were based on three principles, namely, the importance of ensuring accountability in the expenditure of public funds, the importance of voluntary bodies that are in receipt of public funds complying with Government health, economic and industrial policy, and the Government's very strong support for the concept of assisting voluntary bodies to undertake the very challenging task of delivering health services.

On the basis of those three principles, virtually since I came to office I started to look at the way in which the then Home for Incurables had been allowed to operate for 10 years under the Labor Government and to try, always in a spirit of co-operation and working with its board, to alert the board to the importance of operating within Government policy. Probably one of the greatest advances over the past 2½ years on an issue that was literally ignored by the previous Government was the effort to encourage the home to adopt admission, rehabilitation and clinical policies that are in broad accord with Government health policy. I was interested to see that that aspect of the whole affair has been virtually totally ignored by Dr Cornwall.

I should also say that Dr Cornwall, in dealing with this whole subject, has been extremely careless about his facts.

In his customary fashion, he has imputed the basest motives to people who are working in an honorary capacity. I have demonstrated, in my Ministerial statement, that many of his allegations in another place yesterday were absolutely without foundation or, alternatively, were completely wrong. In some cases, he had what he believed to be a sketchy background of information on which he came to false conclusions. South Australians are becoming very familiar with this approach by Dr Cornwall and I think it fair to say that, throughout the health service, there is deep suspicion and mistrust of his motive.

**Mr Bannon:** Encouraged by you, with more reflections.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** That does not worry me, but I think it would worry the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. I am reasonably sure that it does. It is a matter of record that the Opposition spokesman on health has used Parliamentary privilege to attack numerous individuals, and that has subsequently been proved wrong.

**Mr BANNON:** Mr Speaker, I take the point of order that, once again, the Minister is using not a Ministerial statement but Question Time to get in material that you ruled out of order in her Ministerial statement. I am not objecting in any way to the Minister's answering with factual information. I am making clear that I am taking the point of order on the casting of imputations and reflections on a member of another place.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition said, in phrasing his point of order, that the Minister was getting into the record material that she was refused permission to enter previously. I think that on reflection he will appreciate that that is not a situation over which the Chair has any control, on the basis that, in answering questions, a Minister may answer in whatever way he or she desires. However, I do take up the point that the Leader has raised in respect of imputation and reflection.

I think members will recognise that there is a constant reflection in debate and in questions in this House, and that is sometimes difficult without the Chair being constantly on its feet, involving the Chair in the daily debate. I do, however, take a stronger view against imputation, because I believe that Standing Orders are quite clear that there shall be no imputation. However, members on both sides will recognise how difficult it can be to decide, until after a word is expressed, whether it is an imputation or otherwise. I ask all members, in asking questions, debating, or answering questions, to recognise their responsibility to people in another place.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** It would be so nice if the Leader of the Opposition were as careful of the Parliamentary conduct of his Opposition spokesman as he attempts to be of mine. The Government is fully committed to supporting voluntary organisations such as the Julia Farr Centre and, indeed, the St John organisation and the Adelaide Children's Hospital, both of which have been attacked by the Opposition spokesman on health.

I should say that the record, over the past 2½ years, of the Government's efforts to assist the centre to bring its administrative operations up to date with those expected of Government-funded bodies in the 1980s have been considerable. They are largely outlined in the letter which I wrote to the Chairman of the board and which I tabled a short time ago. That would certainly stand any public scrutiny.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Call on the business of the day.

## MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That for the remainder of the session in relation to the Appropriation Bill (No. 2)—

#### *Suspension of Standing Orders*

- (1) Standing Orders be so far suspended as would require the Bill to be considered in a Committee of the Whole House.

#### *Consideration in Estimates Committees*

- (2) On completion of the second reading of the Bill, members may discuss grievances on a motion which shall be moved by a Minister—'That the House note grievances', on the passing of which the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the schedules to the Bill shall be referred to an Estimates Committee. Such referral shall be on motion moved by a Minister, of which notice has been given. The committee may be ordered to report by a specified date.
- (3) There shall be two Estimates Committees to be known as Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B which shall not vote on, but shall examine and report upon, the proposed expenditures contained in the schedules. A committee may ask for explanations from Minister of the Crown, assisted where necessary by officers in the provision of factual information, relating to the items of proposed expenditure. The report of a committee may contain a resolution or expression of opinion of the committee but shall not vary the amount of a proposed expenditure.
- (4) The Speaker may, at the request of the chairman of an Estimates Committee, with one day's notice, reallocate any proposed expenditures from one committee to the other, if in his opinion, such reallocation is necessary to facilitate compliance with an order of the House relating to the time of reporting.
- (5) Forthwith at its first meeting, an Estimates Committee shall agree to a daily timetable for examining the items of proposed expenditure. Such time table shall be notified to the Speaker and may not be varied without his concurrence.

#### *Members*

- (6) Subject to paragraph (11), each Estimates Committee shall consist of nine members including the Chairman.
- (7) The members to serve on each committee shall be nominated by the mover, but if any one member so demand they shall be elected by ballot.
- (8) A member may be discharged from an Estimates Committee if, at the end of the examination of any item of proposed expenditure, or at the 1.00 p.m. or 6.00 p.m. suspension; he delivers in writing to the Speaker or Clerk a request to be so discharged; provided that the member may nominate another member in substitution, such member indicating on the same notice his concurrence to serve.
- (9) In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of an Estimates Committee, the Speaker may nominate a member in substitution but in so doing shall have regard to the composition of the committee as elected by the House.
- (10) An Estimates Committee may proceed to the despatch of business notwithstanding any vacancy in its membership.

#### *Chairmen*

- (11) The Chairman of—
  - (a) Estimates Committee A shall be the Chairman of Committees; and
  - (b) Estimates Committee B shall be nominated in writing by the Premier to the Speaker.

- (12) Any member of the Committee shall take the Chair temporarily whenever requested so to do by the Chairman of the committee during the sitting of that committee.

#### Quorum

- (13) The quorum of an Estimates Committee shall be four, of whom one shall be the Chairman or Acting Chairman and, if at any time a quorum be not present, the Chairman shall suspend the proceedings of the Committee until a quorum be present, or adjourn the Committee.

#### Participation by Other members

- (14) members of the House, not being members of the Committee, may participate, at the discretion of the Chairman, in the proceedings of the committee, but shall not vote, move any motion or be counted for the purpose of a quorum.

#### Sitting Times

- (15) An Estimates Committee shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays at 11.00 a.m. and shall adjourn by 10.00 p.m. If a committee is sitting—  
 (a) at 1.00 p.m. the sitting shall be suspended for one hour, or  
 (b) at 6.00 p.m. the sitting shall be suspended for one hour and a half.

#### Proceedings of Estimates Committee

- (16) Consideration of proposed expenditures in an Estimates Committee shall follow, as far as possible, the procedures observed in a committee of the Whole House.

#### Naming of member

- (17) If any member persistently disrupts the business of an Estimates Committee the Chairman shall name such member and—  
 (a) in the case of the member so named being a member of the Estimates Committee shall suspend the sittings of the Estimates Committee and report the offence to the House;  
 or  
 (b) in the case of the member so named not being a member of the Estimates Committee shall order his withdrawal from the sittings of the committee until he has reported the offence to the House, and shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who shall give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day.

#### Disagreement with Chairman's ruling

- (18) If any objection is taken to the ruling or decision of the Chairman of an Estimates Committee, such objection must be taken at once; and having been stated in writing the Chairman shall, as soon as practicable, advise the Speaker, who shall give notice that the House is to meet at 9.30 a.m. on the next day; Provided that the Estimates Committee may continue to meet, but shall not further examine the Vote then under consideration.

#### Meeting of House

- (19) For the purposes of paragraphs (17) and (18), it shall be sufficient notice of a meeting of the House for the Speaker to cause notices thereof to be placed on the House notice boards before 10.00 p.m.  
 (20) If the House meets pursuant to paragraphs (17) or (18), it shall, after the Speaker has read prayers, hear the report from the Chairman who requested the meeting and—  
 (a) where a member has been named, proceed with the matter as if the naming had occurred in a Committee of the Whole. For the purposes of any suspension of a member the sittings of an Estimates Committee shall be considered as a sitting of the House;  
 or  
 (b) where a Chairman's ruling has been disagreed with, resolve the matter, pursuant to Standing Order 164.  
 (21) Subsequent to any proceedings taken under paragraph (20) a motion may be proposed to alter the time table relating to that Estimates Committee's consideration of the estimates of expenditure; such motion to be put forthwith without debate, but no other business may be entered upon during the sitting.

#### Hansard Report

- (22) A Hansard report of Estimates Committee proceedings shall be circulated, in manner similar to the House Hansard, as soon as practicable after completion of the committee's proceedings.

#### Report of an Estimates Committee

- (23) A report of an Estimates Committee shall be presented by the Chairman of that committee or a member of the committee deputed by him and shall contain any resolutions or expressions of opinion of the committee.  
 (24) On the reports from the Estimates Committees being presented, they may, subject to paragraph (25), be taken into consideration forthwith or a future day appointed for their consideration.  
 (25) In considering the reports from the Estimates Committees, the following question shall be proposed: 'That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to (and that the resolutions or expressions of opinion agreed to by the committees in relation thereto be noted)'.  
 (26) An amendment moved to the question proposed in paragraph (25) shall not require a seconder.  
 (27) Upon the completion of consideration of reports of Estimates Committees A and B the question shall be proposed and put forthwith without debate: 'That the remainder of the Bill be agreed to'.  
 (28) When the Bill has been agreed to by the House, the third reading may be taken into consideration forthwith, or made an Order of the Day for the next day of sitting.

#### Time Limits

- (29) The following time limits shall apply in relation to the following questions—'That the House note grievances'.  
 One Minister and Leader of Opposition or member deputed by him—30 minutes.  
 Any other member—10 minutes.  
 'That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to'.  
 One Minister and Leader of Opposition or member deputed by him—Unlimited.  
 Any other member—30 minutes

*Motion carried.*

## SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 14 September at 2 p.m.

*Motion carried.*

## PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1965-1978. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is a simple amendment to the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1965-1978. The intention of the amendment is to allow the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal greater flexibility in reaching its determinations for salary adjustments for members of State Parliament. At present the tribunal is required to base its determinations largely on general community wage increases. In the current economic climate there is a great need for wage restraint and wage responsibility. In seeking a general moderation in wage demands, it is important that community leaders set a genuine and meaningful example.

Under the existing legislation it is impossible for the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal to take into account community attitudes, the State of the economy, likely economic effects, and other relevant factors in reaching its decision on salary adjustments for members of Parliament. In introducing these amendments, I would ask all honourable mem-

bers to consider the need for wage restraint and the example which every member can set for the community.

In 1981 the Government introduced suitable amendments in an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill which sought to provide a means of restraining members' salary increases, but these were defeated in another place. In the Bill now before the House, clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act. Subsection (1) is redrafted to remove reference to recommendations of the tribunal. The tribunal now makes determinations rather than recommendations. The new subsection (5) is the major provision of the Bill. It provides that, in arriving at a determination, the tribunal shall take into account the need for members of Parliament to set an example of salary restraint in the general community, when the need for such restraint is indicated by general economic circumstances. The tribunal must also have regard to the state of the economy and the likely economic effects of its determinations.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ROYAL COMMISSIONS 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

It makes an amendment to the Royal Commissions Act providing that witnesses, commissioners and counsel are to have the same protection and immunities in relation to things said and done by them during the course of a royal commission as witnesses, judges and counsel in proceedings before the Supreme Court.

It had been supposed, until a recent decision of Her Honour Justice Mitchell in the matter of *Douglass v. Lewis*, that witnesses, commissioners and counsel were protected in respect of statements made by them during the course of a royal commission from liability for defamation. Proceedings before the Supreme Court are the subject of absolute privilege in this respect and it was thought that the same protection existed in the case of a royal commission.

However, in her judgment in the case of *Douglass v. Lewis* Her Honour Justice Mitchell was required to determine, as a preliminary point of law, whether absolute privilege applies to royal commissions in this State and, after an exhaustive examination of the authorities, concluded that it does not. Her Honour noted that absolute privilege exists by virtue of the Royal Commissions Act 1902 in respect of royal commissions of the Commonwealth, and similarly the Royal Commissions Act, 1923, of New South Wales, confers absolute privilege in relation to royal commissions in that State.

It is desirable that the South Australian position be brought into line with the position in other States. If royal commissions are to conduct comprehensive inquiries into matters of public controversy, it is essential that their proceedings should not be hampered by the possibility of actions in defamation being brought in relation to submissions made before the commission, the findings of the commission or the evidence given before the commission. The purpose of the present Bill is to confer the necessary protections on the commissioners, witnesses and counsel.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 effects the proposed amendments. It confers on a royal commissioner the protection

and immunities of a judge of the Supreme Court, on a witness the protection and immunities of a witness before the Supreme Court, and on counsel appearing before the commission the protection and immunities of counsel appearing before the Supreme Court.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PRISONERS (INTERSTATE TRANSFER) 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

The necessity for uniform legislation to provide for the interstate transfer of prisoners was first raised at a meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General in 1973. In 1974, it was agreed that the matter should be considered by the New South Wales committee reviewing prison regulations under the chairmanship of the late Mr Justice McClellens. The report of this committee provided in large part the basis for the uniform legislation. The provision for a uniform 'Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act' as agreed upon by the States and Territories have now been drafted, and it is hoped that the legislation will be operational Australia-wide by next year.

The Bill provides for the transfer for prisoners from one State to another or from a State to a Territory or a Territory to a State, in the following circumstances: first, when the prisoner requests the transfer and the transfer is for the purposes of the prisoner's welfare (in this case the consents of the respective Ministers having the administration of the prison systems in the 'sending' and 'receiving' States or Territories are necessary before an order of transfer is issued by the Minister in the 'sending' State); secondly, where another State or Territory requests the transfer of the prisoner, or the prisoner himself requests his transfer for the purpose of standing trial and being dealt with for offences committed in the other State or Territory; and, thirdly, when a prisoner is to be returned to a State or Territory after trial or for the purpose of attending appeal proceedings.

The draft Bill does not provide for the transfer of prisoners serving sentences within a State for offences against Commonwealth laws (including prisoners serving a combination of sentences within a State for offences against both Commonwealth and State laws). The Commonwealth has indicated that it will be preparing reciprocal legislation to provide for the transfer of these prisoners. When this is done, complementary provisions will be inserted in the uniform State legislation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the Bill. Clause 4 provides that the proposed new Act is to be administered by the Chief Secretary. Clause 5 contains the interpretation provisions and includes definitions of 'prisoner' and 'sentence of imprisonment' which affect the ambit of the operation of the proposed new Act. 'Prisoner' means a person serving a sentence of imprisonment in South Australia but does not include a person imprisoned for an offence against a law of the Commonwealth. 'Sentence of imprisonment' is defined so as not to include a sentence of detention being served in a training centre under the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1982. Children in training centres are therefore excluded from the operation of the proposed new Act.

Clause 6 provides that the Governor may proclaim that the laws of another State or Territory substantially correspond to the provisions of this proposed new Act and that specified courts in South Australia correspond to specified interstate courts. This provision ensures that prisoners will only be transferred between those States that have adopted this legislation (known as 'participating States') and underlines the goal of uniformity. Clause 7 provides the opportunity for a prisoner to be transferred for welfare reasons. The procedure is that the prisoner makes a written request to the Chief Secretary for a transfer to another State. The Chief Secretary then considers whether it is in the interests of the welfare of the prisoner that he be transferred. If he decides that the prisoner should be transferred, he may ask the Minister of the participating State to which the prisoner has requested a transfer to accept the prisoner.

Clause 8 provides that, where a Minister of a participating State agrees to accept a prisoner who has requested a transfer under clause 7, the Chief Secretary may issue an order for the prisoner's transfer. The decision of the Chief Secretary under this proposed section is not reviewable by a court or tribunal. Clause 9 allows the Chief Secretary to disregard repeated requests for transfer by a prisoner which are made at intervals of less than a year. Clause 10 provides for the situation where the Chief Secretary receives a request from a Minister of a participating State to accept a prisoner who has requested a transfer to South Australia. The Chief Secretary is to give written notice to his counterpart that he either consents, or does not consent, to the transfer.

Clause 11 provides that the Chief Secretary may obtain and consider any information, including reports of parole and prison authorities, which relate to the prisoner who has requested a transfer either from or to this State. Parole and prison reports can also be sent to the Minister of the participating State which is involved in the possible transfer. Clause 12 is the first provision in that Part of the Bill which deals with the transfer of prisoners for trial. It provides that where a South Australian prisoner is subject to a warrant for his arrest which has been issued in a participating State and the Attorney-General receives either a written request, accompanied by a copy of the arrest warrant, from the Attorney-General of the participating State for the transfer of the prisoner to the participating State, or he receives a written request from the particular prisoner for a transfer, he may either consent or refuse to transfer the prisoner to the other State. A request by a prisoner under this clause which is directed to the Chief Secretary is to be referred to the Attorney-General. A second request made within a year of the first need not be referred to the Attorney-General.

Clause 13 provides that the Attorneys-General of both of the States involved in a transfer which has been requested under clause 12 must concur, in writing, to the transfer before an order for transfer may be issued. Clause 14 provides that, before a prisoner is transferred to a participating State, he must be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction so that the court can determine whether an order for his transfer should issue. The prisoner is entitled to legal representation at the hearing. Clause 15 empowers the court of summary jurisdiction to refuse to issue an order for the transfer of a prisoner if it considers that the transfer would be harsh or oppressive, would not be in the interests of justice, or that the charge or complaint against the prisoner is trivial and does not warrant the transfer.

Clause 16 provides that a party which is aggrieved by a decision of a court under clause 15 can apply to the Supreme Court for a review of the decision. The prisoner can again be represented by a legal practitioner. The Supreme Court can either confirm the decision, or quash it and substitute its own decision. Clause 17 directs the superintendent of the prison where the prisoner is situated to arrange for the

prisoner to be brought to any court proceedings which relate to his transfer, and to ensure that he is to be kept in proper custody while he is away from the prison. Clause 18 provides that, where a person who is the subject of a South Australian arrest warrant is in prison in a participating State, the South Australian Attorney-General may apply to his counterpart for the person's transfer for trial.

Clause 19 empowers the Attorney-General of this State to either refuse, or consent to, an application by an interstate prisoner to be transferred here. Clause 20 provides that where a prisoner is transferred to South Australia for court proceedings and the result is either that he does not become liable to serve a term of imprisonment in South Australia, or the term of imprisonment is shorter than the balance of the sentence which he is still liable to serve in the State from which he has been transferred (called a 'section 27' sentence), the Chief Secretary shall, subject to the exceptions contain in clause 23, order the transfer of the prisoner back to where he came from.

Clause 21 is directed to the situation where a prisoner has been transferred to South Australia and then appeal proceedings arise in the State from which he has come. In this circumstance, where the Chief Secretary is satisfied that all the South Australian offences which relate to the prisoner have been dealt with, and the prisoner applies to be returned to his original State in order to be present at the appeal proceedings, the Chief Secretary shall issue an order for the prisoner's transfer. The Chief Secretary is not required to act, however, if he considers that a transfer would be contrary to the public interest.

Clause 22 deals with the converse of the situation in clause 21, being the situation where a prisoner is transferred back to South Australia for an appeal. If the result of the appeal is that the prisoner is not liable to serve in South Australia any further sentence, or is not liable to serve a sentence which is longer than the sentence which he was serving at the time of his transfer (a section 27 sentence again), the prisoner shall be transferred back to the participating State.

Clause 23 consists of ancillary provisions to the three preceding clauses. It provides, first, that, in any event, a prisoner shall not be transferred back to the State from which he has come if the prisoner requests that he remain in South Australia and the Chief Secretary and the appropriate interstate Minister agree that it is in the interests of the welfare of the prisoner that he remain. A transfer will also not occur if the prisoner is given what is called an 'indeterminate sentence', which is a sentence or order for imprisonment or detention for life, or during the pleasure of the Governor. Subclause (2) relates to the requirement of both clause 20 and clause 21 that a prisoner is not to be transferred back to the State from which he came unless every complaint or information against him has been finally dealt with. This subclause assists in determining whether all matters have been finalised. Subclause (3) provides assistance in determining the lengths of sentences, which may be relevant in the preceding provisions.

Clause 24 provides that when an order of transfer is made, it shall direct the superintendent of the prison where the prisoner is situated to arrange an escort for the prisoner on his transfer. The escort may be prison officers, policemen or appointees of the Chief Secretary. An escort coming into South Australia from a participating State is authorised to hold the prisoner in South Australia until he is conveyed to the appropriate prison. Clause 25 provides that, on the transfer of a prisoner from South Australia, his South Australian sentences cease to have effect here. Any rights of appeal, time already served in prison, and the remittance of any money to the Chief Secretary for default sentences, are not, however, affected.

Clause 26 specifies the information which is to be sent to the participating State on the transfer of a prisoner. This information is to include the order of transfer, any authority under which the prisoner has been held, and a report on the prisoner, comprised of details of convictions, sentences, non-parole periods, periods of imprisonment served, entitlements to remission and conditional release, grants of parole, and the prisoner's conduct. Clause 27 provides that when a prisoner is brought to South Australia any sentence of imprisonment which was imposed by a court of the participating State is deemed to have been imposed on him by the corresponding South Australian court and shall have full force and effect in this State.

Clause 28 is comprised of provisions which are consequential to clause 27. Subclause (1) ensures that non-parole periods are transferred. Subclause (2) provides that, if on a review or appeal in another State a sentence or non-parole period is varied or quashed, the action is deemed to have been taken in South Australia also. Subclause (3) prevents appeal or review proceedings from being commenced in South Australia in relation to matters imposed by courts elsewhere. Subclause (4) deals with indeterminate sentences during the Governor's pleasure. Subclause (5) directs the Governor in the exercise of the Royal prerogative of mercy to treat a transferred prisoner as a prisoner who has been convicted in South Australia, and he may consider any indication from the Governor of another State. Subclause (6) provides that, on transfer, terms already served and entitlements to conditional release or remission of sentences are acknowledged here. On arrival in South Australia, the prisoner comes under the provisions of the Correctional Services Act and may, if eligible, earn periods of conditional release.

Clause 29 relates to sentences imposed because of default in paying an amount which a court has ordered to be paid. If the amount, or a part, is subsequently paid, the term of imprisonment is consequentially reduced. Any amount which is paid to the superintendent of the prison is forwarded to the Minister in the State where the default imprisonment was imposed. A term will also be affected if the amount in default is altered on appeal or by an appropriate authority. Clause 30 provides that, when the Minister or the Attorney-General makes a decision under the proposed new Act in respect of a prisoner, he must inform the prisoner of the decision. Clause 31 relates to the situation where a prisoner in transit is temporarily brought into South Australia. Any escort is authorised to keep custody of the prisoner and a superintendent of a prison may receive the prisoner into custody.

Clause 32 provides for the apprehension of a prisoner who escapes while being transferred. The prisoner is then to be taken before a justice, who may order that the prisoner be returned to the State from which he is being transferred. A justice's order lasts for seven days. Clause 33 provides a penalty of seven years imprisonment for escaping, or attempting to escape, from custody while being transferred pursuant to an order made in this State. The penalty is to be served at the expiration of the prisoner's other sentences.

Clause 34 provides that a court of summary jurisdiction may revoke a transfer order if the prisoner commits an offence during the course of being conveyed under that order. Clause 35 gives the Governor power to make any regulations which are necessary or expedient for the purposes of the proposed new Act.

Mr KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on the second reading.  
(Continued from 1 September. Page 943).

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** When I began to respond to the contributions made by honourable members in this House last evening, I made the point that very little new had been brought up. The Leader's reply was inadequate. It was a negative contribution and certainly did not deserve any reply. I have, in the past, dealt with the Leader's comments on these matters. I refer members to Page 1108 of *Hansard* of 1980 which contains a statement made by the Deputy Premier on my behalf, and to page 1306 of *Hansard* for 1981 in which all the Leader's arguments were answered in full. The remarks that were made by the Leader on those occasions were very much the same as he put forward on this occasion.

They point up yet again the Leader's ignorance of responsible economy. I repeat and stress (and I believe that this has been the general reaction of the community) that the Budget indicates a continuation of firm, responsible financial management. It is a Budget of sound management, a balanced Budget, and one which I believe has won general acceptance throughout the community, except in the ranks of members opposite. There is no sense of responsibility in the replies given by the Leader on three successive occasions. He has not thought through the implications of what he has said and the criticisms that he has made. I refer, for instance, to his attacks on the use of capital funds for recurrent purposes.

The Budget speech says quite openly that this is not an ideal situation but, on balance, it is the most responsible and the best course to follow. It has come through quite clearly that the Leader of the Opposition and his Party have no alternative to offer. What would he do? I was looking forward, following his statements last week, to hearing the Leader's hopefully well thought out solutions to the problems that he sees facing South Australia. However, I was disappointed, as I believe everyone else was, in that no reference whatever was made to any positive suggestion at all.

We have become used to this negative, continually knocking and whingeing response by the Leader and his Party. One of these days I hope that we might get some positive and constructive suggestions. Obviously, he wants merely to talk about deficit budgeting on the recurrent account and says he would rather go into deficit budgeting. After the Leader had done that, it occurred to me that obviously the Leader does not have the slightest idea of the implications of deficit budgeting. He seems to subscribe to a view that one can go into deficit budgeting and not have to pay interest on the deficit money involved. He seems to think that simply by juggling the figures for a deficit balance it is not necessary to find the money. That became very apparent as one listened to him.

I invite honourable members to look at the Leader's Budget reply, because it becomes crystal clear that, no matter how skilled his advisers may be, he has not yet got the idea. Obviously, in the short term, a deficit can be covered by drawing on cash reserves. However, a Government trying to take out cash reserves would have to face up to raising taxes, cutting services and/or borrowing at current rates of interest to cover the gap. So, deficit budgeting is not the painless option that the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting.

I would like to draw his attention to attachment 4 of the Budget papers which deals with the complexities of understanding the different ways of presenting the accounts as they are currently drawn up, and to tell him that the somewhat different ways of looking at the same accounts can give a different picture of what is happening on the capital account. Again, I remind the House (and I touch on it only briefly, because I realise that all honourable members other than Leader and his colleagues understand the situation) that some significant capital funding occurs from outside the Budget. It must be considered (and not ignored as the

Leader has ignored it) when one looks at the level of capital works now being undertaken by the State Government. We have worked very hard indeed, under considerable difficulties of an international and national economic recession, to provide a satisfactory framework for the continuing well-being of this State, and certainly within a satisfactory framework of public finance.

The two Bills introduced yesterday into this House amending the Public Finance Act and setting up a South Australian Government Financing Authority are just two of those initiatives that have been taken. We have sought to monitor very closely indeed our reserves and other cash balances that might exist in semi-government authorities and statutory authorities. There are no excess or generally available funds that could be diverted (as the Leader of the Opposition has put forward in the detailed policy document) to an enterprise fund. All existing sources of State funds are fully utilised, and they are being put to the best possible advantage for housing, construction and other major State projects.

Although the Opposition finds it hard to understand, I can yet again give a brief summary of the major South Australian authorities spending on capital works that is going on at present. Electricity Trust of South Australia holds very large cash balances, but those balances are held in close co-ordination with the State Treasury. I remind honourable members that without those reserves we would not have a northern power station, certainly not at its present stage. Significant loans are being made to the State bank for housing by the Electricity Trust of South Australia in the meantime, but it would be totally irresponsible to invest those reserves permanently in such a way that they were not available when required for the purposes for which they were borrowed. That is the point. Reserves are available, but they must be used for the purposes for which they were put aside.

The S.G.I.C. already follows the investment guidelines that are set by Treasury. Substantial funds are made available by S.G.I.C. to support the Government's housing programme, semi-government borrowings and SAOG. The S.T.A. has reserves, but, again, it would be totally irresponsible to use those reserves for anything other than the use for which they were originally set aside, that is, supporting the substantial capital projects that are currently being undertaken by the S.T.A.

We talk about the O'Bahn, the rail-car facility, the upgrading of the signalling system, and many other capital projects that are under-way. So, obviously the Leader of the Opposition has not the slightest idea of what this means. If he suggests for a minute that we should take away those reserves in order to bolster up (as he calls it) the recurrent capital works programme, he would do so at the expense of projects which are already well under way, well in the course of planning and which are already bringing work and activity to the State's construction sector.

The Pipelines Authority has very large reserves which are known to the Government, but those reserves have been properly set aside for debt servicing, for exploration for gas through SAOG, and for capital development. Those reserves cannot be tied up in long-term projects or in other funds or in other projects—they just cannot be tied up. Those reserves will be necessary; the SAOG operation and the Pipelines Authority would not be absolutely unable to discharge its full responsibilities to the people of South Australia if those reserves were interfered with in any way. The South Australian Housing Trust also has large reserves. I do not intend to go into those, but they are wholly required for planned housing construction programmes.

May I say that once again the South Australian Housing Trust has embarked upon a programme of providing a

combination in this State which is at record levels. It has not only used reserves which it had available, but has raised and mobilised funds from outside sources for this purpose. The borrowings of the smaller statutory authorities have been up to \$1 200 000 each year and have now been increased to \$1 500 000 each year, which borrowings have been brought under very strict control by this Government. Again, it was a hallmark of the previous Dunstan Government that they borrowed money under those smaller authorities gentleman's agreement arrangements without any thought at all of the impact on recurrent account of the cost of servicing those debts. That is a question that has been plaguing this Government. It was plaguing the Corcoran Government, and I know (and this was to his credit) that the member for Hartley was well aware of the impact on the recurrent budget of those various uncontrolled borrowings during the years before he took office.

The borrowings of the smaller statutory authorities have now been geared very closely to the cash flow needs of those authorities for approved capital projects. There is strict control on those borrowings, as there is strict control on the projects. The small statutory authorities have not been allowed to build up reserves unnecessarily without an approved programme. This was something that was tending to happen before the time of the Corcoran Government.

Where it is necessary to build up a capital reserve in advance of a project, the reserve funds are now placed in trust accounts and monitored by the Treasury. That is the only appropriate and responsible way to deal with those reserves. For the Leader of the Opposition to say that in some way we should build up reserves for specific projects, for instance, such as the new fire brigade building, and then not allow them to be used for the very purpose for which they have been put aside, is just sheer financial nonsense. There are no excessive or available funds in statutory authorities that can be used elsewhere in this State. The sooner we get that message across to the Leader of the Opposition the better.

I turn now to the Leader's position on taxation—something which has occupied the attention of members on this side of the House quite a good deal over the past few days, and which certainly bears repeating. The Liberal Party has always set out to be a Party of low taxation. The Government's desire is to reduce the size and activity—

**Mr Kenelly:** It is the highest taxing Government in the State's history.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think the honourable member is pulling a con trick again. I hesitate to say it, but it is absolutely typical of the attitude of members of the Opposition in that they try to pull a con trick and pretend that there is no such thing as inflation. I would like the honourable gentleman to get up in this House or to go outside and say that the Government has not abolished succession duties, death duties, land tax on the principle place of residence, that it has not given pay-roll tax concessions, and has not given concessions on stamp duties. When the honourable member can be honest and stand up and admit that this Government has taken that very responsible course of action, then I will give him the respect that he deserves. However, so long as the honourable member goes on trying to hood-wink the people by misrepresenting the Government, all I can say is heaven help us.

I noticed in the honourable member's speech the other night the fact that he mentioned that taxation receipts had gone up considerably. If the State had had the same taxes imposed that it had when the present Government took office as well as having those that are currently in operation added to them, taxation would have gone up by more than 50 per cent. I invite the honourable member to have another little look at what he said. The Government will reduce the

burden of taxation, and this State has moved from a State having one of the highest levels of taxation in Australia to a State with one of the lowest levels of taxation in Australia. Nothing that honourable members opposite can say can change that fact. I know that those comments hurt members opposite and that they do not like them, but the people of South Australia will not put up with increased taxation simply to fund a greater bureaucracy appointed for the sake of greater bureaucracy. That was an issue that the people of South Australia voted on at the last election nearly three years ago, and I am quite convinced that the attitude that was prevalent at that time is still the prevailing attitude.

There is certainly no consolation for South Australia if one considers the activities of Labor Governments in other States. The actions of Premier Wran following the last Premiers' Conference, to which I have already referred in this House, give clear evidence of his determination to raise taxation, come what may.

**Dr Billard:** Yes, \$280 000 000 worth.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Indeed, \$280 000 000 raised from taxation to cover what he said at the Premiers' Conference was a \$38 000 000 shortfall. That is pretty good accounting! It shows just how determined that Labor Leader is to keep the burden of taxation down in New South Wales! I do not think there is any problem at all as far as keeping South Australia's Budget under control in that respect. I was asked yesterday whether or not the Government had any plans to increase State taxation. The Government's control of the budgetary situation, our management of the State's economic position, has been so good that there is no need whatever to consider taxation increases in South Australia. That is the way that the Government is going to keep it.

The tragedy of all this is that the Labor Party (and I lay a great deal of the blame for this on the Leader of the Opposition) has totally and absolutely contradicted itself concerning State taxation over the last few weeks and days. First of all, the Labor Party's platform commits it to increasing public spending and to raising tax rates. The situation is quite ludicrous when one refers to the various statements that have been made just recently. Let me refer to some of the statements that the Leader has made.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** If you can find them.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have them fully documented here, and I would be delighted to let the honourable gentleman have full copies of them. These matters are something that I believe should be brought to the attention of all members opposite, because I really cannot believe that they can associate themselves with this perfidy and this total contradiction in regard to taxation policies which have been represented by their Leader. Indeed, I would strongly advise them to try to persuade him to come clean and say exactly what taxes are going to be increased, at what rate they will be increased, and what new taxes will be brought in. The inescapable conclusion that one draws from the policy documents that have been brought out by the Australian Labor Party and from the comments that have been made by members opposite (including the comments made last night by the member for Stuart who, if he reads the speech that he made, will realise that he was advocating increased taxation) is that members of the Labor Party support increased taxation and that that is what they will do. After all, that is exactly what the platform of the Labor Party states. I think it is important to put that on the line right from the start. The Labor Party's policy platform states it quite clearly:

A State Labor Government will increase public sector spending to maintain services in real terms per head of population to the extent that this is possible, and where possible regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than by cutting public expenditure programmes.

Later, that same policy platform states quite clearly (and there can be no mistake about it):

The taxation policies of a State Labor Government will be guided by the need to provide sufficient revenue growth to finance improved Government services and expanded Government services.

And for 'improved Government services' read 'expanded Government services'. The policy document itself states that 'Labor will increase public sector employment'. If it is to do that it must find the wherewithal to finance that public sector increase. Where can it find that wherewithal other than from State taxation? Yet when the economic strategy report from the Labor Party was released in May 1982 the statement was made that there would be an inquiry into the State system of revenue raising. That was the only portion in that document that referred in any way to that very significant question which everyone in the public arena wanted to know about, namely, where the money would come from.

All he could say was that there would be an inquiry. I suppose there is some merit in that, but it went on to say (and rather spoilt the record) that Labor believes it would not be appropriate to change the rate or abolish any existing State tax or substitute new taxes until a thorough and wide-ranging inquiry was carried out into the way the State raises its funds. That puts a total and complete freeze on taxation in South Australia until the election after because the Opposition Leader said, quite categorically:

The inquiry would be established by us in Government. If there are any major changes to be made to our structures they will be put to the people at an election and they will know precisely what they are.

In the *Advertiser* of 23 July it is reported that a future Labor Government would not increase State taxes or charges or bring in new taxes during its first term in power. That was unequivocal. It was a statement made without any fear of contradiction. It is clear from that that the Labor Government said in that statement that it would not increase the rates of existing taxes or introduce new taxes until after the results of a review into taxation were put to the people at an election. I know the propensity for Labor Governments to go to the people in a relatively short time, but I would have thought that that would be two or three years. So what the Labor Party, through the Leader of the Opposition that was undertaking to do was to put a total freeze on State taxation for two to three years.

**Mr Keneally:** You're even worse than you were last night.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I know it is embarrassing for the honourable gentleman. It must be embarrassing, because the Leader of the Opposition has now done a back flip on the whole matter. On 28 August, in an A.B.C. television interview dealing with State taxation, the Leader said:

I will be spelling out my programme in greater detail, both in my reply to the Budget next week—

So he said! I have not noticed it. Perhaps we have missed something, but I do not think anyone noticed any answer. He went on:

—and, of course, whenever the election comes, in my election policy speech.

Those were the words of the Leader of the Opposition; he certainly has not spelt out anything else. He goes on to say, it is not his intention to introduce any new taxes and, secondly, to reduce charges of taxation, and thirdly, to increase rates of taxes, but then came the important change, the rider, as follows:

and thirdly, to increase rates and taxes unless absolutely necessary to do so.

**Mr McRae:** Have you got the full policy speech?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have a full transcript indeed. The Leader also said, 'It may be that a review of some rates



is necessary.' In other words, the Opposition is now saying not that it will have an absolute freeze on taxes, no new taxes, no changes to the rate of taxes; the Opposition is now saying, 'Well, it was not quite right.' It is saying that it did not really mean that as a promise at all. A Labor Government would consider reviewing the rates of taxation. That does not seem like a freeze to me. It does, however, seem like a broken promise and a promise made at that stage by the Leader of the Opposition who is running up and has aspirations to lead a Government in this State, I believe it is a broken promise that ought to be remembered by the people of South Australia. There we have that total about face. Having given a categoric denial that there would be any change to tax rates or to the type of tax brought in, the Labor Party has now turned around and said openly that it would consider reviewing rates of taxation. The long and short of that is that it has no option to review rates and taxes, because it will not apply to sound and careful management, both of manpower and of the State's finances, that this Government has provided.

If it cannot do that, it will have no option but to increase the amount of money that it rips off the South Australian taxpayers, and that is the long and short of it. Indeed, it is encouraged in that by its own State Labor Party policy platform.

**Mr Keneally:** You accuse us of carrying out the policy platform? Is that it?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** What is astounding is not that the Party is following its platform, but that the Leader of the Parliamentary Party is not acknowledging that it is following its platform and he has made a promise, in fact, that it will not follow its platform. Whom does one believe? The major areas of State taxation are pay-roll tax, stamp duties, land tax, liquor, gambling, motor vehicle licences and registration, payments from State corporations, such as ETSA, and a series of regulatory fees, such as gun and pawnbrokers licences.

This is part of the con trick that the member for Stuart was trying to play the other day, because he knows full well that there has been a change in the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures and matters that are now classified as taxation as opposed to charges. There is no basis for comparison between the last year of the Labor Government and taxation receipts this year. This, again, is typical of the con trick that is now the hallmark of the Opposition.

The Leader has claimed publicly and with some heat that there will be no return of death duties. That is very fine, but three months ago the Leader also said that there will be no increase in taxes, no increase in the rate of taxes, and no new taxes. About one week ago the Leader said that he was wrong, that there would be an increase. If the Leader was wrong on that matter, how much reliance can one place on his promises not to reintroduce death duties? To me, that is a measure of credibility and the Leader has destroyed his credibility in regard to taxation measures completely.

The abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence has been significant for many people in our community. That measure was well received by everyone. Now, the Leader of the Opposition has given no undertaking whatever on land tax. Again, I challenge him to come clean. Does he intend that his taxation increases will apply to land tax, and does he mean by 'increase' that the A.L.P. will increase the scope of land tax and once again embrace all of those people who currently enjoy the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence?

**Mr Keneally:** It saved me \$5 in land tax.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I think that the honourable member does the people of South Australia rather more than an injustice. Obviously, the member is saying that he does not care whether land tax on the principal place of

residence is reintroduced, and I hope that that message gets through to the people of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and the metropolitan area. Will the Labor Party reconsider a resource tax or a profit tax? Will it introduce a pay-roll tax surcharge, for instance? Certainly, there is precedent enough: the Labor Governments of both New South Wales and Victoria have brought in massive surcharges on pay-roll tax. Will the Labor Party do that, or will it pin its hopes on increased land tax for householders or bring in succession and gift duties once again?

The people of South Australia have a right to know exactly what a Labor Government will do in regard to taxation. We have established that the A.L.P.'s earlier plan, that it will not touch taxation, is not valid. That has been rejected by the Labor Party itself. Exactly what is the A.L.P. going to do? Its economic document has proved to be absolutely worthless, by the statements of the Leader himself. I believe that the Labor Party must say what taxes it intends to increase, what new taxes it intends to introduce, and how much money it intends to raise. I can tell the A.L.P. that it has a problem in convincing the people of South Australia that whatever it says now can be trusted and that it will not change its mind, either before or after an election.

If their colleague Mr Cain's record in Victoria is anything to go by, the Labor Party will make promises now that it knows perfectly well it cannot and will not keep if ever it comes to office.

There are a great number of uncertainties about the Labor Party's policies. I believe that they will lead to more concern and more difficulty, basically because the Leader of the Opposition promised again last week on the A.B.C. that he would give the answer, what the Labor Party would do, that he would give the alternative Budget 'next week' in this debate. Once again, he has not done so. He seems to make statements and not follow them through, and makes them with gay abandon. I repeat that his credibility is wearing thin indeed, and it is time that he came clean about his tax policies.

People want to know where the A.L.P. really stands, what taxes it is going to bring in, from where will the enterprise fund come and how will it work. Let me compare these pie-in-the-sky and contradictory promises that have been made and then broken with the record of this Government. This Government has given sound and steady leadership. It has been a model of consistency since it came into office. It has kept a tight rein on our finances and, indeed, we now enjoy the reputation of being the best managed State in Australia. That is something about which we can be very proud. We are weathering the economic storm better than any other Australian State. Indeed, I invite members to read this morning's reported remarks of Mr D. C. French, of International Insurance Brokers, Reed Stenhouse, who stated:

We have put a lot of money and effort into upgrading the personnel and facilities of Reed Stenhouse (South Australia) in recent years. We wanted to be ready for opportunities like those that are now occurring.

As late as a couple of years ago, I felt less than optimistic for South Australia. However, South Australia has put its house in order cost wise and learnt to live with the difficulties of interstate transportation. It is now better placed to move up economically having coped with its own recessionary pattern years ago. You can feel that the change is coming in South Australia, and I just cannot believe the shift since the 1979-82 years.

In summary, I am confident that the Government's Budget strategy is the right one for maintaining confidence in the future development of South Australia. We intend to press on with the policies of encouraging investment and development in this State. We have managed and demonstrated clearly that we can manage the State's economy with some success, and that success is now well known by potential investors in this State.

As I have said, we will press on with that policy of investment and development, because investment and development in this State will create jobs and security for South Australians. We will do everything we can to help those of our citizens who are in difficulty with high interest rates, and with rental management. Also, we have proved that we can attack those problems, and we are doing so with some success. Certainly, more rapidly and more effectively than any other State in the Commonwealth.

The runs are on the board. We can show indenture Bills for the Hilton Hotel, the Cooper Basin-Stony Point pipeline, and Roxby Downs. Many other negotiations are presently going on and are of concern to members on this side of the House, even if they are not of concern to members of the Labor Party. Negotiations are presently in train for a petrochemical study which is further down the line than anything that was ever achieved in the days of the Dunstan Government.

**Mr McRae:** What, 1991?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There is nothing wrong with 1991. I am sure that the honourable member would be delighted—it is because of the attitude that is crystallised in that interjection of the member for Playford that potential investors in this State are absolutely petrified at the thought of a return of a Labor Government: a Government with the policies of the 1970s. It is exactly that sort of comment that absolutely petrifies those potential investors.

**Mr McRae:** Garbage!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** If the honourable gentleman thinks it is garbage I invite him to do some research. There is no way that South Australia can afford to go back to the policies of the 1970s, when private enterprise, manufacturing, investors in this State are absolutely petrified at the thought of a return of a Labor Government: a Government with the policies of the 1970s. It is exactly that sort of comment that absolutely petrifies those potential investors.

With the petro-chemical negotiations, uranium processing and milling, uranium enrichment, coal gasification, a number of other projects which are currently being investigated, and the final decision on the production stage of Roxby Downs, which will come in 1984, it is vital that we continue with a stable economy and stable management of that economy, and continuity and stability are the hallmarks of this Government in very difficult economic times.

There is no question but that the Opposition in its contribution to this debate has been negative, carping, whingeing and has had nothing of any positive value at all to contribute. If that is all the Opposition can contribute to the future of this country and this State, all I can say is that it can be very sure of one thing; it will not attract any support worth having for its aspirations to government in South Australia. I am confident that, with this continued management, which is becoming more and more recognised by the electorate, with the degree of quiet confidence, confidence that despite tough economic times South Australia is moving ahead, South Australia will move ahead and will be moving ahead under a Liberal Government for many years to come.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the House note grievances.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Playford will assist the Chair if he indicates whether any member from the Opposition benches other than the Leader of the Opposition will be exercising the lead position.

**Mr McRAE:** No, Sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. The honourable member for Playford.

**Mr McRAE (Playford):** There are four points I wish to deal with briefly. First, today is the day when the International Free Labor Movement throughout the world acknowledges the dreadful occurrences in Poland and places on record its support for, and solidarity with, the free trade union organisation known as Solidarity in Poland and, on behalf of the official Opposition in this Parliament, I note our support and further note our disgust at the incidents that have taken place in Poland in the past 24 hours and our continued disgust at the arrest and detention of Lech Walesa, the Leader of Solidarity, and of thousands of other political prisoners of conscience.

There is little we in this Parliament can do except be heard to state our opinion and give what support in money and moral terms we can to the various international organisations that are trying to assist the Polish people. Certainly, the Polish people do not deserve the horrors that they have had to put up with over the past 50 years.

It is tragic to think that, on the one thousandth anniversary of the State of Poland, the situation is so bad that the Pope apparently will not be able to make his scheduled visit. It is disgraceful to think it is probably because of the historic encyclical letter that the Holy Father wrote on the question of the value of work, in which he dealt specifically with Solidarity, that he was shot down by what was clearly an organised assassination team. I am afraid I cannot say much more on the matter.

I turn now to my second point, the Liberal Party's tactics at the moment. I make clear that we have an election drawing ever closer. We have just listened to a potted election speech by the Premier.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** It was a trial run.

**Mr McRAE:** My colleague says that it was a trial run. It was a hesitant trial run; he will have to do a lot better than that. I make one or two points about the taxation question. The Premier was harping about rates and taxes. I have said it twice this week and I thought it may have sunk into the minds of some members of the Liberal Party, particularly those members representing outer electorates where the rate of youth unemployment has now reached a staggering 25 per cent. I said 20 per cent and was horrified to find that I was wrong. I was corrected by the local officer. The rate has now reached 25 per cent in the outer north-eastern and northern suburbs. The policy that the Liberal State Government is following is the same policy as that of its Federal counterparts, and of Reagan and Thatcher. It is the policy of Milton Friedman.

I read yesterday the statement of John Kenneth Galbraith, who would be acknowledged as one of the great economists, certainly of this century, if not of any century. That economic policy has one hard kernel to it: to tax the poor to pay for the rich. That is precisely what is happening here. One can note that by the way in which succession duties and gift duties were abolished, as well as such taxes as land tax. It all had the effect of transferring the burden of taxation across to the less well off, and gave enormous advantages to the very wealthy. To make it quite clear, those who can rejoice in a State Liberal Government are the very wealthy, whose sons and daughters would have had to pay legitimate succession duty on their estates; the very wealthy who, if they do not already avoid taxes (and I suggest that half the Liberal Party is in that category), have to pay taxes of various kinds to the State.

The ordinary people do not benefit at all, except in relation to land tax. In my area people benefited to the magnificent extent of \$15 a year. Many in the electorates of Bragg and Davenport have benefited literally to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars. No wonder they are supporting the

Premier! They have no more succession duty or land tax to pay—no more this and no more that. Just let the poor people in the outer suburbs pay through increased water charges, and bus and transport charges, and so on.

The Premier, far from being a low-tax or no-tax (as he even had the gall to say) Premier, is in fact the heaviest taxing Premier (as my colleague the member for Stuart said last night) in the history of the State. Worse still, he is taxing the ordinary people by stealth. I repeat that for the benefit of people in the north-eastern suburbs, so there will be no doubt that the policy of this Government is to tax the poor to pay for the wealthy. It has done that very successfully. This Government imposes the highest taxes in the history of the State. It has done it by stealth. These people who have been unemployed—thousands of them—for years on end are not going to forget that.

If the Liberal Party thinks for one moment that these scare tactics that it has built up during the campaign for the Florey by-election are going to have any success, let the members of that Party wait until the results come in, because the Labor Party's day will come. Let me make that quite clear. I am making these comments not on behalf of the Labor Party but purely as an individual: after reading that filthy advertisement that was put around in the Florey District, and after reflecting on the filth that was published prior to the 1979 election, it occurred to me that two can play the game dirty. I would have a very good selection of Liberal Party members and supporters in this State who I would say are gross tax avoiders. I can—

**Mr Ashenden:** Name them.

**Mr McRAE:** The honourable member ought to be very careful with his challenges. I have indicated that I make that statement as an individual. I have not approached my Leader on this matter. However, I have made quite clear that, if this sort of filth is to go on, two can play it dirty. It is not just a question of tax avoidance. Other activities are involved. I shall be looking into this matter, and the Party no doubt will be discussing it, so I suggest that honourable members opposite calm their enthusiasm in asking me to name names, because I can do so right now.

**Mr Ashenden:** And do it outside, too.

**Mr McRAE:** For the benefit of the honourable members who are interjecting, their own Attorney in the Upper House, who I believe holds a degree of Master of Law, specialising in taxation, was asked today about tax avoidance by the Liberal party on the sale of the Liberal Club building. The Liberal Party avoided taxes of \$7 000. The Attorney's answer to that question was that it was quite legitimate. The implication was 'Let the ordinary person in the community pay for that.' The Labor Party objected and said 'What a disgraceful thing for you, the Attorney-General of this State, to say, namely, that the avoidance of \$7 000 was quite legitimate.' The implication was that, if the Liberal Party could get away with it, good luck to it. That was the substance of what the Attorney said. He seriously put to the House the proposition that he had no intention of doing anything about tax avoiders, until they were caught, at which time he would change the law once they had got away with their millions of dollars. That message will not be lost on the people of my electorate, nor will it be lost on the people in the north-eastern suburbs.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr McRAE:** It will do the member for Todd no good to shout and scream. This is a very touchy issue, and we will make quite sure that the people in the electorate of Todd as well as those in the electorates of Playford and Newland know all about it. Challenges such as that made by the member for Todd today are very dangerous indeed. Let me stress that point.

Finally, in the time that I have remaining, I want to raise a much calmer point. Mr Deputy Speaker, as was raised today by the Speaker, there are still a number of matters outstanding that deserve the attention of the Standing Orders Committee. While, in some senses, I almost cry about the prospect of having yet more committees, I think that, after having got through to Standing Order 159, it is imperative that we push on again to see whether we can finally get some progress with some of these arguments that are perpetually raised and annoying members under Standing Orders.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I call on the honourable member for Henley Beach.

**Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach):** Thank you for the call, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr Keneally:** Dissociate yourself from the tax avoidance in the Liberal Party.

**Mr RANDALL:** I have no problems concerning taxation.

**Mr Keneally:** What about your Party?

**Mr RANDALL:** Well, I do not know everything that goes on in the Party, either. In the time that I have available to me, I want to turn my attention again to this afternoon's *News* and to a question that I raised with the Premier this afternoon. I want to explain why I believe it is urgent that we resolve the matter of an appeal against a sentence that has been handed down. I listened with interest to the point of order that the member for Elizabeth raised during my question, because I knew—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member is not going to reflect on a decision of the Chair.

**Mr RANDALL:** No, I am not reflecting on a decision of the Chair: I am reflecting on the tactics in which a member of the Opposition wishes to participate in this House.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr RANDALL:** When a member of the Opposition takes a point of order, and when the Opposition Leader in another place is asking the same question that I am asking, one wonders where the Labor Party is going and about the validity of the point of order. I knew what was happening in the other House, because the alternative Attorney-General had signalled publicly that he was going to ask the Attorney-General the same sort of question that I asked the Premier. The Hon. Mr Sumner, as I am, is apparently concerned that something should be done, not in the long distant future, but in the near distant future, about this matter. So, that member wanted an answer urgently, just as I do, being the local member.

As the Premier quite rightly said—and I would like to explain the other side of the story—there are always two sides to a story. Unfortunately, there are in our community today young people who believe that they should spend their leisure time getting together as gangs. There are a number of groups of people who like to call these gangs by a name, and they tend to have clashes with other gangs from time to time. There is no difference now in the way gangs are formed from the way in which they were formed when I was younger. I know full well that it has almost become a tradition of growing up that young people tend to congregate themselves into teams or gangs, whatever one likes to call them, and that clashes sometimes occur between these gangs.

What concerns me is the form that these clashes are now beginning to take. I said when the incident was reported that I believe that young people should learn to grapple with their differences in alternative way—and not get out a gun and shoot each other. As I said this afternoon, I was

concerned, as was reported in today's *Advertiser*, about the way in which these young people decided that they were going to resolve the issue. They decided first to carry a firearm in the vehicle, to make sure that they had appropriate ammunition ready for the firearm and that, when the time arose, to make sure that they resolved the issue by shooting a rival gang member. To make it worse, they did not just pull the car up alongside the victim, as is reported in the *Advertiser* today, and shoot him once; they shot him four or five times and then, because he got up, they turned the car around and came back for a second go, and made sure that they had another go at him with the rifle.

This incident and incidents like it concern me, because these four youths and the adult have got away with suspended sentences on this occasion, although they no doubt knew that the consequences of murder in our society were severe. Therefore, I believe that those who carry out such an action, with the potential of murder occurring, should be more severely dealt with. I believe that, and I am motivated sufficiently to call on the Premier to seek an urgent report. I also ask the Government to take an appeal to another court and present its view.

A number of people in my electorate and in the community at large would agree with that form of action, because we cannot tolerate this method of resolving differences in the community. I am not saying that one gang was right and the other gang was wrong, because I do not doubt that there was a certain amount of provocation from the other side. If one looks at the whole issue, quite often one sees where confrontations take place, be it at union/employer level or wherever, that there are always two sides to a story, and confrontations can be avoided by conciliatory measures. As I indicated to the House last night, I believe that there is a growing concern in our community regarding discipline.

I expressed the need for parental aspiration towards stronger discipline within the school system. The member for Albert Park, who followed me last night, quite rightly pointed out that he believes that discipline should begin in the home—so do I. I believe that if more parents knew where their children were and what they had been doing before arriving home late in the evening or in the early hours of the morning, as is the case these days, perhaps more discipline in the home would prevent some of our community problems. No doubt all members are aware of the problems that are occurring in their own electorates.

I stress again to the House today my concern and that of my electorate about the suspended sentences handed down to these young people. I believe that they should have been made aware of the consequences of their actions; perhaps they should have spent some time within the prison system to learn that there is a deterrent for such people if they carry on in this way in the community, that is, the loss of their freedom. The problem is that many young people are not aware of the consequences of their actions when involved in group confrontations in gang warfare. I refer also to the way in which they drive their cars, sometimes believing that they are the only ones on the road and that they should not worry about the results of their actions in relation to other people when they indulge in drag racing, and so on.

I believe that there should be a reinforcement of community discipline in relation to young people through our legal system. Quite rightly, as members opposite have pointed out from time to time, and I repeat it (and I am sure that back-bench members on this side will point it out to the Government), there needs to be a tightening up. We believe that the Government was quite right in implementing the appeal system. I ask the Government and the Attorney-General today to look at this case and institute an appeal on behalf of the Government.

I wish also to clarify what I said last night about discipline, that is, that I believe that it is the responsibility of the family to take some action. I believe that the families of the young people who are associated with this incident will be taking some action. I only hope that that action will not come too late, and that I do not see these same people in front of the courts again for similar sorts of disturbance within my own electorate.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** This afternoon I remind members that only a few days ago, on 26 August, I asked the Minister of Health what other assistance was to be offered to those persons identified in the community as having worked at the Radium Hill mine during the years that it operated in the 1950s and the early 1960s and who, for one reason or another, have suffered apparent injuries to their health because of the nature of that occupation, that is, the underground mining of uranium. Since I raised that matter in the House, I have received a letter, the contents of which are so sad that it should be brought to the attention of members. The letter addressed to me begins:

I read with great interest an article in the *Advertiser* of 27 August 1982, referring to working conditions and health problems associated with former Radium Hill Miners. I am a former Radium Hill employee who worked underground for nearly 2½ years from mid 1959 to late 1961 when the mine closed down.

Those dates have been confirmed by my research, so the letter is accurate to that point. The letter continues:

In mid 1979 the question of health of former Radium Hill workers was also discussed in Parliament. I wrote to the then Minister of Health [who at that time would, I think, have been the Hon. P. Duncan] and also to Mr R. Millhouse, M.P. asking that my particular case was to be included in any study of cancer in relation to Radium Hill employees.

My correspondent has attached photocopies of the relevant correspondence. The letter continues:

It appears that nothing happened until you raised the matter again, and I personally wish to thank you for your concern and courage.

So, in the space of almost three years nothing has happened in relation to those former employees at Radium Hill. The letter continues:

What is most distressing is the fact that my case was recorded, but I have so far not received any questionnaire from the Department of Health. It is appreciated that I have moved residence since then, but I believe the Department of Health has not made any efforts to locate me, in particular as my name—

I want to paraphrase slightly the wording in the letter so that I can keep the identity of my correspondent undisclosed. So, I will use words "in a very small group in the phone book" which is not exactly what is in the letter, which then continues:

The Minister of Health is searching for connections between cancer of the lung due to smoking and lung cancer in Radium Hill employees.

I pause there to remind members that I pointed out to the Minister of Health on that occasion a few days ago that the questionnaire sent to former Radium Hill miners and other underground workers referred, in the space of about four paragraphs, to smoking on at least three occasions. It did not seem to be so concerned with other aspects of their health. The letter continues:

'Well, dear Mr Payne, I have or have had cancer of the lymphatic system and besides that I was a non-smoker; consequently, I feel that my illness should be considered in the current study.

Perhaps you could request that a questionnaire be forwarded to me by earliest opportunity.

I assure the House that that is in motion. The letter further states:

Again, I wish to thank you for raising this matter in Parliament, and I sincerely hope that you will not rest until some compensation is available to former Radium Hill employees who have and are suffering from 'radiation related illnesses.'

Additional information which has been provided to me by the writer of the letter includes the name of his medical officer, and so on, and the opportunity to check that the condition I have indicated, cancer of the lymphatic system, is indeed what that unfortunate person suffers from.

The reason that I am raising this matter in the House again is that there is proof and an illustration of why the matter was raised with the Minister of Health the other day. Almost three years has elapsed since, under the previous Administration, an intention, at the very least, was announced that former workers who worked in those days at the Radium Hill mine were to be searched out; also, that a study was to be made to try to determine the incidence of cancer and other diseases which might well have been caused by their employment in those years and, as I understand, other assistance would be made available to those unfortunate persons when they were found. Yet three years or so has gone. Here is a person who has stated that his illness has been diagnosed; that information has been made available to members of Parliament who have taken action previously, years ago, yet there is nothing else forthcoming from the Minister, the Government or the Health Commission of the State. When I asked the Minister about this matter the other day, the reply that I received was fairly guarded and in fact, for the Minister concerned, it was somewhat different from the replies that we have come to expect from her as Minister. I believe that the Minister was indicating to the House her concern also that nothing really was happening in this area. Of course, the Minister must accept the responsibility for that. If there has been inaction, if there has been less effort made by the Health Commission and by the Government in this matter, then it is clearly a health related matter, and the Government must accept the blame for not having proceeded in a way that I believe would be justified in relation to those former workers, and in a way which would be wholly supported by the rest of the citizens of this State in relation to the actions which ought to take place—that is, medical assistance and/or compensation.

It is interesting to note that, during the passage of the Roxby Downs indenture Bill and the select committee that was involved with it, this was one of the areas that I as a member of that committee canvassed, and subsequently in debate in the House. I said that there must be a proper arrangement in respect of the after care (if that is the right word) of workers engaged in any proposed uranium industry, and a proper arrangement with respect to any compensation that may have to be paid. Despite the evidence that has been available so far on this topic from the most eminent scientists and other people in the world, I have never seen anyone come forward and make a categorical statement that there is no possibility of cell damage or cancer when people are working in that industry, and in particular when they are working in an underground mine. Therefore, clearly the possibility exists, and there must be protection for workers who are engaged in that activity.

I wish to remind the House of an important matter—the credibility of the Premier of the State. Quite recently I was able to demonstrate to the members of this House that some promised assistance in the field of housing rental support, which the Government claimed was already available in the community, was not available, after the Government had claimed that State money had been provided for the purpose; when the acid test came, that information was not correct, as I was able to demonstrate from a letter that I quoted to the House dated 20 August, in response to an approach by me on behalf of a constituent who was requesting rental assistance. The answer that I received, as the member for the district, stated:

The implementation of this scheme requires amendments to Commonwealth legislation and it is anticipated that assistance will be available in November.

The letter did not state that it would be November 1982, but I assume that it means that assistance will be available in November this year, and not at some later date. I believe that the Premier's credibility was very severely tested on that occasion. To this time, to my knowledge, he has not been able to come forward with anything but bluster and persiflage in an attempt to get around the fact that, clearly, the public of South Australia has been misled by the Government's pronouncements on this topic.

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

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** The first thing I wish to comment on this afternoon is the drought and its consequences, perhaps in this instance not so much for the people who will certainly suffer, but more particularly for the animals—not only farm animals but also the greater populations of native animals that have grown up as a result of the increased availability of food and water across this country since its development for agricultural purposes.

From a recent discussion with the Minister of Environment and Planning, I can say that we recognise the need to consult with the people who have the responsibility of securing the welfare of rural communities which are afflicted by this natural phenomenon of drought; the farmers and district councillors. Accordingly, the Minister is currently considering forming a group of people with whom he can consult, from local government and from farmer organisations, to determine the best way in which policy in this area can be developed. Clearly, it needs to be developed, and quickly. It is cruel to leave animals starving, be they native animals (all fauna including emus), as well as domesticated sheep, cattle, and the like.

We will have to take action to ensure that the numbers of livestock grazing on the limited vegetation, be it native flora or improved pasture and crops, are reduced. The effect will be devastating on native flora if the stock grazing it, whether native or otherwise, is allowed to exceed that flora's capacity to recover. The effect on farmers will be equally devastating if they have to shoot their domesticated stock but, at the same time, through some irregularity in the way that regulations are applied, native fauna are allowed to continue grazing their pastures.

I do not see why any farmer should be expected to provide food and shelter for native animals while at the same time recognising the necessity to kill his own livestock upon which he and his family depend for a living, and upon which, in turn, his local community depends for a living. The local council requires rates from him, and local small business men require business from him in order that they can economically survive. I am pleased that the Minister so willingly accepted my representations to him. I commend him for the commonsense approach that he has taken, and I believe that in a short time this kind of meeting can be convened.

I now wish to turn to the substance of the comments that have emanated from the Labor Party in its attempts to criticise this Budget. Members opposite have advocated an increase in Government spending and criticised the Government by saying that capital works have been cut down, and thereby the number of jobs available in South Australia has been reduced. Regrettably, they have failed to understand that a dollar goes only so far.

The most important thing that this Government has recognised is the immediate survival of the jobs which already exist and which people wish to continue to have. By attrition, this Government has reduced the number of people employed by it during its three years in office, without

having to sack anyone. The fact remains that it is not possible to balance a Budget (and that is the responsible and honest thing to do) if one is to continue with public works without reducing the labour force.

So, higher taxes would be needed to pay for an increase in capital works. However, in our Budget which is balanced, all available revenue is exhausted. It is axiomatic to the argument being advanced by the Labor Party that taxes will have to be increased, as there is no other source of funds available. If one increases taxes one reduces the incentive for people paying taxes to take risk, invest in a business and produce more. The only jobs that a Government ever creates are pretend jobs, where unemployment schemes are the basis upon which they are created. Any dollars left in the private sector, instead of being taken through the tax mechanism in the public sector, create more permanent and real jobs in the private sector. A dollar in one hand does not buy any more labour than a dollar in the other hand buys. In fact, the truth is that a dollar creates less jobs if it is spent in the public sector than it can create if it is spent on wages in the private sector.

The reason for that is quite simple. Taxation, as I am explaining, does not have a multiplier effect other than a negative multiplier effect. It reduces the rate at which an economy can expand, so much so that we can, in fact, turn an expanding economy into a contracting economy by continuing to increase the tax burden on the private sector.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Stuart is going to speak in a few moments, so I suggest that he allow the member for Mallee to make his contribution and he will then have an opportunity to speak.

**Mr LEWIS:** The reduced incentive in the private sector I have referred to is the incentive to industry. It means reduced jobs and, therefore, it means greater welfare because we cannot leave people to starve and we cannot leave people without a roof over their head. An increased welfare burden means higher taxes to meet the cost of that welfare burden. As I have already pointed out, taxes being increased has a negative effect on the multiplier effect on the economy and one can directly increase taxes and graph the effect and see the point reached where, in terms of inflation, the economy begins to contract.

There is a further reduction in jobs resulting in the necessity to increase taxes to meet the welfare payments of those people put out of jobs by increasing those taxes in the first instance to produce the kind of pretend jobs that members opposite are advocating. We just get locked into a downward spiral in the economy until it finally collapses. Governments do not know better than people how to dispose of the wealth which their efforts generate. Governments do have a responsibility, on the other hand, to people. However, Governments need to recognise that the burden of taxation that any enterprise or any citizen can carry is not unlimited. At present in Australia we have sailed critically close to that line over the past several decades, certainly during the past two decades. We broke that line during the mid-1970s.

I want to refer also to the arguments I have heard advanced about the necessity for wages to continue to increase. It must be realised that, at the same time, every increase in wages (that is, each individual wage, or improvement in conditions) means a reduction in job numbers wherever that increase has occurred, because higher wages and better conditions each week simply mean higher costs of unit production.

It follows from this that higher costs of unit production will mean that higher prices have to be charged by any business if it is to remain viable, regardless of what that business is or what goods or services it produces. Higher prices will result as they are necessary to ensure that there

is a better percentage return on capital than the bond rate. On Commonwealth bonds the interest rate paid on money, in the system of economic usury into which we are locked, is the bench-mark. Mr Speaker, time compels me to continue my explanation in my next grievance.

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

**Mr LANGLEY (Unley):** I am sure today would be one of the epics of all time. There must be an election on Saturday after seeing what has happened with Government members today. It is marvellous how certain things come up at this time and how well they can be used. I have been out into the Florey District. The Premier said that there would be a 10 per cent swing when mentioning Saturday's by-election, but he is hoping that there will be only an 8 per cent swing so that he can say that his Party did well out there. I door knocked 450 homes in that district and I can assure honourable members that most people I spoke to will be voting Labor at the by-election next Saturday, if we can take their word.

**An honourable member:** Want to bet?

**Mr LANGLEY:** We are not allowed to bet in the House. I would like to know how many doors the member has knocked on.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr LANGLEY:** I do not want the protection of the Chair, but I can assure honourable members opposite that if they had been out and done their homework they would have seen what was in action. Today, we saw the Deputy Premier and the great friends of the Labor Party, the *News*, finding something they had not found for weeks and weeks. Suddenly they dug it up. I do not know why the people in charge of the *News* do not join the Liberal Party and be done with it. They should come out into the open. We have heard about the pecuniary interests of members. I would like to know what pecuniary interests the *News* has in these developments. Are they totally unbiased? I am not afraid of them. Only on one occasion have they tipped that I would win the election. That was when I stood against Susie Cream-cheese and Johnny Mack. According to the *News* on every other occasion I was going to lose Unley. Once I got over 60 per cent but according to the *News* I would lose next time. I got close last time and I admit that. If that is the way the *News* wants to carry on, with that bias, let it carry on. However, dirt does not wash.

I refer to the unscrupulous way in which the Government of the day gained office last time. We now have the same thing going on in a pamphlet just released. I know Mr Don Willett. I believe he was Brigadier Willett. Fancy a gentleman of his calibre putting his name to the bottom of that pamphlet! I thought he would not be as dirty as that. I know him from my days at Keswick Barracks. If members opposite think they can continue on like that they will be in a lot of trouble. This dirt has to stop. It will not do them any good at all.

Even when the Deputy Premier spoke on uranium, once again we saw a couple of Dorothy Dix questions. I have become used to them. I hardly ever stay at Question Time for that reason. I will be frank. It is a fiasco. It is just knock, knock, knock. If we did not have the Leader of the Opposition, no questions would be asked at all. We do not have an opportunity to ask the Leader of the Opposition a question, as it is not possible under Standing Orders.

We recently received information from the uranium people. They have even quoted a chapter from the church. They are trying to sway people in the churches. I refer also to the Minister of Health. I worked at the Home for Incurables before the name was changed. I did not think that was right but it was the people's wish. I heard the Premier

say at the show that, if he got into Government, the hospital would have all the beds and the building would be full. What has happened? Nothing has happened, and last year was the International Year of the Disabled Person. About 200 handicapped people can move into that area. However, nothing has happened. I was invited to the annual meeting but the Minister of Health did not arrive. I do not know whether she was sick but she did not arrive because she knew it would be a bit hot. People are disappointed in that regard. The Minister gets up here and says her piece, and I do not blame her for that, as she is entitled to her say. However, I refer also to the sheets going over the top of pillowcases at the Flinders Medical Centre. There is also no linen change on the week-end.

**Mr Randall:** You said that last night.

**Mr LANGLEY:** I am saying it again. I need to say it half a dozen times before it sinks in with the member for Henley Beach. They are 'good' cuts the Minister has made. It is tiggly touchwood compared with most other things. I am very pleased about the way the Premier gets up and talks about unemployment. Perhaps the Premier cannot read. During the course of a speech that I made recently, I had inserted in *Hansard* a graph concerning unemployment. It is a funny thing that the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who surely has some control over things relating to employment, said the other night that under a Labor Government unemployment was at the level of 8.2 per cent, which was higher than it has ever been during the term of the Liberal Government. I can assure members opposite that it was 8.4 per cent in 1981.

What happens in this place is that members say things and think that everyone is going to take it. The way the Government is going at the moment and having regard to the popularity of the Leader of the Opposition, and to the fact that members are willing to work, I do not think that the Labor Party would have any trouble at all resuming the Treasury benches. I am very sorry that I will not be available for selection, and that I will not be here following the next election.

**The Hon. P. B. Arnold:** Are you going to join the old buffers?

**Mr LANGLEY:** I will have a lot of pleasure doing that. I think that it was in September 1979 that the present Government came to the Treasury benches.

**Mr Randall:** Nearly three years.

**Mr LANGLEY:** Yes. If the Premier goes to an election next March, the Labor Party is a certainty. I went through a list just to make sure that what the Premier had said was an untruth. On one occasion, when the Premier spoke about unemployment he mentioned that South Australia was second on the list, that in November it drew level with Western Australia and that in the following month, December, Western Australia was higher than South Australia was. Every month since that time South Australia has had the highest rate of unemployment of any mainland State. Yet during past months the Premier has told us that we are doing well. However, the only members in this House who would listen to his comments would be members opposite. One finds that people outside are fed up with this type of thing. They are fed up with a lot of things and I wish I had an hour to speak of them.

**An honourable member:** Fed up with the Premier.

**Mr LANGLEY:** They might also be fed up with the Premier. The Premier in this House says things that he cannot substantiate. Further, he has been challenged by the Leader of the Opposition to debate certain issues on television, but on those occasions he rushed for cover. However, he is the Premier, and I must be fair: as I said the other night, the Premier is allowed to have his advisers, like anyone else, and he needs them, too! After the last election,

the persons who became press secretaries for the Premier came from amongst those people who write for the *News*. Those people would know someone at the *News*, they would say, 'If you do this for me, I will do this for you.' The Premier's comments about unemployment in this State are definitely wrong. For two weary years the level of unemployment has been—

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Billard):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** There are two points I wish to raise this evening in the grievance debate. I know that the Minister of Water Resources may think that strange, but as we move into Committee this is the opportunity to raise issues one may like to grieve on. First, I wish to compliment the Electricity Trust of South Australia for bringing out its annual report, dated 30 June, on 31 August. This is the first statutory authority to bring out its annual report and it is the first report we have received in relation to Government departments.

Normally, at this stage, one would have expected to have received the Auditor-General's Report. On previous occasions, under the Labor Government, when there was a delay, I made it known very strongly and protested to the then Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) that I was not happy about that. The then Premier informed me that it was beyond his control. I would appreciate, as all members would appreciate, receiving the Auditor-General's Report, if possible, at the same time as we receive the Budget documents.

As far as the ETSA Report is concerned, I compliment the trust on the annual report and the detail contained therein. There is some interesting information contained in it, and I hope that all members will bother to read and study it very closely because it contains some very timely warnings. I wish to quote from the report.

**Mr Hemmings:** We have got the report.

**Mr BECKER:** The honourable member interjects that he has got the report, but I do not believe that honourable members have read it, nor do I believe that the circulation and coverage of the report have been wide enough. The total revenue of the Electricity Trust for the year ended 30 June 1982 was \$337 448 000; the total cost of operation was \$303 692 000; and capital expenditure was \$151 037 000. I wish to now quote a very important feature of the report. The report states:

Sales of electricity increased by 3.5 per cent over the previous year and demand reached record level. At the same time costs in all areas of operations continued 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. Because of this, tariff increases were necessary to maintain the undertaking in a sound financial position. Despite these increases the trust's tariffs still remain among the lowest in Australia.

The situation which applied for many years in the past, where electricity costs were reducing in real terms because of the economies of scale being achieved through the installation of large generating units, no longer applies. 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. Because of these factors electricity tariffs are now increasing in real terms, i.e., at a rate faster than inflation. This trend can be expected to continue for at least the next few years.

That is the warning that worries and concerns me as far as consumers of electricity in South Australia are concerned, because it is a warning emphasising the long-term effect of the supply of natural gas. I feel that the price of electricity in this State will continue to increase, and increase at a rate faster than inflation, and at a level that some people in the community cannot really afford. Those I feel sorry for are pensioners, the aged, the invalid, all of whom depend on electricity—

**Mr Plunkett:** What about the unemployed?

**Mr BECKER:** And the unemployed, most definitely. People who depend on electricity for heating during the winter (and our winters can be very cold and bitter)—

**Mr Slater:** You think that those people should be entitled to concessions?

**Mr BECKER:** That is what I am coming to. Because of our bitter winters, the effect on the aged is quite real and it is regrettable that the aged and disabled have to worry about the cost of electricity and about stretching their pensions from one cheque to another. Because of this worry and concern, those people need electricity, not so much for comfort, but for power and for the cooking and preparation of proper, balanced meals. Arthritis is one of the most common problems affecting the aged and heat can be some comfort when one has this ailment.

I am very concerned indeed that the cost of supplying power to provide comfort for these people will get out of hand. I approached the previous Government on many occasions seeking concessions for pensioners. At one stage the Hon. Hugh Hudson said that the concessions that I was seeking were similar to those applying in New South Wales and would amount to about \$3 000 000. The Electricity Trust put up a pretty creditable performance, because in 1982 it paid \$14 800 000 to the State Government. Of course, that is based on the percentage of revenue paid to the trust. Therefore, every consumer in this State is billed an extra percentage which goes into State Government general revenue.

If these concessions amount to only \$3 000 000 (and they would probably cost a little more today), I believe that either the Electricity Trust, the Government, or both parties together, could afford to absorb this cost. The Electricity Trust's profit for the year ended 30 June 1982 was \$4 600 000. It had a retained surplus of \$500 000 from the previous year so the retained surplus as at 30 June is \$5 100 000. One could say that for such a huge undertaking that is not a great deal in reserve. I am not suggesting that we should dip into the trust's reserves. However, it has made substantial provision for further exploration and upgrading of plant and equipment. Personally, I believe that the Electricity Trust can come up with little opposition about providing concessions to pensioners in relation to electricity charges. It is quite possible that we will be in for a long, dry summer, and I believe even more that the under-privileged will suffer more stress in worrying about having to pay their electricity accounts.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

### WATER RESERVE No. 87

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** It is rare for me to cross swords with the member for Brighton in this place. However, I am not too sure that that is my intention now. The member for Brighton made certain comments in this place on 25 August about a group of people associated with what is known as the Gilbertson Gully. Some of these people have approached me and asked me to put the record straight, because they believed that the member for Brighton was incorrect in certain of his contentions. These people are former constituents of mine, and therefore I am only too happy to do so. The burden of the complaint by the member for Brighton at that time was that a meeting had been called 'last Sunday'.

He was not invited to it; nor was local government invited. However, he found later, to his consternation, that the A.L.P. candidate for the Federal seat of Kingston had been invited to it, and the A.L.P. candidate for his own seat (Brighton) had also been invited. The member was alleging certain skulduggery in the light of these matters. I have been asked to put the record straight in relation to this particular matter. The Gilbertson Gully Preservation Committee claims that it did not convene a meeting on that Sunday, 22 August. Apparently, channel 7's *State Affair* wanted to film the gully and contacted one or two local people to tell them that they would be coming down, and those one or two local people happened to contact certain of their neighbours. How the two candidates got to know that the television people would be in the area I do not know.

**An honourable member:** Probably a bit more astute than the local member.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Certainly, it indicates a certain amount of astuteness on the part of these two people. I have not been told. In any event, it is a little difficult to invite anyone to a meeting that, in fact, does not take place. I am assured that there was no meeting of this group on that day. So there it is. If political candidates are able to indicate their interest by turning up at a time when the media are there, good luck to them. I can recall a case where a member of this place actually sent an apology to a meeting to which he had not been invited. I believe that was accounted to him for a good deal of astuteness on the part of the people who had forgotten to invite him to the meeting. They made sure they invited him to the next meeting. In any event, there was no meeting to which the member for Brighton, the Clerk of the City of Brighton, or any of the councillors could have been invited. But, that is by the way.

There does seem to be some misunderstanding about the nature of what is going on at Gilbertson Gully. I was involved in this, as I say, as the local member in the very early years, when people first noted that, in the light of the considerable amount of development that had occurred in the area, it was important that some open space be retained and, secondly, that there would have to be proper management of such an open space area because of its proximity to residential development.

The people involved at that time put together a scheme, and they are under the impression that there was an agreement with the City of Brighton regarding the nature of that scheme. The present agitation revolves around the fact that they believe that the City of Brighton is endeavouring to get away from the terms of that original agreement. It is interesting to note that usually when there is some sort of clash between local residents and government, at any level, it is because the local residents want government to spend more money and government is not prepared to spend as much as is requested. It is interesting that in this instance the local people are saying that the council's version of the scheme for Gilbertson Gully will be far more expensive



than their own scheme. In fact they are asking local government not to spend more money but indeed to spend less than any reasonable costing of the scheme would suggest will have to be spent.

I have in front of me a statement which says, in part, that this gully needs (and all members would agree that this is so) regular cutting of grass and weed control; removal of kikuyu grass or bush, artichoke, etc, from the creek bed; a flood water diffuser at the Arthur Street end; and a drain or pipe along the backyards of four or five properties, the yards of which extend to the gully's base and become flooded after very heavy rain. It was further stated:

This does not require, and certainly is not wanted, \$120 000 worth of total piping, filling and bulldozing of existing flora, some 800 trees now six years old.

I am not in a position to know whether or not that last statement accurately reflects the intentions of the City of Brighton in this matter. However, I point out to the member for Brighton, who is presently in the Chamber, that these seem to be the figures of local people; they believe that, in fact, a large drainpipe will be placed along the bottom of the gully, it will be covered, the natural topography of the area will be destroyed, the trees that have been planted will have to be done away with, and so on. That is what these people are worried about: they do not see why what they believe to be the more grandiose scheme of the City of Brighton must proceed.

If, in fact, this is not the case, and if the Brighton council does not intend to carry out this rather ambitious scheme, a simple statement from either the council or the honourable member will, I guess, end the agitation. One really wonders why there has not been rather more communication in relation to this particular matter.

I believe that the media has continued its interest in the issue, and will probably continue its interest until the matter is resolved. I believe that the honourable member has been canvassing a very wide area to ascertain what people want to have done, and I can appreciate that there is always a problem about whether one should consult merely those people who are in the immediate vicinity of the problem or whether one should look at a broader area, given, of course, that some people who are consulted will not feel very much the impact on their lives in regard to the gully. I wanted to assure the House that, in fact, the honourable member was not ignored, that no meeting took place on that day at the instigation of the Gilbertson Gully Preservation Committee, that the media were interested, and, when the media are interested, people will always flock around.

**Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** I thank the member for Baudin for raising this subject. It is apparent that he does not have full knowledge of all the facts involved. First, the honourable member mentioned in his short address that channel 7 had wanted to film the gully: in point of fact, channel 7 was invited to film the gully by a certain gentleman who is the mainstay of the Gilbertson Gully Preservation Committee. In fact, it could be said that that person is attempting to represent the whole area with a certain viewpoint in regard to the work that should be done on the gully. It is interesting to note that that person was the one who agreed with the council last year and the year before that on an orderly development of the gully.

It is also interesting to hear the honourable member state what he thought was the general point of view of people in the area in regard to what they would like to happen in that development. I discovered by accident that there was to be a meeting. I might add that I was first told about the meeting by the Town Clerk of Brighton, who had heard about it from the Labor candidate for Brighton at a southern regional meeting (at which the honourable gentleman was also pres-

ent). At that meeting the candidate said to the Town Clerk, 'I will see you on Sunday at the meeting.' The Town Clerk said, 'What meeting?', to which the reply was, 'The meeting to be held in the gully about its development.' The Town Clerk said, 'This is the first I have heard of it.'

That was the first time the council had any notification that anything was going on. I did not hear about it until the weekend, by which time it was too late to change any plans. I thought that the best way was to find out a bit more about it. On the following Monday I had a call from one person who said that they had been canvassed to attend a meeting. From some of the replies, the following emerged:

I did, however, receive a visit from the A.L.P. candidate for Kingston last Sunday week about Gilbertson Gully and inviting me to the meeting.

I have many other replies that I have received since. I then canvassed the area with 600 letter drops. The other day someone said to me, 'Why did you go to such a large area?' In fact, it is not a large area, and merely takes in the streets which happen to border Gilbertson Gully.

It seemed to me that in an area which is set aside for public recreational use most people should be able to express a view on what or how the gully should be developed. The interesting point on this is that many people's ideas vary. Some people have said that, because of the rats and snakes in the area, they would like to see the gully filled in. Others have said that, because of the stormwater drainage, they would like to see a pipe go through. One letter came in today stating:

In our opinion we are not too concerned if the reserve section of the gully is piped or not, but what we would like to see is the backyards of the private properties which run into the gully piped with the proposed 4ft diameter pipe.

In other words, these people want some protection for their properties. At the bottom of the gully is a group of units, and there are 13 residents in those units. They wrote to me and said that they had never been consulted about what treatment should take place in the gully. They told me that in the drainage to the main drain (No. 10 drain on Seacombe Road), they are part of the property which runs into the gully and which is often washed away, and they want a piped area so that the water does not affect their property.

Surely those people have a right to some protection for their property. Other people have written to me expressing concern about what they have heard from representatives of this organisation, that the council was going to fill the gully with car bodies. Not only would it fill the gully but it was also going to level it and sell off the blocks for housing. Anyone would know that in proclaimed areas one just cannot do that.

In fact, that sort of rumour that has been spread in the community is totally wrong. If people had cared to follow up the matter with the council they would have found that the council had every sympathy in keeping the area in as natural a state as possible. What the council says is that perhaps the slopes on the gully could be somewhat contoured so that the council workers mowing the area, keeping the long grass down, will not be in danger of one of the gang mowers falling over. One of the workers told me some time ago that on two or three occasions the mowers being used had actually rolled over and taken workers with them.

Of course, they are concerned with their safety, and residents are concerned about the safety of their children playing in an area where the grass is long and full of weeds, especially with the possibility of snakes, rats, unwanted refuse and health hazards, and the like. They are saying that they want to preserve the natural beauty but make it a nice park so that they can enjoy the area and let the recreational needs of others be catered for. In seeking to gain an answer from the community I have the impression that there is a diversity of opinion on how the gully should be treated.

What I objected to in the exercise was that a group of people should canvass an area inviting certain selected people to a meeting and to appear before a television camera so that it would appear that those people who were there were going to use the gully. There were children on horses and bicycles who had been conned into going down to appear before the T.V. cameras just to show that a certain group, along with two Labor candidates, was taking the opportunity to say, 'Look, we care about the community', yet they did not have the decency to ask a person who lives 100 metres from the gully, who is their representative, who supported their plans previously put to council, to do something about it.

The council had approached me with the request that I support it in its request to the Department of Environment and Planning for a grant to put a pipeline through and to do an environmental plan of the area. That is all that happened, but from that point on it became a political exercise. People wanted to take the matter completely out of context and politicise it in such a way as to say that the local member did not care and was not at that meeting. Of course he was not there, because he was not invited and was not told that the meeting was taking place. That is the whole reason for that circular being sent out. Now, I am at least getting information back from the residents as to exactly what they expect and wish to be done with the gully, not only for their benefit but for the benefit of the total community in which they live.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** I commence my comments this afternoon by assuring the member for Brighton that the Labor candidate for Brighton and the Labor candidate for Kingston do care about people and do take up issues because of their concern. They are doing that out of their belief that the welfare of people can be advanced in a number of different ways in a number of different activities.

I wish to spend my time tonight on the subject of technical studies in the secondary education sphere. Technical studies is a very respected area of education in our State, going back a great many years. It has played a part, first, through the technical high school system and, more latterly, through the complete high school system. Then, more latterly still, in the prevocational specialist schools. There are a number of matters of considerable concern to people in the technical studies arena. Those matters were brought to my attention by Stephen Blight, the Labor candidate for Morphett, who has been most assiduous in pursuing these and other matters.

He forwarded to me a copy of a document arrived at between the Technical Studies Teachers Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. From that and other inquiries I have been able to make, I understand that there are quite a number of important issues affecting teachers in that field and also affecting technical studies as an arena of education. One of the important points that is affecting them is that concerning new proposals for transfer of technical studies teachers to country areas.

Members will know that we have the equitable country service scheme so that all teachers in the profession will, as far as possible, equally share the requirement for the students who live in country areas of this State to be presented with a fair cross-section of teacher quality. The situation in the technical studies area is that certain guarantees given under the equitable service scheme possibly may not be able to be adhered to. The particular guarantee I am referring to is the one of four years country service bringing a guaranteed right of return to the city and a guarantee that that will not be followed by further country service requirements. Now, because of problems in the personnel make-up of the technical studies section of the Education Department, that

department has been put in the position of going back to technical studies teachers and saying that some of them will have to go back and do another four-year stint of country duty.

I received a letter from one country high school urging me to support such a proposition. I wrote back to them stating that I could not support it. It is, to my mind, fundamental to the success of the equitable service scheme that the guarantee of return after four years be adhered to. If that guarantee turns out not to be worth anything some years later to the teachers in question, indeed, there will be much less support for that scheme from the teachers themselves. I fear that the scheme would collapse. Other alternatives are necessary.

I would be most interested to read the suggestions apparently being put by the Technical Studies Teachers Association. They deserve a lot more examination than they have seemingly had to date. One interesting side-line of the matter of the transfer of teachers to country areas is that if the proposal from the Education Department goes ahead, three of the prevocational schools (those especially set up with some fanfare last year by this Government) will be hit in that they will lose their seniors to country postings. These schools were set up as being focal points and centres of excellence for technical studies. Yet, people who are in those senior positions in those schools and doing good work will be summarily ripped out of those schools, and loss of continuity could well result.

However, I have other matters of concern. Technical studies has, like many other areas of education, suffered badly in the advisory support services available to teachers in the field. In 1979 there was one principal education officer for technical studies, one project officer, two consultants and 12 special seniors at the regional level. These 12 special seniors represented the equivalent of 6.6 full-time non-teaching positions. The situation proposed for February 1983 is very much worse than that; there has been some considerable erosion. I understand that there is doubt as to whether or not there will be a principal education officer for technical studies. There will be only one consultant. In terms of advisory positions, there will be a .2 position in the central western region, .2 in the central southern region, one full time in the northern region of the State, and a .4 position in the Murray lands. That is a considerable drop in commitment from what existed in 1979 under the former Government. One wonders exactly how much support is being given to technical studies teachers in the field.

One might make a similar point that, as a result of the erosion in terms of the real allocation for printing by the Education Department, another anomalous situation has existed. That concerns the curricula material available to technical studies teachers. The curriculum document, Technical Studies in the Curriculum, prepared by advisory people within the technical studies area, was prepared over two years ago. It has been sitting on the printing schedule at the Government Printer ever since. So, for two years that document has been of no use to most of the teachers in the field unless they happen to have a draft copy of it. They will have to wait yet longer.

The Government may have been claiming that it can cut waste in the Government Printer section by reducing the education budget for printing, but it is denying valuable support materials to many people in the field. Another point of considerable concern (and it has been of concern to me personally for a long time) is the matter of equipment needs in technical studies in the decade ahead. Now that technological change is proceeding rapidly, it is very important that our educational institutions are able to respond to that change, that they are able to upgrade their equipment to

take account of generational changes in equipment, and also that they are able to replace equipment as it wears out.

I commend the Government that money is being made available to the TAFE sector to partly meet such needs. Money is also being made available in some of the pre-vocational schools. Link courses likewise have had some money made available to them. However, there is no allocation at all in the Budget for the general technical studies area in all other secondary schools, other than in pre-vocational schools, so it means that they are in grave danger of going backwards in the years ahead. I have called before for a plan of exactly what should and could be done in the decade ahead, what is needed in our secondary schools and in our tertiary facilities for that matter as well in order to keep them up to date with technological advances, what is needed in terms of equipment and the money that that would cost, what would be needed in terms of training staff to use that equipment to maximum effect, and, furthermore, what could be done to liaise between the TAFE sector, the secondary sector and other parts of the community to maximise the use of machinery already purchased to get the best value

for our dollar in this field. If that is not done, technical studies are in grave danger of going backwards, and at a time when we want to support education to the hilt, no-one could happily entertain such a prospect.

In the very short time that I have left available to me I want to repeat a matter that I have raised before concerning the Daws Road High School and why no money is being made available for funding for the converted woodwork shop that is now a metal shop. I raised this matter before and I had hoped that the Minister would have replied by now. However, to this time I have had no reply, so I hope that this matter will be drawn to his attention and that he will give me an early response.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Billard):** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 14 September at 2 p.m.