

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 September 1982

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Fisheries Act Amendment,
Land Tax Act Amendment,
Referendum (Daylight Saving).

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

NEW MEMBER FOR FLOREY

Mr Robert John Gregory, who made an Affirmation of Allegiance, took his seat in the House as member for the District of Florey in place of Mr Harold Howard O'Neill (resigned).

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*: Nos. 10, 119, 131, 133, 134, 142, 144, 146, 150, 152, 154, 155, 168, 171, 182 and 184.

ABERFOYLE PARK HOUSING

In reply to Mr **EVANS** (19 August).

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: The South Australian Housing Trust has a continuous programme of seeking to provide housing in localities in which low income applicants require accommodation. This is achieved through a variety of programmes, including:

- (a) the purchase of established houses;
- (b) the rental of houses from the private sector;
- (c) the purchase of land and the subsequent construction of trust-designed houses on these sites by private builders;
- (d) the entering into an agreement (design and construct) with private builders to erect houses of their design on land in which they have some interest.

In each of these programmes it is possible for the Housing Trust to acquire housing in areas in which it had not previously had an interest.

The Housing Trust built approximately 100 houses in a Land Commission subdivision adjoining Taylors Road, Aberfoyle Park in 1977-78. The design and construct proposals were introduced into the Housing Trust programmes to:

- (a) provide variety of location using the proponents' own land;

- (b) assist a segment of the building industry which traditionally had not previously participated in the erection of public housing;

- (c) provide variety of appearance in the type of housing supplied.

The successful proponents in the Aberfoyle Park area are all well-known builders who in the past have operated in this State. The house designs and external appearances were selected by the proponents from their existing range of houses which have been used in the private housing market. Six proposals have been approved in the area. Two of these by Downer Hewett are grouped within one subdivision. The locations of the proposals are, to a large extent, determined by the progress of servicing of the subdivision. The remainder are generally scattered or occur in small groups throughout the area. Although the ideal solution may be to have only one trust-owned house in every five, the cost to the developer (at this time of high interest costs and depressed land market) would seem to make this objective prohibitive.

The trust information document relating to design and construct proposals calls for each detached house site to be fenced 'on the rear and side boundaries, and be provided with screen fencing at the front line of the house and suitable gates'. The document also states it is considered essential that the fittings and finishes should not be less in quality than those listed below:

Fencing:

2—rail corrugated galvanised iron to sides and rear;

3—rail lapped paling to screen fences and gates.

This is considered a minimum standard and proponents are able to suggest alternative materials. From observations made by senior trust officers, galvanised iron fencing is predominant in adjacent developments. The Housing Trust also owns 3.75 ha. of vacant land in Sunnymead Road purchased from the Education Department in March this year which will be used for housing and is currently negotiating with the Meadows council for a joint venture on council-owned land near The Hub.

INTERIM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

In reply to the **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (11 August).

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: The following answers are given in response to questions concerning interim development control powers for the district council of Victor Harbor. The State Planning Authority made the decision to revoke some of the powers of interim development control from the District Council of Victor Harbor pursuant to section 41 (5b) of the Planning and Development Act. The authority is the body solely responsible under the Planning and Development Act for determining when these powers may be returned to the council. Neither the Governor nor the Minister of Environment and Planning is involved in these processes.

In clarification of the points raised on this matter during debate on the Supply Bill on 18 August 1982, it is pointed out that references to sections 41 (1) and 41 (4) of the Planning and Development Act have no relevance to the authority's powers to delegate, vary or revoke a delegation of its interim development control responsibilities. The State Planning Authority has recently resolved that the present restricted delegation of interim control responsibilities should remain in force at Victor Harbor for the time being. This resolution means that the full powers are unlikely to be restored to council until after the new Planning Act comes into operation. In anticipation of this the State Planning Authority has recommended to the Planning Commission, established under the Planning Act, 1982, that the existing arrangements should be carried over into the new legislation,

with subsequent delegation of control to be determined at the discretion of the commission.

Any decision by the commission to delegate any of its powers under the Planning Act will require the approval of the Minister of Environment and Planning, in contrast to the situation applying to the authority under the Planning and Development Act. It can be seen therefore that, while the Planning and Development Act remains in operation, the decision to restore planning controls to council is entirely in the hands of the State Planning Authority. If the restoration of interim control powers has not been resolved by the authority at the time the Planning and Development Act is repealed, the decision is made by the Planning Commission and is subject to Ministerial approval.

It is not expected that any action will be taken by either the authority or the commission to review the existing arrangements until after the October local government elections. If the authority, or the commission, whichever the case may be, is to be in a position to consider restoring normal planning powers to the council, it would do so on the basis that it was satisfied that the council was adopting a responsible attitude to the administration of the planning within its area, and that the council was properly reflecting the wishes of the Victor Harbor community. The October local government elections would obviously be pertinent as they provide the opportunity for the public to express its views on the matter. There would then be little to gain from the State Government's further involvement in what should be locally determined issues.

The decision by the State Planning Authority to withdraw some of the interim control powers, previously delegated to the District Council of Victor Harbor, had been made following decisions by the council on five separate applications for retail or office development in the area. Investigations showed that consents issued by the council for four of the applications conflicted with provisions of the authorised plan and other factors. Two of the proposals approved by council incorporated seriously inadequate parking facilities and hazardous access and manoeuvring arrangements for both customer and service vehicles. Decisions had also been made by the council without consideration of the requirements of the Commissioner of Highways regarding access onto abutting main roads. The authority's revocation of portion of the council's powers was derived solely from its concern over decisions made by the elected council and not from any action taken by administrative staff of the council.

YOUTH REMAND AND ASSESSMENT CENTRE

In reply to Mr ABBOTT (19 August).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: My colleague the Minister of Community Welfare informs me that the staff at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre have proposed the restructuring of the present unit system at the centre. This proposal has not yet been considered by the department. No initiative has been taken by the department to cut costs at the centre by any restructuring nor has there been any initiative taken to alter existing policies.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1982.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Lotteries Commission of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report 1981-82.
- ii. Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1982—Regulations—Prescribed Transfers.
- iii. Savings Bank of South Australia—Balance Sheet, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Report, 1982.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1982—Regulations.

- i. Forms.
- ii. Noise Induced Hearing Loss.

By the Minister of Public Works (Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Public Works Standing Committee—Fifty-fifth General Report.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Fences Act, 1975-1977—Regulations—Drainage Reserves.
- ii. Justices Act, 1921-1982—Rules—Forms (Amendment). Rules of Court—Supreme Court Act, 1935-1981—Supreme Court—
 - i. Admission Rules.
 - ii. Fees.
 - iii. Companies (South Australia) Code.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. South Australian Waste Management Commission—Report, 1981-82.
- ii. District Council of Port Broughton—By-law No. 25—Bathing and Controlling the Beach and Foreshore.
- iii. South Australian Housing Trust—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Vehicle Inspection Fees.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1982—Regulations—Lottery Licence Fees.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Health Act, 1935-1980—Regulations—Swimming Pools.
- ii. Hospital By-laws—Hillcrest—Management of Hospital Grounds.
- iii. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1981—Regulations—Audit of Hospitals by Auditor-General.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Surveyors Act, 1975—Regulations—Code of Ethics.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. J. W. Olsen)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1982—Regulations—Small Loan Limits.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PASTORAL BOARD

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Lands): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Honourable members will recall that on 31 August I made a statement to this House in which I said, among other things, that I had called for a detailed report on the allegations made against the Pastoral

Board of South Australia, which appeared in the *Adelaide Advertiser* of 28 August.

I am now in a position to inform the House that I have received from the Director-General an interim report in which he states that it will be some months before the full report I have requested is completed. However, in the light of that interim report, the Government has taken certain steps to ensure that this matter is dealt with expeditiously and properly.

Following discussions the Director-General of Lands has had with the Pastoral Board, Cabinet has decided to recommend to Executive Council the appointment of Mr K. C. Taeuber, the Director-General of Lands, as Chairman of the Pastoral Board. This move is supported by the Pastoral Board.

In recommending the appointment of Mr Taeuber as Chairman of the Pastoral Board, the Government was mindful of the need to ensure that, if any problems exist in the administration of the board's functions, they should be resolved and that the board's on-going administration be more effective. In his capacity as Chairman, Mr Taeuber will be in a better position to report to the Government in due course on measures that may be necessary.

Mr Vickery will remain a member of the board, and, as the board cannot have more than four members under the provisions of the Pastoral Act, the appointment of Mr W. J. Edwards as a member will have to be terminated. It should be pointed out, however, that Mr Edwards's appointment was of a temporary nature only.

I want to stress that the purpose of this investigation is solely to clear the air over the whole matter of the allegations that have been made against the administration of the Pastoral Board, and pastoral industry in general. The press articles were selective in only quoting isolated examples of overstocking which have had the effect of giving a grossly misleading impression of the overall situation, and reflect adversely on the many excellent lessees who have managed the arid lands with skill and dedication to the principles of conservation.

QUESTION TIME

GAS PRICES

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say whether an offer of an agreed increase significantly less than the arbitrated amount was put to PASA by the producers during the course of arbitration on gas prices? Is it true that this offer was acceptable to PASA and the gas users? Why was it finally rejected in favour of the completion of the arbitration procedure, and, if so, by whom?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The answer to that question is 'No'. The Leader saw fit to make some public statements in relation to this matter. The allegation made was that I had interfered in the arbitration procedure in such a way as to preclude a settlement from occurring with a price lower than that which the arbitrator eventually found. When I was asked by a reporter about that my response was that it was a downright lie: as I am now in Parliament, I simply have to say that it is completely untrue. That was my response to that reporter. That reporter then rang the producer who confirmed the fact that no such offer had been made. The Leader alleged that this occurred in August.

I did hear that there was some talk towards the closing stages of the arbitration which, from memory, had been going on since about June. During the closing stages of the arbitration I heard that there was some talk about settling this matter outside of arbitration, so on my own initiative

I contacted the Chairman of Santos and asked him whether there was any chance of settling the matter other than by arbitration. The Chairman of Santos, Mr Carmichael, was quite adamant to me in his response that there was no possibility of that whatsoever, but that there had been, to use his words, some lawyers' talk.

What the Leader is alleging is completely untrue, and this was, from memory, within a fortnight to three weeks of the arbitration concluding. For the Leader to allege that is (as I have said, if it were outside the House, I would say that it was a downright lie, but in here I will just say that it is) completely untrue. The Labor Party entered into a contract for the supply of gas in such a way that South Australia got the worst of all worlds; in fact, it was an appalling piece of work.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson has been fronting up on radio today (he was not the Minister at the time) trying to put a gloss on these events, but the fact is that we have a problem in relation to these contracts on two counts, one relating to supply, and the other relating to arrangements for price. Not only in its foolishness did the Labor Party contract to sell gas to New South Wales until the year 2006 but it only ensured in the contract that gas was available, in the first instance, to South Australia, to the year 1987. I am told that the then Premier waved his hands airily, as was his wont, and said, 'We'll find plenty of gas.' However, since that time reserves have been downgraded, and currently we are spending money via South Australian Oil and Gas to find gas to satisfy the Sydney contracts, because of the terms of this Labor Party agreement, before we even have any more gas for our own needs after 1987. So we have a problem in relation to supply. I have been negotiating with Australian Gas Light, the people who hold the Sydney contract, to try to do something about that aspect of the contract.

The second most unfortunate and appalling aspect of that contract was the arrangements made in relation to price, whereby there would be an annual review, if agreement cannot be reached. If agreement is not reached, an arbitrator is appointed and, if the parties cannot agree in relation to the arbitrator, the arbitrator is appointed by a Supreme Court judge. That has occurred this year, and the arbitrator, who happened to be a retired judge from Queensland, recently brought in an arbitrated increase in the order of 80 per cent. That, in terms of the contract negotiated by the former Labor Government, is retrospective to 1 January.

A.G.L. at least had the wit to do better than did the then Labor Government in relation to their contracts, because they not only have their supplies assured to the turn of the century but they also have pricing arrangements that are far superior to those which the former Labor Government negotiated. Their arbitration takes place only every three years, so they can at least plan ahead for three years. Secondly, their price determination is not retrospective to 1 January. They are currently in arbitration, and the result of it will take effect from the date of their contract, which is 20 September or the date at which the determination is made, whichever is the later. In other words, if that A.G.L. arbitration goes on for months and months the price will not apply until the determination is made. Compare that with what the Leader's predecessors negotiated for South Australia. If the negotiations went on for 18 months (say, into next year) and arbitration occurred then, it would still be retrospective to 1 January this year. What an appalling lack of foresight. The A.G.L. negotiations take place before two arbitrators, one of the choosing of each party. Therefore, on all counts the deal which A.G.L. carved out for itself with the Cooper Basin producers—for our gas—is far superior to the appalling deal that the Labor Party managed for South Australia. That is an acute problem with which I,

particularly, as Minister, and this Government have had to wrestle. It does not help—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It seems to me that the Deputy Premier is canvassing an area relating to a matter that is currently under arbitration elsewhere. It might well be argued that he is being prejudicial to the arbitration of the matter to which he has been referring, involving A.G.L.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order in relation to this matter being before arbitration. The arbitration, in so far as it applies to this State, has already been completed. In relation to matters that are being canvassed interstate, it is not incumbent on this Parliament to comply with any *sub judice* rule. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There we have it—a major supply problem in relation to our own gas and a major price problem, because of the appalling lack of business acumen displayed by the previous Administration. Finally—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You voted for it in Parliament.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, we were not privy to the details of that contract when the Bill came before Parliament—far from it. We were not privy to the details of the contract: all we were given was a ratification Bill, not the sort of commercial detail that is contained in these contracts. Let me say that gas was sold to New South Wales and supplies were guaranteed simply to make possible the establishment of a petro-chemical plant by the Labor Party.

The company with which the Labor Party was negotiating has now, after all this time (about 10 years), quit the scene, so now this foolhardy contract was entered into simply because of one of the pipedreams of the Labor Party involving a possible (not even a probable) development. The only other point I would make is that it does not add anything to the public awareness of this matter for the Leader to promulgate what I would describe outside the House as a downright lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier has used the word 'lie' on three occasions during the course of his answer. I tolerated the first two occasions, because they were purporting to report an action outside this Parliament, but I suggest that there is no need for that word, in the context in which it is being uttered, to be repeated further.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I will rephrase that final sentence and say that it ill behoves the Leader to try to confuse the issue by promulgating complete untruths in relation to the negotiations on gas prices.

POLYCLINIC

Mr SCHMIDT: Has the Minister of Health seen a letter to the Editor in yesterday's *Advertiser* by Dr J. C. Moore in relation to a proposed polyclinic for the southern area, and does she see the polyclinic as being warranted? Dr Moore stated in his letter that the plan for a polyclinic in the southern area was not a new idea in so far as it had already been canvassed by the Minister of Health, her department, and the Health Commission. Furthermore—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What happened to the hospital?

Mr SCHMIDT: It was canned, as the honourable member well knows. The Opposition will also know that in an article in the *Southern Times* last week, submitted by the A.L.P. candidate for the area, the member for Baudin, and the Hon. Dr Cornwall from another place, it was claimed that they had been to the polyclinic at Mount Druitt in Sydney and had had discussions with the Director of the polyclinic, Dr Mooy. I spoke to Dr Mooy in Sydney on Friday and he

was surprised at a statement issued under the name of the A.L.P. candidate for Mawson, namely:

We have already explored the possibility of the secondment of Mount Druitt Director, Dr Miles Mooy, to supervise and co-ordinate the establishment of the Noarlunga facility.

Indeed, Dr Mooy was very surprised, because he had no recollection at all of a discussion along those lines with the party that had visited him.

Furthermore, during the tour of the Mount Druitt complex he made it clear that the polyclinic had been set up when no other medical services were available in that area; at that time there was a ratio of one doctor to 5 000 persons, so naturally a vacuum in medical services needed to be filled. He also pointed out that the polyclinic had made it a policy that, as people were referred to the clinic, they were encouraged to go back and make use of the services of their local medical practitioners, so that as more and more private facilities became available in the area those facilities were taken out of the programme of the polyclinic. He also admitted and agreed that the casualty care section of the polyclinic was being transferred to the new hospital being built in the area, and would no longer be a functionary part of the polyclinic after the hospital became operative in a few months time.

Contrary to the comments of the A.L.P. that appeared in the *Southern Times*, there was no 24-hour casualty centre at the Mount Druitt polyclinic, because it closes at 10 p.m. and opens only at 8 a.m., so anyone requiring the services of a doctor after 10 p.m. had to ring a normal *locum* service, as is the current practice in most other metropolitan areas, especially here in South Australia. He was more than delighted with the fact that in the southern metropolitan area around Christies Beach and in the Mawson area we have private practitioners providing a 24-hour service to the public, namely, one at Christies Beach and one at Reynella. He said that if such facilities had been made available in his area the programme of the polyclinic would have been different. Effectively, the polyclinic in Sydney is being—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now starting to debate the issue.

Mr SCHMIDT: I am asking the Minister whether a polyclinic is needed in my district, I am repeating the comment made by the director of the polyclinic that the clinic at Mount Druitt is now a community health centre, and I was making the point that we already have two community health centres in the southern area, one at Christies Beach and one at Morphett Vale.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I did see the letter to the Editor from Dr Moore in yesterday's *Advertiser*, and I believe it summed up succinctly the realities of the provision of health services in the southern suburbs, realities which the A.L.P. has chosen to ignore in its efforts, I believe, to attempt to buy votes. It certainly did not do its homework in the southern area before it went to Mount Druitt. If the A.L.P. members had done their homework, if they had consulted with the providers and consumers of health services in the southern area, they would have found that this area is as well, if not better, served than any other in the metropolitan area in South Australia. It is worth looking at the undertaking as reported in the *Advertiser* on Monday 30 August, in which the Opposition spokesman on health was reported as saying that the clinic would enable the Labor Party to provide specialist medical services on a sessional basis from Flinders—of course, such services are already available at Flinders, and locally. The article also quoted the spokesman as having said:

A pre-natal clinic, specialist pediatric services, ophthalmology, pathology, occupational and speech therapists and mental health services will be available.

I wonder whether Dr Cornwall had bothered to check on the availability of those services at present. If he had he would have discovered that the Christies Beach Community Health Centre, which is already operating, provides services which include individual and family counselling and therapy, nutrition counselling, speech pathology, community health nursing, cancer support, enuresis training, total health courses, women's support groups, parentcraft courses, relaxation courses and stop-smoking courses. In addition, venues are provided for ante-natal courses, GROW group, neighbour aid, weight control groups, Red Cross first-aid courses, Family Services Board (aged care programme), agoraphobic group and natural family planning. At the Morphet Vale Community Health Centre there is a venue for Birthline, the Southern Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service, a Mental Health Services extension provided from Glenside Hospital, child adolescent and family health services, intellectually retarded services and services provided by the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, the Royal District Nursing Society, the School Dental Service and St John Ambulance. That is just the basic framework. In addition to that there are voluntary agencies—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Well might the A.L.P. yawn, because if it had done its homework it would have discovered that the taxpayers' money that it has undertaken to spend would be wasted. I note that its undertaking did not include any time commitment; in other words, it was another big dose of A.L.P. pie in the sky, a dish which the voters in the southern suburbs found very unpalatable in the last election.

I want to go on to enumerate, as I believe it should be read into the record, the other services provided in that area. As my colleague has said previously, there are 53 general practitioners throughout the area. There are two 24-hour casualty services and a sports injury clinic. We are now getting into the highly specialised areas not normally found in health services. I would like to read to the House the specialist medical services which the A.L.P. is going to provide at cost to the taxpayer. There are three physicians, four general surgeons, one paediatric surgeon, three paediatricians, seven obstetricians and gynaecologists, two psychiatrists, two gastroenterologists, four oto-rhino-laryngologists, five orthopaedic surgeons, two ophthalmologists, two dermatologists, three plastic surgeons, one neurologist, one cardiologist, two rheumatologists, one urologist, one vascular surgeon, and one pathologist.

In paramedical services there are three podiatrists, 19 dentists, seven chiropractors, and seven physiotherapists. None of these services were available at Mount Druitt. All of them are available in the southern suburbs. In addition, the Government services provide community health nurses, social workers, clinical psychologists, a nutritionist, a speech pathologist, a medical practitioner, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, a paramedical aide, a podiatrist, home helpers, a community mental health nurse, dentists, dental assistants, dental therapists and other staff.

I believe that that summary indicates that the health services already provided are sufficient, appropriate, well distributed and quite proper to meet the needs of the people of that area. Not all of those services existed when this Government came to office. Certainly, the two 24-hour general practices did not exist. The certainty of knowing that a doctor is available every day of the year for 24 hours a day, combined with the other emergency retrieval services established under this Government, is a key service which gives confidence to people in those suburbs. It is a confidence which I think will be completely shattered if an A.L.P. Government were to attempt to abuse and misuse taxpayers'

money to no advantage to the patient and consumer in the way it proposes in its policy.

TAX AVOIDANCE

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the Premier agree with the Attorney-General that any tax avoidance device, however contrived and artificial, is justified, provided it is not illegal? If so, is he at variance with both the Prime Minister and his own comments? Does he now maintain that people are entitled, by the use of artificial schemes, to find loopholes in legislation? This morning's *Advertiser* quoted the Attorney-General as saying, 'People have a right to arrange their affairs to pay minimum taxation.' He also said:

The law has never said the taxpayer or citizen had to arrange their affairs to pay the maximum amount of duty. If Governments leave loopholes, individuals can take advantage of them.

The Premier will be aware that the Prime Minister said, while in Adelaide, 'Any Liberal involved in tax avoidance should leave the Party.' In this House the Premier agreed with that comment.

The Premier will be aware that the Prime Minister used the word 'avoidance' and not 'evasion'. I have been advised that the term 'tax avoidance' specifically refers to activities which strictly may not be illegal but which are artificial and contrived devices to defeat the intention of revenue legislation. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council said the scheme used to avoid stamp duty in the sale of Liberal Club premises was clearly in the 'tax avoidance' category.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would direct the Deputy Leader's attention to the fact that he is now moving into an area which could be thought by some to be *sub judice*, a writ having been issued. There has been no transgression at this point, but I am simply suggesting to the Deputy Leader that no explanation which might contravene should be undertaken.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would not want to do that, and I know that you, Sir, would not let me in any case. It has been put to me that the Premier does not know the difference between 'tax avoidance' and 'tax evasion', because he seems to be contradicting his previous statement on tax avoidance when he agreed with the Prime Minister that those involved should leave the Party.

It has also been put to me that, according to the Prime Minister's definition of tax avoidance, the Attorney-General should quit the Liberal Party because of his involvement in what appears to be a petty and somewhat shabby attempt to avoid paying the State its just dues.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me deal with the first matter that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has raised. It is a well-established principle of law that people may arrange their affairs so that they do not pay more duty or tax to the Government of the day than is required by law. I do not think that anyone, not even the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, would argue with that, provided that it does not involve any sham or fraud or illegality.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: 'Sham' is the word.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There was nothing in the multiple transfer system that was used in the transaction that was in general use at the time: it was a common practice, and it was totally legal and it was used probably by literally thousands of people in transferring assets up to that time. The law has been changed since that time, and because the law has been changed, it is now no longer legal to adopt that sort of practice. However, there is nothing that is implied in the change of the law which makes practices before the change of the law illegal. Again, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would be well aware of that.

I find rather sickening the attempts that have been made by the Opposition at the present time to assassinate or attempt to besmirch the character of the honourable the Attorney-General, an honourable man in the true sense of the word. The activities of the Opposition and the long history of gutter politics and smear and dirt campaigns that it has used are not in the slightest bit attractive. Indeed, it will not hurt this Party; it will hurt only those people who resort to such tactics. I will make no further comment. As you have said, Mr Speaker, a writ has been issued in this matter against the Leader of the Opposition in the other place, and I trust that that matter will come to a resolution.

NAVIGATION LIGHTS

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Marine have an investigation made of the effectiveness of navigation lights at the entrance of Outer Harbor and North Haven?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: I understand that some small boat operators coming from the north-west find it almost impossible to pick up the navigation lights at the entrance of Outer Harbor and North Haven. I am informed that the reason for the difficulty in identifying the red navigation lights is that there are so many red lights on pylons on shore as well as the confusion of motor vehicle tail lights. It has been suggested to me that, because of the effect of background lighting and vehicle traffic, a blue light be placed underneath the red navigation light.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I must say that I am not aware of any complaints in this regard, but I will have the point raised by the honourable member investigated and certainly have a look at the efficiency of the lights and their visibility from the sea. Background illumination and the effect on navigation lights have always been a problem. I recently ordered an investigation of background illumination and the efficiency of the breakwater lights at Glenelg. I will certainly have the honourable member's question attended to and give him a report as soon as I receive it.

MEMORIAL DRIVE NOISE

Mr PLUNKETT: Is the Minister of Environment and Planning aware of the numerous complaints from western suburbs residents about the loudness of music from the rock concerts at Memorial Drive on Saturday 11 September and Sunday 12 September? What action does the Minister intend to take to stop these disturbances recurring? Since early on Sunday morning I have had numerous calls from residents in my electorate complaining about the noise from the Memorial Drive concert. I understand that three rock groups, Cold Chisel, Mickey Finn and Swansee, were promoted by radio station 5SSA-FM and played in an open-air concert at the Memorial Drive.

Members interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: Apparently people in the Henley Beach area did not complain but I can assure him a lot of people complained in my electorate. With open-air concerts of this nature there is no protection against noise to residents within four or five miles of the venue. Apparently there is also no one to complain to, including the Minister, because some of my constituents rang him on Sunday night and the Minister asked them what they expected him to do! I ask, is the Minister going to put conditions on permits when rock groups are playing? I will speak further on this subject tonight.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Answering one of the comments made as to the answer I provided to any person who rang me on Sunday night, I do not know how many Ministers of Environment there are in South Australia, but I received only one phone call on Sunday night. I understand the caller was from the honourable member's electorate and that person was unable to contact the honourable member, so he rang the member for Hanson. The member for Hanson asked the person to ring me. This is always a very difficult situation—

Mr Plunkett: Why didn't you answer the letter two months earlier about the same thing?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: If the honourable member would like to provide me with more information I will look into that situation. The problem of loud music has been with us for some time. There are some people who are concerned about it, whilst others appreciate the opportunity of hearing these groups. The honourable member has asked me if I am going to take any action. Yes, I have arranged a meeting with people from my department, the Adelaide City Council, the South Australian Cricket Association and the Lawn Tennis Association tomorrow morning to discuss future concerts at Memorial Drive. Last year, as a result of such a meeting, we had a very good arrangement and very few complaints were received following that meeting.

It is my intention to look again at some of the requirements that are necessary in regard to open-air concerts. That meeting is to take place tomorrow, so, in fact, I am taking action. I would reiterate that it is a difficult problem, because many people in this State would appreciate the opportunity of attending such a concert, and we must recognise those people as well as the few people who have complained. Regarding the honourable member's specific complaint about my not having answered a letter from one of his constituents, I point out that, if he would provide me with the information and the detail, I would be happy to look into the matter.

PAMPHLET

Mr MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs seen a pamphlet which has been circulated by a New South Wales publisher and which describes the new national companies code as 'horrifying new anti-business legislation'? The pamphlet makes a series of allegations, including the claim that people who have written cheques over the past two months risk a fine of \$1 000 and that the new legislation virtually means that no new small businesses can start up, merge or even expand by taking in new partners. As the pamphlet has caused considerable concern in small business circles, will the Minister inform the House whether these allegations are true?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, I am aware of the pamphlet: in fact, I was given quite a few copies of it last week. When I was at Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla last week I talked to small business men, and I know that a number of people in Adelaide, including the member for Glenelg, have also received copies. The people concerned are very worried about whether or not the pamphlet is correct. Headed 'Horrifying new anti-business legislation' and dated 1 September 1982, this scandalous piece of literature states:

If you wrote a cheque in the last 60 days, you risk a \$1 000 fine. That's the amazing consequence of savage new anti-business legislation effective from 1 July. It is the biggest change to occur in business in 20 years. It changes the way you must operate your business. And if you don't know the new rules, you face heavy fines—or even imprisonment. . . This virtually means: no new small businesses can start up (except sole traders); no existing small businesses can merge; and no existing small businesses can expand by taking on new partners or new shareholders.

Another headline states 'Go to gaol for "human error"'. Frankly, it is a scandalous distortion of the truth. The whole thing has been put forward as a cheap attempt to promote the sale of the *Small Business Newsletter* that is put out by a certain gentleman by the name of Philip Ward who, as the publisher of that newsletter, has produced this scandalous document.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The address is Business Newsletter Group, 41 Rawson Street, Epping, New South Wales, 2121, and there is a telephone number—

Mr Hemmings: What's the telephone number?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is here. If the honourable member wants the telephone number I will give it to him—it is 02 (which applies to someone calling from outside New South Wales) 868 2100.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Some might regard it as humorous but, in fact, it is not. It is a scandalous—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I want to know what it has to do with South Australia.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It has everything to do with it. The South Australian Parliament, of which the honourable member who has just interjected is a member, was party to a piece of legislation involving the uniform companies code, on which this Parliament voted.

It has everything to do with this Parliament, and this piece of literature is put out specifically knocking a piece of legislation which both sides of the House supported. This gentleman is trying to promote his cheap *Small Business Newsletter*, which is published on 25 occasions during the year at a cost of \$58 to the person who is foolish enough to fill in the coupon and send it back with the appropriate cheque. Frankly, it stinks. Anyone who goes out on the basis of fear and peddles this sort of untruth in the hope of selling a newsletter to people throughout Australia is, I think, a person who should be stood up and made to account publicly for his actions.

I am delighted to say that the Attorney-General, who incidentally also has picked up the issue and who has made a statement on it, is carrying out a full investigation at the request of the Premier. I urge all South Australians, particularly small business people, not to send \$58 to Mr Ward because, if his newsletter is reflected by the standard of quality of journalism and truth as portrayed by this pamphlet, it is certainly not worth buying or paying one cent for. I urge all small business people who have any fears whatever about the legislation to contact immediately the Attorney-General's Department, the Small Business Bureau or the Department of Corporate Affairs, so that they can have the new legislation explained fully to them.

STAMP DUTY

Mr TRAINER: Does the Premier agree that the clear intention of the stamp duties legislation was that only one transfer would be used where the land is contained on one title, and that the use of 27 separate transfers on the sale of the Liberal Club's North Terrace premises resulted in the deliberate avoidance of the payment of stamp duties, and does he agree that this was a contrived and artificial scheme?

I have been advised, and I am sure the Premier is by now aware, that a judgment of the Full Court in the case of the *Superannuation Fund Investment Trust v. the Commissioner of Stamps* in 1978 made it clear that stamp duty is a debt due to the Crown by the person who executes the instrument. In dealing with section 5 (2) of the Stamp Duties Act, Mr Justice Jacobs said:

Pausing there, that enactment operated, in the case of a transfer of land under the Real Property Act, to charge only the vendor the payment of the duty for he alone executed the instrument. No doubt the vendor might stipulate for a contractual indemnity from his purchaser, but the Act did not in turn charge the purchaser.

This makes clear that the obligation to ensure payment of stamp duties rests with the vendor. However, the Premier yesterday wrote to the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council stating that the Attorney-General could not be impugned for the manner in which the purchaser legally required the Liberal Club to execute transfers of its property. The Premier also said:

I am informed that when the transfers were presented to the Chairman of Liberal Club Ltd for execution he was given advice by the Liberal Club's legal advisers, with whom the Attorney-General had no association, that legally there was no option but to sign them.

Can the Premier advise the House how the legal opinion he has expressed in public on this matter is at variance with that of the Full Court?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think that the honourable gentleman is losing sight of one very important factor: the law was changed by this House in 1975. Therefore, the rest of the question does not stand up. Let me say something else, too. I am grateful to the honourable gentleman for allowing me to add to what I said before. One of the points at issue is that the Attorney-General was not, as has been stated by the Leader of the Opposition in another place and reported in one or two sections of the media, the solicitor acting for the Liberal Club at that time. That statement grossly impugns him, and I have no doubt that action will be taken as a result.

WILLS

Mr RANDALL: Will the Premier call for a report on the statement made at page 352 of this month's *Choice* magazine, in an article headed 'Making a Will' under the subheading 'Robbing the Estate'? A constituent has drawn this report to my attention and seeks clarification of South Australia's position. The report states:

The abolition of probate duties in Queensland and of succession duties in South Australia has created a potential risk of theft from deceased estates. Before these duties were abolished the executor or administrator of an estate had to file a list of a testator's total assets with the appropriate duty collecting authority. A grant of probate could not be issued until all duties were paid.

But with the abolition of these duties an executor in Queensland and South Australia no longer has to provide a detailed list of assets to obtain a grant of probate. Therefore, there is no official record of a testator's estate.

Now an executor has control of the estate without anyone else having full knowledge of what it contains. A less-than-honest, or inept, executor could neglect to distribute all assets to the beneficiaries. He or she could even keep the whole estate if, for example, a testator lived alone and had left the estate to beneficiaries in another State or overseas.

Similarly a parent appointed as trustee of a deceased spouses' estate could take all the money and the children would know nothing about it.

The report goes on to explain other disadvantages, and the final extract that I wish to quote is as follows:

So far no problems appear to have occurred in Queensland or South Australia. It would be difficult to tell when they had. But Queenslanders and South Australians should be particularly careful in choosing executors and trustees in whom they have complete faith.

My constituent is concerned that a major action may be happening in South Australia and has listed to me the names of people who may be involved in such actions. I believe this matter needs to be clarified.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the honourable member's constituent can produce facts and figures which indicate that there has been some fraud or misappropriation of

funds, I would strongly advise him to make contact with the police and relay this information so that investigations can be made. Certainly, I would do whatever I could to further those investigations and make it possible. I have seen the article to which the honourable member refers. It is a matter that has not come to my attention previously, but there is no doubt that there is some possibility of the problem occurring and, although that may be an extremely rare occurrence, I believe it does bear some investigation.

I am most grateful to the honourable member for bringing this matter forward. I understand that in New South Wales and Western Australia an executor must file with the court a list of all the assets of an estate, together with their estimated value. In the Northern Territory I understand that not only does that final list of assets have to be filed but that also there has to be a list setting out the distribution of those assets by the executor. That may be something that should be looked into. It may be, unfortunately and regrettably, a necessary thing, but I will undertake to look into the matter for the honourable member and see whether or not that course of action is deemed to be necessary.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government will cease its ambivalent attitude towards Aboriginal education and provide it with appropriate support and permanency? I have received a number of approaches in recent months from a variety of areas complaining about the ambivalent attitude towards Aboriginal education by the present Government. I refer to a letter I received from a member of the staff of the Narungga Community College, who wrote to me in the following vein:

I would like you to bring to the attention of your colleagues and possibly the wider public, the ambivalent attitude being adopted by the present Government in its policy and dealings with Aboriginal education.

He cited one example, as follows:

The Department of Technical and Further Education has adopted a most disfunctional attitude towards the professional staff employed within the School of Aboriginal Education. Lecturing staff have been employed on three-monthly contracts whereas in the past six-monthly contracts were generally employed.

He went on to mention the high-cost exercise involved in that. I am also informed that the South Australian Aboriginal Education Consultative Committee made an approach to the Minister suggesting that, for it to undertake its brief properly, it would need a secretariate that should comprise a full-time Chairperson, a full-time executive officer, a full-time research officer, along with secretarial and stenographic support.

I believe they costed that amount of support at \$120 000 recurrent, and yet the most recent Budget provides them with only \$13 000. The other point that has been brought to my attention is that the small schools programme, which has resulted in an impressive improvement in a number of small country schools in this State, has never at any stage in its history had an Aboriginal school on its list of schools for redevelopment.

Another point that was brought to my attention was that the Aboriginal schools of this State save the Government \$300 000 a year, because their school assistants staffing is paid for not by the department but by the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and this Government has no commitment at all to assistants in those schools.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member raised a number of questions, one of which referred quite specifically to the Aboriginal Consultative Council, which is based at the Adelaide College of Advanced Education, Holbrooks Road Campus, and for which he complained that the South

Australian Government had provided only \$13 000 or \$16 000 in the current Budget. This is in fact a considerable improvement, in that South Australia had previously provided no funds for that body, which was funded on a three-year basis by the Federal Government. Those funds expired at the beginning of the last financial year but, by rearranging the allocation of Federal funds which had remained surplus, we did extend the financing through the Federal Government for another 12 months which ended on 30 June this year. The South Australian Government has now done what it has frequently done in the past, which is to pick up the tab for a phased-out Federal specific purpose grant. The South Australian Government has in fact never formally recognised and funded that body. However, the council has in previous years submitted an extensive budget, something over \$100 000, seeking to establish a permanent secretariat based on the Adelaide College of Advanced Education, which again the honourable member must realise is normally funded by the Commonwealth.

The question arises whether the South Australian Government should in fact be responsible for Aboriginal education through the Education Department, and I assume that the answer to that would be essentially 'Yes'. Of course, the Education Department does have its own Aboriginal Education Unit, with Mr John Coker in charge of the unit under the direction of the Director-General of Education. The question is again begged whether we should be duplicating what is already provided by way of an essential Government service: I believe not. There is no question that the consultative council is providing some services to the Education Department, but I do not see that it is necessary for that body to be funded as a sort of super advisory power to the extent of over \$100 000 so that it can enter into competition with the State Government's Education Department, which is quite legitimately handling Aboriginal education throughout the State.

We have allocated sufficient funds for the current year to keep the advisory committee under Paul Hughes functioning as it has done for the last three or four years and certainly not to extend its power so that it becomes a super advisory body rather than a subsidiary of the Education Department.

I do not propose to accede to the honourable member's request, nor to that council's request, for considerably enhanced funds in the current financial year. The amount of money which is available is already set down in the Budget, and it will not be increased. I will examine the question of Department of Further Education staffing, and the question of the length of the contracts available is something on which I will bring down a report.

I am aware that here again Federal funding for a variety of purposes is partly responsible for the shortness of contracts, and the Federal Government has further extended its annual funding into the field of tertiary education; whereas previously it involved triennial funding, it is now funded on an annual basis. Were the Government to extend contracts over a much longer period, it would automatically be faced with the problem in the longer term of having to pick up the tab should the Federal Government decide to phase out its funding, and this happens in a wide variety of federally based initial grants, not the least of which is the childhood services grant, for which \$3 700 000 has been allocated for the last five years, the State Government having increased its effort from 20 per cent to more than 80 per cent of the total cost.

I can assure the honourable member that his concern for Aboriginal education is certainly shared by me and the Director-General of Education. The line between responsibilities of the Federal and State Governments has never been perfectly clear, and the Federal Government itself assumed quite massive responsibilities in the early 1970s,

responsibilities which were quite readily handed over by the previous State Government of South Australia without much question. The present State Government of South Australia is accepting and extending its responsibilities in the field of Aboriginal education, and we are in regular dialogue with the Federal Minister for Education and the Federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs to see whether some of these grey areas cannot be cleared. However, the Federal Government is largely responsible for the administration of Aboriginal affairs in South Australia, and under the present Government there has certainly been no relinquishing of responsibility but rather a more ready acceptance of responsibility, which was not really strongly in evidence when we came to power in 1979.

ELECTRICITY AND GAS TARIFFS

Dr BILLARD: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what is the position of electricity tariffs in South Australia compared to those in other States, particularly in Victoria? The relativity of electricity tariffs, and to a certain extent gas tariffs, between the States is important not only for consumers but also for industry, which will select the State in which it will establish partly on this basis. A comparison with Victoria is particularly important, because I am informed that the present Premier of Victoria, Mr Cain, was widely quoted in the media, prior to his election as Premier, as promising that he would reduce the cost of electricity and gas to the consumer.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a most important consideration in the thinking of this Government that we keep our charges and costs below those of the other States because, as we all know (or at least as members of this side of the House know), we must maintain our markets in the Eastern States if the whitegoods industry in particular is to survive in the future. South Australia must maintain a cost advantage in relation to production, and one of the important elements in that is the cost of power—gas and electricity—which makes all the more troubling to us this recent enormous increase in gas prices.

At the moment South Australia does have the cheapest electricity of all the mainland States, and we will certainly be doing all we can to minimise the impact on tariffs, both of electricity and gas. The impact on the gas price of the increase of the size which has been awarded is more dramatic than in the case of electricity because the price of the gas to the Gas Company represents a far higher fraction of its total cost than it does in the case of the Electricity Trust, in which case I think it is about a 20 per cent component of the total cost structure, whereas in the case of the Gas Company it is far higher.

We will be doing all we can to alleviate the impact of the price increase to everyone concerned. The Government is looking at the tax on gas and electricity introduced by the Labor Government. I guess memories opposite are getting short but one of the taxing measures of the Labor Party when in Government was to put a tax on gas and electricity to all consumers.

We remember the catch cry of the former Premier to tax the tall poppies. He increased the rates of succession duty, and so on, early in the life of the Government and then, casting around for other taxation measures, he found (as do all Treasurers and as the new Victorian Treasurer, Mr Jolly, will find) that, if one is going to raise considerable sums of money by way of taxation, one has to tax the average citizen. That is what the Labor Party did in this State: it put a 5 per cent tax on gas and electricity. Everybody—tall poppies, housewives or whoever pays electricity bills—was faced

with an increase of 5 per cent. This Government is looking at ways of alleviating that tax imposed by the Labor Party.

However, over the years it has been built into Budgets, and it has been built into our Budget at a time when funds to Government are declining dramatically, particularly from the Federal Government, which is the chief source of our revenue-sharing grants, so the fact that it has been built into our Budget could have a considerable impact. Nonetheless, the last thing we as a Government want to do is increase the cost to householders and industry. The Labor Party, by its incompetence in negotiating these contracts, could well be prejudicing the jobs of people in industry in South Australia.

What the honourable member said is also true in relation to the scene in Victoria. At the moment we do have a cost advantage, and we have an advantage in relation to the cost of electricity. Mr Cain, who went to the election stating, 'Gas bills will be reduced by four cents in every dollar,' is referred to in a report in the *Herald* of 23 September, as follows:

Mr Cain is pledging that a State Labor Government would cut electricity and gas prices.

I will be very interested in the Budget brought down in Victoria by Mr Jolly at the end of this month. I will be interested to see whether he does anything about gas prices, because that Government is on record as saying that gas is too cheap now. There have been significant price hikes, particularly with electricity, in Victoria. Mr Cain suggested that there had been a 15 per cent increase in electricity tariffs when he announced the increase in Victoria. However, the householders are bearing the brunt, and the effective price increase far exceeds 15 per cent: in fact, it is 27½ per cent. In Victoria the average household bill for an all-electric house went up from about \$800 per annum to \$1 020 per annum, which is a hike of 27½ per cent. That has been done by a Labor Government which puts itself forward as the friend of the little people. It promised a reduction, but the people it is hitting most are the average householders. This Government will be doing everything it possibly can to minimise the impact of this latest increase in the price of fuel as the result of the incompetence of our predecessors.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Currently the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967-1981, provides only for the extension of financial assistance to primary producers adversely affected by drought and other defined natural calamities. The purpose of this Bill is to put into effect the agreement reached at a meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers of Agriculture/Primary Industry in Melbourne on 6 September 1982 for the extension of low-interest carry-on loans to small rural businesses embraced by drought-affected areas. That decision reflects the potential severity of the current drought in South Australia and its already marked effects in other areas of the continent.

Under the proposal, such businesses will be bound to demonstrate that they are in necessitous circumstances

because of drought and that their activities are closely related to servicing primary producers. All loans to small businesses would be included in the State's contribution under the Natural Disasters Arrangement with the Commonwealth Government and, in consequence, are required to be administered under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. Other minor refinements are incorporated in the Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 incorporates the definition of 'small rural business' to meet the spirit of the Ministerial agreement and adds the definition of 'rural liquidity'. Clause 3 serves to widen the application of Commonwealth moneys received under the Natural Disasters Arrangement to the area of small rural businesses. Clause 4 effects consequential amendments. Clause 5 empowers the Minister to extend loan moneys to small rural businesses affected by a natural calamity. Additionally, this clause strengthens the criteria for determining eligibility for both advances and grants to persons applying for financial assistance, and specifies that only advances (loans), and not grants, may be extended to small rural businesses. The power to recall loans is extended to all assisted applicants under the scheme.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): The Opposition has indicated its willingness to proceed with this Bill immediately, because of the need to have the legislation passed by both Houses this week. As a result of that, we have not had the full time necessary to prepare our response to the matter. It ought to be noted that the second reading explanation reached my hand only a few minutes ago. My responses accordingly may be a little disjointed, and I apologise to the House in advance for that situation.

The Opposition supports the Bill. We believe that the proposal for drought relief initiated by the Federal Government and supported by the various State Governments of Australia, regardless of their political persuasion, deserves support from this Parliament. One may say, however, that there are certain innuendos about the whole programme which have raised the odd comment from many quarters. I will read from the 6 September issue of the *Primary Industry Newsletter*, whose initial comments on the whole scheme are as follows:

The sudden decisions by the Federal Government on drought assistance last week may be attributed almost entirely to Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser—his farm background, and his determination to keep available the option of a general election in November.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You are being cynical.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am being cynical, because it is interesting to note that the Labor Party has had its own proposals at the Federal level on drought assistance as well, and I do not believe that they have been given the serious attention that they ought to have been given. John Kerin, the Federal shadow Minister for Primary Industry, has spelt out to the Parliament and the country the Labor Party's attitudes.

The Labor Party's drought policies were to encourage producers to protect themselves against the consequences of drought, to provide support in the event of severe, sustained drought so that valuable resources are not lost to agriculture and so that the family and farm business could be maintained, and above all, to create a system which is predictable and equitable. The present proposition of the Federal Government has a number of different features from earlier drought assistance schemes. For example, I refer to the interest subsidy that will apply on loans that have interest rates in excess of 12 per cent. Also, there is the application of cheap interest, cheap money for carry-over loans, not only for this year but also for next year, and also for the provision of loans to enable restocking of farms.

Also, of course, there are subsidies on the cost of water cartage and the transport of fodder and livestock.

That is a very broad ranging package. What is interesting, though, is that perhaps many people feel that it is only the Federal Government that is going to pay for that. Of course, it will not only be the Federal Government that will pay for that. Indeed, if drought relief for South Australia was to the tune of less than \$3 000 000, the Federal Government would not pay one red cent of that amount because, as I understand the provisions of the Bill and the provisions of the package announced by the Federal Minister, we must pay the first \$3 000 000 *in toto*. Consequently, this grand pre-election package by the Federal Government is a very cheap one for it as far as South Australia is concerned. It is not so cheap for South Australia, because of course we must provide that money. I have no doubt that Parties on both sides of this House will be quite prepared and quite happy to provide that money because of a belief that such assistance is necessary for that community involved. I make the comments I have just made on the basis of the fact that we know—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That is not quite the funding arrangement that will apply.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: If the Minister could clarify that matter for members of the House in his reply we would appreciate that. The anticipated effect of the drought in South Australia is somewhat less than in other States, and I refer to the number of farmers who will be affected by the drought. Information provided in the primary industry newsletter suggests that throughout Australia there are nearly 170 000 farmers of whom nearly 86 000 could be considered to be drought affected, or 51 per cent of the total. The figures for South Australia indicate that there are 19 000 farmers and that 4 000 of those could be considered drought affected—in other words, only 21 per cent. The figures indicate that for New South Wales where 76 per cent of farmers are presumed to be drought affected; for Queensland, with 56 per cent and for Victoria with 53 per cent, the Federal financial commitment will be more significant. The Federal commitment for States such as Tasmania, Western Australia and South Australia will be less.

In looking at the full situation there are a number of elements that are quite important. Indeed, the running of farms in this country is very big business. That industry contributes significantly not only to the State's finances but also to the Federal finances. Many thousands of millions of dollars are involved, not just in the provision of incomes for those who live on farms, but also in terms of capital replacement of machinery and buildings, which, of course, has a consequent effect upon the entire economy. I suppose it is for that reason that the programme does incorporate assistance for small businesses in country areas that could be presumed to be affected by the drought. However, that is one area which during the very short time that we have had to look at the Bill, has concerned us quite significantly. The Opposition would like to know exactly the specifics of how one determines whether or not a small business in a country area has been drought affected. We know from the very alarming increase in the number of bankruptcies of small businesses throughout Australia that small business is facing a crisis, one that has been responded to by the Labor Party by its firm policies on small business, and one which has indeed been recognised by the appointment by the Leader of the State Opposition of the Deputy Leader as shadow Minister for small business, as well as shadow Minister for other things. That recognises that small business throughout the country is in trouble. How does one define whether small business is in trouble due to the general economic malaise that may be prevailing in this country or derived from overseas as opposed to that which derives

purely from the drought affected component? I understand that the Act provides a means of specifying that only country small businesses receive such assistance, making such assistance available only to companies employing people in country areas. I understand that there are means to preclude the large pastoral companies from receiving assistance so that only small business can receive it.


But there are a number of questions to be raised. For example, a farm machinery company could claim on the one hand that it had lost sales because of the drought and that therefore quite clearly it is drought affected, but on the other hand it might pick up on the maintenance side of its business, because of farmers being forced to keep their machines on the land much longer. Therefore, they would have to pay high maintenance bills. Such a business might be in the situation of losing on the swings but gaining on the slides. However, how will that be measured by those assessing applications as to whether or not a business is entitled to assistance under the drought relief programme?

The other point concerns how much small business in country areas is really directly related to the health of the rural economy and how much is just an on-going factor that is at a base level that is not directly affected by the rural community; in other words, that which is inelastic to the health of the rural community. I do not believe that there have been sufficient economic studies made of that matter. It would be a very interesting area about which to do economic studies. However, I do not believe that such studies have yet been done and any such study has not yet

come to my attention. I want to make one comment in this regard in trying to go through some of the economic data available about the agricultural community and the way in which it has been affected in recent years: I was somewhat appalled at the paucity of information available in summary accounts of the state of the economy. I know that there is ample data available in year books and I know that there is ample data available from the relevant Federal and State Departments of Agriculture, but I would have thought that those comprehensive summaries of the whole state of the economy would have been wise to give some attention to the state of the agricultural economy when reflecting upon the state of the whole economy. I refer in that regard not only to such things as the Reserve Bank summary of the economy but also to the private bank summaries of the economy, those done by the A.N.Z., the Bank of New South Wales, and the like. It is very difficult to garner from those reports any information about the agricultural economy. I have some figures that I would like to have incorporated in *Hansard* concerning the problems that the agricultural community is facing. The agricultural community does constantly carry over a very large debt, first, for the purchase of land and secondly, for the purchase of machinery and for the holding of stock, and, of course, debts that result from past travails, such as drought. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it, a graph which is purely statistical and which details the ratio of gross farm debt to net farm income for the years 1961-62 to 1982-83.

Leave granted.

RATIO OF GROSS FARM DEBT TO NET FARM INCOME
1961-62 to 1982-83



Source: Derived from BAE publications, Occasional Paper No. 62 'The Campbell Inquiry and the Rural Sector' and various editions of 'Trends in the Rural Sector'.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The graph shows the seriousness of the situation. Even if there are significant rains in country areas in this country before 30 September, the ratio of gross farm debt to net farm income will be as high as it has been almost during any period for that 21 years, save for 1967-68 and for 1971-72; that is, if rain comes. If rain does not come until after 30 September the situation will be markedly worse and will be the worst for the past 21 years. If rains do not come before 31 October the situation will be dramatically worse.

That is why I incorporate those figures for the edification of members. It is of some concern that interest rate relief for home owners in this country has been a very long time in coming. Programmes offering important relief to home purchasers have had to be virtually squeezed out of the Federal Government. In the meantime many hundreds of thousands of Australians have gone through financial deprivation as a result. As one who lives in an electorate of people who have very high rates of mortgage payments to income, I know just what financial problems it presents. This is not the place to debate that matter but I just wish to note that it has taken so long for relief to come to them, and yet relief has come so quickly in this instance.

There is an interesting element here, the question of why full interest rebates should be given above 12 per cent. This deserves some analysis. The Federal Government, of course, is only offering tax deductions for interest above 10 per cent and that is somewhat less than this situation. It is true that the rate of interest on loans generally applying to the rural sector is somewhat higher and has grown more in recent years than that on home loans. In 1978 the maximum prevailing rate of interest on home loans was 10 per cent and it has now gone up to 13.5 per cent. The situation with the Reserve Bank Rural Credits Department is that their maximum has risen during the same period from 10 to 16.25 per cent. That is of some significance.

On the other hand, there is some good news for farm incomes, some amelioration of the position which should at least be acknowledged and, if I had a longer time than the agreement has provided me with this afternoon, I would go into that. I refer to the relative exchange rates between Australia and other countries. Looking at the trade weighted index of the average value of the Australian dollar *vis-a-vis* currencies of Australia's major trading partners, one finds the position with the agricultural export community is better as at 28 July than it has been at any time since 1980. The index is presently 86.1, having reached a peak in June 1981 of 92.9. That is a relative improvement of about 7 per cent. Those sectors of the agricultural community that are exporting their products would of course receive a flow-on into their general farm income, provided that the drought leaves them very much to export. That does indicate that there is some good news for the agricultural community.

There are many other points I wish to make on this matter, but I am conscious of the fact that the whips have reached an agreement to expedite this matter and I certainly want to do the same. The Opposition supports the legislation before the House. It acknowledges that drought relief programmes are necessary and calls on the State and Federal Governments to give further and deeper consideration to the policies put forward by John Kerin, the Federal shadow Minister of Agriculture. I also ask that the Federal Government show the same degree of responsiveness to the many other people in this country suffering from the economic malaise from which this country is presently suffering.

Mr RUSSACK (Goyder): I commend both the Federal and the State Governments who have made it possible for this measure to be introduced. I strongly support the Bill before the House. I know that later the Minister will spell out the conditions that are involved in the provisions that

have been made by both these Governments. There is no doubt it will prove to be of great benefit for the rural community. We must all accept the fact that small business is the backbone of any country community. When good business is being done in agricultural machinery there is a spin-off to other business in a country town. This morning I drove through about 180 kilometres of my electorate and, whilst I accept that there are some areas that are in reasonable heart, many other areas are in a state of severe drought. I note that the member for Salisbury read from a table which suggested that there would be certain improvements if we had rain by the end of September or by the end of October.

I agree that there would be some improvement, but I say there are many areas that at this stage would not be redeemed. Feed has burned off, crops have thinned out and have died in many patches of the country. Last week I had the opportunity of going around the Lochiel area and many of the crops there are in poor condition and, without rain, they are deteriorating daily. This is not an isolated case: it is the situation throughout much of the State, particularly in the Mid North and higher up.

This particular provision, which has been in existence for the assistance of farmers, will now be extended to help the proprietor of a small rural business so that that person might gain some carry-on finance to assist over this most difficult period. One small business, a partnership owned by a family in my electorate, has found it necessary to consider, if improvement is not forthcoming in the very near future, reducing the staff from 22 to 14. There are many businesses in this same predicament. I understand that finance for new machines on the floor of a small business costs something like 18 per cent. If a sale is not effected within a certain time, that interest rate increases to something like 23 per cent. This is just one of the difficulties confronting people in rural areas in the machinery business.

I do not wish to say any more, other than that one could talk for a long time bringing forward case after case where there will be the collapse of business enterprises but I am sure that, with the introduction of this measure, it will be of great assistance. Many rural communities will benefit by this legislation and many will take advantage of it. As far as the distribution of this money is concerned, there will of course be the necessary investigation. I am sure that those who are responsible will see that the money is used wisely, so that there will be, through the drought, a continuation of business so that those businesses will be there, ready to spring forth again into a virile and vigorous business when the rains have come. I commend the Bill to the House and I request members to support it.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I too commend the Bill to the House, and I trust that it will receive a speedy passage and the support of all members. I share the concern of the member for Salisbury that we have had very little advance knowledge of this amendment, but I recognise the urgency in passing the Bill. Over a number of years I have made requests about extending the provisions of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act to incorporate small business men. The reason given in the past was that, if a primary producer is adequately supported, he in turn will pay his bills and help the small businesses.

While that may appear to be ideal and while one would hope that it was the case, in practice it does not work out that way. In many cases we find that the small business community that services the primary industries of this State is, in fact, carrying the can and has little access to any other financial relief. So we see that many of the small businesses go bankrupt because the primary producing sector is not really meeting its commitments.

Further to that, we must also look at the fact that small businesses, in many cases, are in-between organisations: they come between the primary producer and the major supplier. The major suppliers that are, in turn, servicing those small businesses quite often demand payment for their goods in advance and certainly on delivery. When the small business man makes that commitment he has to endeavour to recover his funds as soon as possible. That is where the chain breaks down. This Bill will enable the small business man to take advantage of the funds that could be available to the primary producing sector in much the same way.

The member for Salisbury was generalising when he referred to matters relating to the drought. I believe that we all find ourselves saying that the drought is a national disaster and things like that. The member for Salisbury stated that, of the 19 000 farmers in South Australia, 4 000 have been affected by the drought. I noted that the honourable member cited that figure from a prepared statement, a newsletter of some sort. I believe it is fair to say (and the honourable member would recognise) that, since that newsletter was prepared, the figures would have altered dramatically.

Mr Lynn Arnold: That was on 6 September.

Mr BLACKER: The figures alter week by week. As each week goes by, a larger proportion of the farmers in my district are finding themselves in an irreversible, irrecoverable situation. I do not take any particular point about that, but whereas the honourable member stated that 21 per cent of South Australian farmers are affected by drought, I believe that the number would now be considerably more than that. Certainly, in overall general terms, and not being able to forecast rain in advance, one could say that the drought is becoming very serious.

In overall terms, the drought is not as severe in South Australia as it is in other States. The point I wish to make is that, for the individual farmer and the individual small business person who happens to be in one of those drought pocket areas, it is an absolute disaster. This point must be recognised, and I believe that this Bill, from the very brief opportunity that I have had to look at it, provides flexibility so that people who are affected and who are in isolated situations can be assisted in some way. From that point of view, this Bill is good.

I do not wish to go any further other than to add my support to the measure. I foresee that there will be difficulties in administration and that some small business men who believe that they have a right to access to relief funds will find that they may not be eligible. I believe that we will experience a similar set of grievances as occurred when the first Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act (and the revised Act of 1967) came in. At that time there was a lot of bargaining (if one might call it that) with people making claims for eligibility for such schemes. I think we will go through all that again in relation to small business houses. Hopefully, those in most need will be serviced and will be given the drought relief assistance that I believe they justly deserve.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I have no intention of speaking for very long. I support the measure, as other members have indicated that they support it. In addition to the remarks that have already been made, I believe that one or two points can be made that further clarify the necessity for this measure at this time and with this haste. It is not only the rural community that is suffering and will benefit from this Bill: the entire national economy depends upon a healthy rural community, especially at a time when the income from mining products, as a significant contributor to the balance of payments position, is at an all time low. World metal prices are very depressed.

We now find ourselves with a national calamity. The situation is as bad in other places, if not worse, than it is in South Australia. We have had no rain, and we rely on rain. In any business there are cyclical fluctuations in prices depending on supply and demand, and that makes things risky. In the rural industries the situation is more risky because of the added uncontrollable, unpredictable element of weather. If it does not rain, there cannot be a process called photosynthesis that is conducted in the leaves of plants whereby solar energy is assimilated with the combination of water and carbon dioxide. That enables grain to be produced and vegetation to be grazed, and the desired commodities to be found and sold. When it does not rain, that does not happen, and we lose.

If we were not to keep the rural sector of the Australian economy healthy, we would be in dire straits in future, because we have never had such high interest rates as at present. The necessity to ensure that the rural communities can survive intact as far as possible, according to every other criterion for viability, is very important, and this Bill ensures that they can. Why is it important? Because, if we were to allow those farmers and small business men who are adversely affected by unpredictable drought to be subject to liquidation, those people would come into the cities seeking accommodation, social services and welfare assistance, which are already stretched. That would be a more expensive exercise for the national economy than to keep the people where they are, to keep the enterprises together, and to keep the prospect of a swift recovery (as referred to by the member for Goyder) all that much more intact. I will not delay the House any longer, but I stress the importance of this measure not only to rural communities but also to the whole community throughout the length and breadth of this State and this nation.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I wish to make a brief contribution to this debate because parts of my district would be as badly affected as any other part of the State. The member for Salisbury said that if we had rain by 30 September the effects of the drought would be lessened. That is certainly true of parts of this State, but parts of my district would not be helped if we had substantial rain, as it has not yet been possible to sow the crops. If members looked at the area around Quorn and Hawker, they would be fully aware of the parched nature of the soil in that part of the State.

It should be clearly understood that the effects of this drought will be serious for the whole South Australian economy. I was interested in what the honourable member said about the Federal A.L.P. spokesman on primary industry, because one can only accept what people say and, when one examines what they did when they were in Government, it will be seen that in the history of this country no Government has made a stronger attack on the rural industry than did the previous A.L.P. Government. It launched the most savage attack on the primary industry that has ever been launched.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Wriedt was the most popular Minister ever.

Mr GUNN: Perhaps I could describe Senator Wriedt as being one rose amongst a lot of thorns. He had a reasonable understanding, after some time. However, the others were academic planners who had no idea whatsoever. I want to refer to the so-called spokesman on agriculture in this State. Over the past week-end I travelled around my district, and many of my constituents—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will confine himself to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Sir. I am delighted with what is contained in the clauses. I was about to comment that many people who have been affected by the drought were most

upset by the comments of the Labor Party spokesman in this State and expressed to me very strong sentiments about those comments, which inferred that they were dishonest and would be using the system. When I attended a large gathering at a football grand final about a week ago, I was amazed by the reaction of the people.

Mr Keneally: You told them that that was not what he said.

Mr GUNN: I would suggest to the honourable member for Stuart, who knows nothing about this subject or about many others in which he gets himself involved, ought to confine his remarks to something about which he knows something. I am aware of what happened to the small businesses in my district during a previous drought. In towns like Streaky Bay persons employed as mechanics in machinery agencies were devastated because there was no work for them. Some garages were virtually placed in the position of being on the brink of closing down. It has taken considerable time for those businesses to be built up. I would hate to see those people go out of business because their services will be required again in the near future. Steps, such as income equalisation deposits, have been taken, and they will certainly alleviate the effects in some areas. I do know some people who will probably have to buy their seed to plant next year's crop, and those people are well and truly behind the eight-ball. I am therefore pleased that both Governments have seen fit to extend this arrangement to those people in the rural community, namely, the small business men and women who will also be affected by the drought. I hope that the measure has a speedy passage through the House.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): I regret that this debate, which I thought would be above Party politics, seems to have become of a Party political nature. I support the rapid passage of this Bill because I believe it is of importance. However, I would like to make the point that I oppose the quick passage of any Bill that does not allow one sufficient time to study it in detail. With other speakers, I foresee there may well be some administrative problems, which I hoped would have been sorted out. I am surprised that, with the difficulties that have been known for some time in extending this sort of relief to small businesses, such measures could not have been brought in earlier to allow for times of stringencies such as this, so that there would have been sufficient time to study the Bill and so that we could sort out any anomalies.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill but I wish to make the point, and to give the Minister an opportunity of answering it in his reply, that during previous droughts many businesses within the metropolitan area that are solely dependent on the rural industry have been able to use their personnel on other work effort or, if the business could not continue to employ them, the employees have been able to get other work of a similar nature with other companies because we have had a period of over-full employment. This is the first major drought that has occurred while we have an unemployment problem throughout the country and in the Western world, resulting somewhat from the drought. Can the Minister say whether, when considering small rural businesses, we are also considering businesses in the metropolitan area employing people but dealing directly, in the main, with the rural sector?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I would like to place on record my appreciation of the support of this measure from both sides of the House as well as from the Independent Parties. I take this opportunity further to indicate that the Government in this instance

recognises the vitally important contribution that agriculture generally makes to the economy, and the welfare and development of South Australia. It is in that light that the Commonwealth in this instance has proposed an extension to the core measures that apply to what has been a long-standing Commonwealth-State agreement to assist our primary sector in times of need.

The member for Salisbury referred to those core measures and I think quite unconsciously cited in his remarks points that do not apply to the Commonwealth-State contribution. To clarify for the record the several parts of those core measures, I point out that carry-on loans to farmers, freight concessions, stock slaughter payments, plus, under this new Bill, carry-on loans to small rural businesses come out of a fund to which in each financial year the State must contribute \$3 000 000 before it qualifies for any Commonwealth Government assistance and that for those several measures mentioned, \$3 000 000 having been lent in one financial year, the contribution from thereon is \$3 from the Commonwealth to \$1 from the State.

The other additional measures that the Commonwealth has now introduced are entirely funded by the Commonwealth quite separate from the Commonwealth-State funded scheme. I refer to the interest rate subsidy, wherein the Commonwealth Government proposes to pick up the interest rate over 12 per cent on debts held and loans entered into where those debts attract 12 per cent or more on primary producers. It also proposes to fund at 50 per cent the cost of fodder purchased in those drought affected areas. When I speak of areas in South Australia, it is acknowledged by the Commonwealth that we do not define regions or districts of the State in the drought affected capacity but that each application from each property is dealt with on its merits.

The member for Fisher raised an important point, as to whether we proposed to assist people who may qualify in all other areas of the criteria laid down but who happen to be located in the city. If those businesses are solely owned, run by a partnership or by a proprietary company, indeed, they qualify to apply in the same way as does any other business in an out-of-town region or country village situation. The only businesses that will not qualify are those which are corporate or public companies. I think those points are clearly cited in the second reading explanation to the House. If there are any further questions on the matter I would hope they will come forward in Committee.

I appreciate Parliament's accepting the importance of this measure. I assure members that some careful research has been undertaken. It is the most appropriate Act under which these funds should be extended. Because of the restrictive nature of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, it is necessary for us to cover small businesses which are clearly in need and clearly the first section of the community to be affected as a result of the drought, or a similar calamity.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its purposes are two-fold: to provide greater flexibility in setting the threshold interest rate for purposes of stamp duty on credit and rental business; and to foster the development of a secondary market in semi-government securities in this State. Since December 1980, the threshold interest rate above which loans become liable for stamp duty has been raised on four separate occasions, to take account of rising interest rates. The point has now been reached where a further increase is warranted to take account of movements since the last adjustment in February of this year.

However, not all rates of interest have moved uniformly and an increase in the general threshold rate would deprive the Government of considerable revenue which it has traditionally received, notably from Bankcard transactions. It is the Government's aim to preserve the *status quo*. Those transactions which have in the past attracted duty should continue to do so, while those which have not should continue to be free of duty.

In order to achieve this aim, the Government is seeking the power to set different threshold rates for different classes of transaction. For most loans, it is our intention to raise the threshold, but for Bankcard a different and lower rate would be set in order to ensure that duty continued to be collected. The proposed amendment would also enable the Government to make some concessions to building societies in recognition of their co-operation in forgoing interest rate increases on housing loans. A somewhat higher threshold for building societies would permit them to apply market rates to their commercial loans without attracting stamp duty.

Loan Council recently agreed that member Governments should take steps to facilitate the development of a secondary market in securities issued by all semi-government authorities. Several States already have provisions which provide for exemptions from stamp duty on a comprehensive basis where securities issued by statutory authorities are traded on the secondary market, but the South Australian provision is more restrictive and requires that each such authority must be separately prescribed.

To bring about the freedom from duty for the statutory authorities of all States and to achieve, as nearly as possible, consistency with the other States, the Government has decided to alter the form of the exemption provision in this State. As a precautionary measure against an unintentionally broad interpretation of this exemption, provision has been made for particular bodies to be excluded from the exemption.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Under the clause, different provisions of the measure may be brought into operation at different times. Clause 3 amends section 31b of the principal Act which sets out definitions of terms used in the part of the Act dealing with duty in respect of credit and rental business. Under the clause, 'prescribed rate' is now defined as being the rate for the time being fixed by regulation, or, where different rates are fixed by regulation for different classes of transaction, the rate for the time being fixed for the class of transaction to which the credit arrangement, discount transaction or loan belongs. The clause also empowers the making of regulations fixing a rate of not less than 9 per centum as the prescribed rate, or different rates of not less than 9 per centum as the prescribed rates for different classes of transaction. The effect of this amendment will be to authorise the fixing of different rates as the rates of interest that must be payable on different transactions before duty under the credit and rental business head of duty is payable on such transactions.

Clause 4 extends the present exemption for conveyances of securities issued by a South Australian statutory authority to any securities issued by a public statutory body constituted under a law of the Commonwealth or of this State or any other State or Territory. The clause provides for regulations to be made excluding any statutory body or class of statutory bodies from this exemption.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin), the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill), and the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence to the Estimates Committees of this House on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2).

Motion carried.

STATUTES REPEAL (AGRICULTURE) BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal certain Acts relating to agriculture. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: 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 purpose of this Bill is to repeal a number of Acts relating in general to agriculture which are now obsolete. The effect is to clear the Statute Book of redundant enactments, an object to which this Government is committed by its policy of deregulation.

In most cases the Acts were passed to provide financial assistance to farmers in times of hardship by reason of disastrous seasonal climatic conditions. Another large category is that of fruit fly compensation which concerned the urban community and in each case related to fruit fly outbreaks in a specific year.

Each of the Acts was designed to meet a contemporary situation which was of a limited duration. It is desirable that obsolete enactments be repealed in order that the Statute Book remains as uncomplicated as possible.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Acts set out in the schedule. The schedule sets out the Acts which are to be repealed. I shall summarise briefly the effect of each of the enactments which the Bill proposes to repeal, and the reasons for its redundancy.

The Drought Relief Acts of 1914, 1919, 1923, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1940, 1945 and 1946 were all basically enacted to provide drought relief to farmers for that particular year. Some of the Acts related to previous seasons as well, when these were drought years. These Acts had a finite time of operation.

Acts which related to the same problem were the Drought Relief Act Amendment Act, 1920, which was introduced to overcome a legal difficulty in recovering moneys loaned for drought relief and the Drought Relief (Extension) Act, 1929, introduced to assist farmers because of poor seasonal conditions. In a similar vein the Drought and Frost Relief Act,

1944, was introduced for the purpose of providing assistance to primary producers who suffered loss through drought or frost in 1944.

The Frost Relief Act, 1927, was introduced to assist fruit-growers whose crops were destroyed by the frosts that occurred in September 1927. The Voluntary Wheat Pool Agreement Ratification Acts, 1924, and 1925, were introduced for the establishment of a voluntary wheat pool in South Australia for the marketing of wheat of the 1924-25 season in the first instance and in the second instance for its continuation for another three years. The Hailstorm Relief (Validation) Act, 1925, was introduced to ratify action taken by the Government to get relief for those unable to assist themselves or get relief from other sources for the damage done by a hailstorm in 1924.

The Farmers Relief Act, 1931, the Farmers Relief Act Extension Act, 1931, and the Farmers Relief Act, 1932, were introduced to provide finance for farmers due to the effects of drought in previous years. In the first instance this was for the season 1931-32 due to the effect of previous drought years and the poor return in 1931-32. The passing of the Farmers Relief Act Extension Act, 1931, had the effect of extending the assistance into the 1932-33 season and the Farmers Relief Act, 1932, extended the period of operation of the legislation to cover the 1933-34 season.

The Chaff and Hay (Acquisition) Act, 1944, provided the necessary powers for the Government to acquire supplies of chaff and hay in order to meet the requirements of primary producers in drought-affected areas of the State. The powers of the Act were to remain in force until 30 September 1945.

The Wheat Stabilisation Scheme Ballot Act, 1948, the Wheat Price Stabilisation Scheme Ballot Act, 1953, and the Wheat Price Stabilisation Scheme Ballot Act Amendment Act, 1954, were introduced in the first instance in 1948 to authorise the holding of a ballot of wheatgrowers on the Commonwealth Government proposals for the stabilisation of the price of wheat. The 1953 Act was introduced to ascertain the views of wheatgrowers on a further stabilisation scheme. Due to the delay in getting all Governments to agree to the stabilisation proposals, it was necessary to amend the 1953 Act to include growers who delivered wheat in the 1953-54 season. Hence the 1954 Act was introduced to amend the 1953 Act, to allow those who delivered wheat to the board in 1953-54 or who planted 50 acres or more of wheat for the 1954-55 season to also be included in the poll.

The Waite Agricultural Research Institute Grant Act, 1948, enabled the South Australian Treasury to make an additional grant for the upkeep of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute for the financial year 1948-49. The grant (\$7 000) that was requested by the institute (through the University of Adelaide) was to help the institute balance its accounts. The University of Adelaide in its budget for 1948-49 had actually requested \$8 000 extra for the operation of the institute, but this had not been accepted. It was hoped that in future years the budgeted figures for the operation of the institute would be sufficient and additional grants not necessary.

The Fruit Cases Act, 1949, was introduced to alleviate a shortage of packing cases for fruit and vegetables during 1949. The Act was intended to prevent the removal of these boxes from the trade either through non-return or in some cases destruction for kindling.

The Fruit Fly (Compensation) Acts of 1967, 1968, 1971, 1971 (No. 2), 1972, 1972 (No. 2), and 1974, were introduced to provide compensation for fruit losses arising from the campaigns for eradication of fruit fly by South Australian Department of Agriculture officers. These Acts related to particular outbreaks in particular years.

Since 1974 the method of fighting fruit fly outbreaks has changed. Whereas in earlier outbreaks all fruit for a 1½ km radius was stripped from trees, from 1974 only infested trees were stripped and any fallen fruit within a radius of 200 metres was taken. Compensation under this method of control is now very small and if required is paid from Ministerial sources. Hence no Acts are required. Therefore, it is appropriate that each of the Acts contained in the schedule to the Bill be repealed.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning Act, 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill amends the Planning Act in two minor respects. The first amendment deals with a problem that has arisen because of the proclamation of the new Act in stages rather than as an integrated whole. Certain parts of the Act have already been brought into operation in order to enable administrative preparation to be made for the new planning system proposed by the new Act. However, references in the new Act at the date of its commencement need to be read as references to the date on which the new planning system is introduced rather than the date on which these ancillary provisions come into effect. Thus a new provision providing that a reference to the commencement of the new Act is to be construed as a reference to the date of the repeal of the present Act (that is, the date on which the new Act supersedes the previous Act) is included in the Bill.

Section 40 of the principal Act provides for the compilation of the new development plan on the basis of certain existing plans and documents. This compilation is, as honourable members are aware, now complete. It is thought advisable now to remove the provision as it could conceivably lead to challenges to the validity of the development plan based upon discrepancies between the plan and the documents on which it is based.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that a reference in the new Act to the date of its commencement shall be construed as a reference to the date of repeal of the existing Act. Clause 3 provides that the document approved by Parliament as the development plan is, subject to amendment under the new Act, to constitute the development plan.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D. O. Tonkin:

That the House note grievances.

(Continued from 2 September. Page 979.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): Earlier today the newly elected member for Florey took his place in the House. The by-election in which he was successful was the

third by-election faced by the Government during its term in office, and it is the third that it has lost. On each occasion the movement of voters away from the Government has steadily grown. Each successive setback has been met with remarkable performances of self justification by the Premier. I recall his reaction to the Government's defeat in Norwood, namely, the calling for an inquiry, some form of commission: we were not sure whether it was for a royal commission, an Electoral Commission inquiry, or what. However, the Government had lost the Norwood by-election and on election night the Premier said, 'There has got to be some inquiry.'

Incidentally, that was an inquiry into a by-election brought about by the wrongful way in which the campaign and the poll itself had been conducted for the general election held in the previous September. It took an action brought in the court of disputed returns by the aggrieved parties against the Government before that by-election could take place. The by-election took place, the Government duly lost the election, the member for Norwood was reinstated in the seat he had held since February 1979, and the Premier called for an inquiry.

I now turn to the by-election for the seat of Mitcham. The disaster of losing the seat of Mitcham occurred following a vacancy created by the Premier. I think all members recall the orchestration of the appointment to bring about a by-election for the seat of Mitcham. It was entirely in the hands of the Premier himself, because he chose the time and the occasion. When the Premier lost that by-election he thrashed about and blamed, among other people, in particular the National Country Party and the preferential voting system. According to the Premier someone else was to blame for that disaster on that occasion.

I now turn to the by-election for the seat of Florey. Faced with a swing of first preference votes in excess of 7 per cent and the certainty of a two-Party preferred swing in double figures (of course, the final figures had not been calculated at that stage) the Premier was asked for his comments by the media on the night of the by-election. The Premier's reaction was reported in the *Sunday Mail* as follows:

An elated Premier (Mr Tonkin) commenting on the results before attending a private dinner last night said he was very pleased.

If the Premier had been elated after attending that private dinner there may have been some excuse for his elation. What an extraordinary reaction! After a day to think about it the Premier held to this comment and on Monday 6 September told the *Advertiser* that it was quite a satisfactory result.

It seems that the Premier is pleased and elated at the prospect of the present members of his Government, for example, the members for Henley Beach, Mawson, Todd, Newland, Brighton, Morphett, Eyre and the Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport no longer being members of this House following the next election. That is what a State-wide swing based on the Florey by-election figures would mean. However, that is not to say that such a swing need necessarily occur. To say that he was elated and pleased with a result of that dimension indicates that the Premier is either very confused or some new definitions now apply to the words used by the Premier.

Mr Hemmings: Or he's a fool.

Mr BANNON: I do not wish to go much further than I have, but I can understand why my colleague feels that way. Perhaps it is understandable, given this Government's appalling record, that a loss of that number of seats might seem to be a satisfactory result. The Premier's comments following the Florey by-election and, indeed, his reaction to all three by-elections must rank with that famous remark by Bill Snedden after the 1974 Federal election when he

said that he did not lose but he just did not win enough votes and enough seats to form a Government.

The Opposition looks forward with eager anticipation to the election night following the next State election. That will be quite remarkable. Unfortunately, the campaign conducted by the Premier and his Government in Florey was characterised by dishonesty, smear tactics and a lack of policies which showed a complete contempt for the ordinary voter. The Premier's main concern was to give the impression that the result was a foregone conclusion: for example, the Premier let it be known that the Liberal Party was not going to spend a great deal of money on advertising, as it had done in Mitcham. It seems that the Premier really meant that whilst the Liberal Party was not going to pay for political advertising the taxpayers were and, indeed, they did.

In a direct response to housing policy initiatives that I announced to open the Labor Party's campaign, precise detailed policies relating to what a State Government could do within its responsibilities (instead of washing our hands of the issue as the present Government has done), South Australian taxpayers' money was used to finance a series of blatantly political advertisements purporting to explain housing relief measures. Actually, they were clearly designed to affect the result on 4 September. Those advertisements were misleading. They announced the operation of a rent relief scheme which was not yet in operation. There has been a response throughout the community, particularly from those people who rang the so-called hot line telephone number to the Premier finding, of course, that the Premier himself was not at the other end of the telephone. I do not suppose we should expect that he would answer the telephone, even though he was pictured in the advertisements sitting with his telephone off the hook.

However, people rang that number, not only finding the Premier was not there, but that they could not get the assistance promised by the Premier. If that reaction is typical those advertisements have done little more than increase the frustration and anxiety of the community over the very grave problem of housing. In the electorate itself the Liberal Party indulged in a campaign which was entirely negative. Interestingly enough, we have not seen those advertisements again but I suspect they will reappear at about the time the Premier is ready to hold his next election campaign, in the interests of course of public information and nothing more! No doubt the Premier plans to introduce them, but I think that the reaction to them and the frustration and anxiety which I believe they caused indicates that they probably will not be reintroduced.

The electorate itself saw the Liberal Party indulging in a campaign which was entirely negative. Members opposite rushed from door to door distorting the A.L.P.'s policy, dreaming up fanciful costings of our economic programme and imagining they could smear our candidate because, as a trade unionist, he has never hesitated to fight for the rights of his fellow workers or to give absolute priority to the health and safety of those he represented. That apparently is some sort of crime on the record of the now member for Florey. That, incidentally, is in very sharp and distinct contrast to the praise that the Premier heaped on the honourable member in his capacity as secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, and as a member of a number of Federal and State authorities; indeed, praise which resulted in the Premier writing a letter to the member himself to explain that he had been misrepresented and had not in any way meant to imply that the honourable member was not most excellent in the discharge of those duties.

It is very interesting that all that was forgotten in an election campaign when scurrilous pamphlets were put out attempting to denigrate and attack the now member for

Florey. His presence here today indicates the lack of success of those tactics but, if the next campaign is going to be fought on that negative base, we can forget about any reasonable political debate in this community. The electorate, in the course of making its decision, is going to have the contrast between a Labor Party, putting up its positive policies and recommendations, and its attempts to do something for the State of South Australia, and the carping, negative attacks of the present Government.

The thing that stands out clearly is that this Government, and the Cabinet in particular, cannot get over the fact that they sat for nine or 10 years on the Opposition benches. Despite three years in Government they still think and act like the most negative, carping Opposition which they were in their day: they cannot shake it off. With every public issue that arises, that embarrasses them, they refer back to the previous days and blame previous Governments. The Deputy Premier is in his element of recent days, attempting to explain his disastrous gas pricing policies and his handling of that vital commodity in South Australia, by turning it around to some sort of attack. He ignores the facts, ignoring his role, treating it simply as if he was in that irresponsible Opposition phase he was in for nine years.

In Opposition we have not behaved in that negative way; we have certainly drawn attention to the defects and problems in the State as has been necessary because the Government will not face the facts. We have always contrasted that approach with positive policies, positive proposals, with suggestions about what can be done, and we have never been given credit for that. Anything positive we have put up has been attacked in the most scurrilous terms by the Government. I believe this Florey campaign was a classical example of that Opposition mentality—these old men of the '70s sitting over there still not used to the idea that they are in charge and are in Government.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr BANNON: Government members are very old in terms of their attitude and approach to the future of this State. They are way back in the days of frustrated opposition of the 1970s, and they are not likely to shift from that attitude. It is better for the State that they sit on this side, fulfilling their natural role, I suggest. That will not be long away. The Florey campaign demonstrated that members opposite have nothing to offer the people of South Australia except those negatives, and there scurrilous pamphlets and equally scurrilous attacks on the member for Florey as a candidate proved that theory.

Let me make one thing clear: the Premier can indulge in all the political name-calling he likes, and the Liberal Party can run as many negative campaigns as it wishes, but no-one on this side will resile from his commitment to ensuring a decent, secure and dignified way of life for the working people of South Australia, giving them some hope and something to hang on to in terms of their future in this State. Perhaps it is not surprising that we get this sort of reaction to a by-election defeat from the Premier. His response is typical of his approach to government.

The past three years have been typified by an alarming refusal to be realistic. Indeed, I believe the greatest disservice the Government has done to the people of South Australia is to refuse to tell them the truth, to refuse to take them into its confidence, and to refuse to look at the situation realistically and start preparing solutions from that base. Nowhere has this been more apparent than in the vital area of economic development. We are all far too familiar with the desperate attempts of this Government to claim every piece of good news as a vindication of its policies and to try to cover up our very pressing problems.

People are not fools, and they do not like to be fooled. People know that there are problems and they want to hear

their Government defining the problems and assessing them in a realistic manner so that we can prepare together some form of solution to those problems. The dishonest way in which this Government has distorted our economic performance over the past few years is one of the worst legacies that it will leave any new Government that attempts to regain the confidence of people in the community and to rebuild the State as it should be rebuilt. Instead of a realistic assessment of our future prospects, and, indeed, of our current position, the people of South Australia are served up with pep talks and well-known clichés such as that we are on the brink of recovery, we are in for a boom, we are around the corner of the up and up. These phrases drip from the Premier's tongue at every opportunity.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I think the closest the Premier ever got to telling the truth was when he said, 'We are going backwards more slowly than other States.' That is the best he could do. However, on another occasion he said, 'We are sick.' The Premier was sick at that time, and later he disclaimed that statement.

Dr Billard: Your Government sent us backwards twice as fast as the other States.

Mr BANNON: I am amazed, because I would have thought that the analysis of the retiring member for Newland was such that he would surely be, in the Party rooms, an advocate for the sort of realistic approach that I am suggesting. If the honourable member is listening to his constituents, he will know that that is what they are looking for in the future. Only last week we had yet another example of the desperation of the Government as it searches for some justification of its three years in office, as it tries to stage manage an election that members opposite hope will show that they have actually achieved something in the past futile three years.

Last week the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs were peddling the much discredited survey of major mining and industrial projects produced by the Federal Government. This survey has a checkered history. It was first produced by Sir Phillip Lynch when he was in charge of the Department for Industry and Commerce. Sir Phillip is well known for his rubbery figures and one or two real estate investments. The survey was used cynically in 1980 to underpin the Federal Government's claim that a huge resources boom was soon to burst on Australia, and in this guise it became an integral part of the Federal Government's 1980 election strategy. We all know the resource boom talk that took place at that time, which encouraged people to re-elect the Fraser Government, aided and abetted by that vigorous and dynamic campaigner in South Australia, the Premier. 'For South Australia's sake, vote Liberal,' he said. 'We need a combination of the Fraser and Tonkin approaches in this State.'

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: He won!

Mr BANNON: Yes, but he did not win in South Australia. More than 50 per cent of South Australians would not accept that message, and he will not win again when the Federal Party goes to the polls, I can assure the House of that. We heard all that and the talk about the great resources boom. Some years later they come back and say, 'Isn't it terrible, the demands being made by workers for improved conditions and wages, as they attempt to keep up with inflation and high interest rates?' In fact, they were fuelling the very expectations of those workers, encouraging them to believe that this great prosperity was about to burst upon them, and when the workers, after waiting for some nine months, a year or 18 months, and still nothing had happened, whilst still their standard of living deteriorated, started making a few demands, attempting to do something about it, they were attacked: not only attacked but also blamed for

the very problems that were created by the scandalous use of these figures in 1980 and the nonsense talked about by the Premier of South Australia and the present Prime Minister in the course of that election campaign.

The survey that was used so much at that time was criticised by independent observers because obviously it was far from accurate. It suffered from the problem of double counting, that is, it included all projects being considered, without reference to the fact that many were competing against one another and would not all go ahead, that if one petro-chemical works, for instance, got off the ground, then obviously the other would not be going ahead.

Also, it was difficult to compare one period with another because of the problem with projects moving between categories. What was not known at the time, but has since become public, is that there were within the Commonwealth Public Service severe doubts as to the validity of the figures contained in the survey. The strongest criticism was made by the Secretary of the Treasury, John Stone, in a letter to the then head of the Department of Industry and Commerce, in which he expressed his concern about the costing of infrastructure for many of the projects in the survey. That letter was tabled in Federal Parliament by the Federal member for Adelaide on 22 April this year. In part, it reads:

The purpose of this letter is to convey to you personally my concern about the proposed publication of these estimates. There is, first, the question of the meaning and reliability of such estimates and their potential for misuse. I understand, for example, that not all the States have responded as fully as requested. Additionally, there are doubts about the extent to which the information received from individual authorities has the imprimatur of State Governments and, even where that might be the case, what meaning can be attached to it in advance, in some cases years in advance, of relevant State budgetary and Loan Council processes. I believe that publication of the schedule would give any estimates therein a degree of credibility and prominence they could not possibly warrant (and should not be attested in attaining).

That letter is from the Secretary of the Federal Treasury. We note that, in the 62 pages of economic data presented in the Commonwealth Budget papers this year, that survey is simply not mentioned once. Even in South Australia Treasury officers clearly do not believe it is worth much, because it also does not rate a mention in the Budget paper on the South Australian economy tabled in this House by the Premier and prepared by the Treasury.

Yet the Premier is laying tremendous stress on these figures and using them as a great vindication of the success of his Government's policies. While the Premier has been happy to quote these figures to the media, and even use them in answering questions in this House, his own officers apparently did not believe they were worthy of mention. Certainly, they did not believe that they were of any use in predicting likely economic activity in the future. Indeed, on page 31 of the Budget paper to which I have referred, under the heading 'Current investment projects', there is the following statement:

Comprehensive data on the level of capital expenditure either undertaken or proposed at the State level are not publicly available.

They would have known of the existence of the survey. They chose not to quote it or use it because its accuracy simply has not been tested.

For my own part, I distrust the results of these surveys by the Department of Industry and Commerce, whether its results are good or bad. They are little more than an interesting list of projects from which no important conclusions can be drawn. Of course, none of this stopped the Premier or the Minister of Industrial Affairs taking the survey as absolute proof that South Australia's economic problems were over.

In fact, so eager was the Premier that he managed to misquote the results. We are used to his inability to handle figures, but this was yet another classic instance of that

when he claimed that a 19.5 per cent share of the national total investment was shown by the survey when, in fact, the correct figure given by the survey for the total of mining and manufacturing was 12.6 per cent. He had misread the table of figures.

Let us take the survey on its face value and look closely at what it actually says. Let us for a moment assume that it is a useful document which is accepted by Treasury officials, unlike what we know to be the case. The Premier, when commenting on the survey, is reported in the *Australian* of Tuesday 8 September as follows:

Since October 1979 we have attracted 19.5 per cent of the national total of investment.

I have already corrected the figure of 19.5 per cent, but let us consider the claim that all this investment has happened since October 1979 and look closely at what this survey actually shows. Remember: the Premier is claiming that all of this has happened in the period since October 1979. He has the figures wrong, but he is still claiming an increase. Even his corrected figure shows a 12.6 per cent share of the national total investment.

First, in the mining sector, at the top of the list is ETSA and the relocation of the Leigh Creek township. According to the survey itself, this project began in 1974 and will be completed in 1985. It is included in the figures that the Premier is quoting, and yet he wants us to believe that it somehow happened only since October 1979. However, it is a project he inherited, and of course it shows up in those figures. It was based on a decision made by a previous Government.

Then of course there is the Cooper Basin, which quite clearly accounts for almost the entire figure of \$2.5 billion which the survey includes for the remaining cost of projects in South Australia as at June 1982. Again, look at the timing that the survey itself gives to expenditure on this project. The starting date is way back in 1963. A possible finishing date is given as 2006. This is a project begun under the Playford Government, continued and developed largely under the Walsh and Dunstan Governments, and now paying benefits to South Australia. Undoubtedly, it is a real success story. And this Premier wants us to believe that it happened only since 1979!

The rest of the mining sector in the survey is quite skimpy because, as I said, most of the investment is tied up in the Cooper Basin. It is worth noting that Roxby Downs is not included even in this survey because, as much as the Government would like us to believe that it is an immediate answer to our problems, it is still listed as 'preliminary'. Also listed as 'preliminary' are five separate projects aimed at supplying the future coal needs for power generation in South Australia. This is a very good example of the double counting that is possible in this sort of survey because all those projects are not going to happen at the same time; whether they happen in sequence or whether any or some of them are developed is yet to be established. That is the mining sector part of this survey that the Premier is claiming as a massive endorsement of his Government's policies.

Let us turn now to the manufacturing sector. I mention in dealing with these matters that, unfortunately, many of the figures contained in these surveys are marked with a 'C', meaning 'Confidential', because particular companies do not wish to have the precise amounts they have given the departments identified. They like to keep these amounts confidential. It has been interesting that in two or three previous years when the Premier has boasted about these figures the exact figures in South Australia, or the share of investment, has been marked 'C', because only one or two major projects are involved that are readily identifiable; therefore, they have been kept confidential. Let us turn again to the manufacturing sector. Here the major project

which, without a doubt, would account for possibly 90 per cent of the investment is the Cooper Basin liquids scheme, a part of that whole project which started with the development of the gas fields back in 1963 through to the present stage.

Without the preparation that had been done by the previous Labor Government, and without the indenture Bills and contracts that the Deputy Premier in his 1970 Opposition phase continually denounces, both publicly and in this House, the liquids scheme would not be in place today. Yet, the Premier is proudly claiming that, which reflects 90 per cent of the investments shown in this survey as an achievement solely of his administration.

What else is in the list? Well, there is the construction of a fertiliser and chemical manufacturing and storage facility at the Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizer Company. The timing given by the survey is 1978 to 1985. It was approved and well under way at the time of the previous Government. Again, the Premier wants us to believe that it magically appeared in October 1979. So the list goes on. The purchase of Mitsubishi is included. Negotiations were well under way when the Labor Government left office. The expansion of John Shearer, timed to begin in 1980, was clearly planned well before that. In fact, of all the manufacturing projects mentioned, the only one which obviously was planned well into the term of this Government was the thermo-mechanical pulp mill being constructed by Cellulose Australia Limited near Mount Gambier. Of this project the survey says:

Due to the depressed market for T.M.P., a customer has not been secured for the output of the pulp mill. The official project has been deferred until the market recovers.

Let me make this point: when the Labor Government left office we had in place a project and contract with the Punalur woodchip project which would have ensured a market and activity in this area in the past three or four years—desperately needed activity in the South-East. The Labor Government had that lined up and it was botched by the current Minister of Agriculture and the current Government. In place of the failure to conclude that agreement and to set up the developments which the Labor Party had established when in Government, the Minister of Agriculture and the present Government said that we should not be worried too much because of the thermo-mechanical pulp mill being constructed by Cellulose.

That project at this stage is simply not going ahead. It is still there in the survey and is still part of the boasted manufacturing investment of the Premier. The official project has been deferred until the market recovers. But even more grave—

Mr Oswald: Of the 95 companies that did go ahead—

Mr BANNON: The honourable member should not make too much a fool of himself. Before we have to deal with this future investment and project, all the information coming at the moment from the South-East is that the future of Cellulose Ltd is gravely in doubt at this moment. So, much less than an investment project of multi-million dimensions for a T.M.P. mill, the very operation and the 175 to 200 persons it employs are under threat at this very moment. That has been boasted about by the Premier.

Mr Oswald: What about the 95—

Mr BANNON: It is fortunate that the honourable member has no connection with the South-East and Mount Gambier; if he did then as he would not be interjecting foolishly at this stage. I am talking about the future of Cellulose and its role in the South-East, and I suggest that the honourable member remain silent. While the Premier and his Ministers posture and distort the figures and clutch at anything to cover up their failure, the State's problems continue. Building approvals have fallen in the past three months by 15.1 per cent. The number of unemployed has gone up 2 000, to

50 300—a record 8.3 per cent. Let us remember that the Premier 12 months ago told all his colleagues, 'Do not tell anyone about unemployment, we will try and ignore that, talk about employment.' Well, the Labor Party is happy to talk about both and employment is down from July to July by 4 500. Retail sales are up 10.6 per cent. Compared to an Australian 11.4 per cent, that is a rise barely in advance of the c.p.i.—in other words, no real growth.

People are leaving the State. As final evidence of the total failure of this Government, there has been a net population loss of 15 660 in South Australia in the period that the survey was taking place. There has been some increased migration, mainly due to taking a higher than proportionate number of Indo-Chinese refugees, and that is fine.

But in terms of population, for the first time in our State's history we now have the smallest population of any State on the mainland. The evidence in the papers tabled by the Federal Budget is that we are now behind Western Australia in population. It is the first time that the population ranking orders of the States have changed since the 1890s, when Western Australia got ahead of Tasmania as a result of the gold rush. There was a time in the 1970s when we had hope and optimism in this State, when we talked realistically about our prospects. That time will return, but it is not going to be reached under this Government. Hope, optimism and activity will be generated by a future Labor Government after the next election.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): It is with some regret that I make this speech today because, to make it possible, Howard O'Neill, the previous member for Florey, had to resign because of ill health. I worked with Howard over a long period of time. He served his apprenticeship with the South Australian Railways, where I also served an apprenticeship. Perhaps it is the association with those workers at Islington that has had something to do with the development of our attitudes and values. The recent election in Florey reflected a significant trend in attitudes in South Australia. The swing to me was about 7 per cent on primary votes; on a two Party preferred basis it was 11.4 per cent and the swing in the Democrats' preferences was from 37 per cent at the last election to 54 per cent at the current election. I must say that the campaign conducted in Florey by my Party and by the Democrats was of a positive nature, putting to the people of the district positive views of what we intended to do. It seems that the people listened and studied what the A.L.P. wanted to do and voted for it.

The campaign by the Liberal Party was in marked contrast to our campaign. I understand that one member refused even to door-knock when he found out what was going on. I want to thank the Liberal Party members who did go out and door-knock and try to explain their policies, because it seems to me that that must have assisted in the swing towards me in Florey. If that swing was transferred into a State-wide basis, we would see the Parliamentary Labor Party sitting on the other side of this Chamber and in Government, and the sooner the election is held the better because I want to go over on that side. Our Party is working hard so that this election can be held, and we want it to be held soon.

I also want to say something about this Government, because it is something that has concerned me for some time. It was voted in on the basis of 'Stop the job rot'. Its friends at 12 Pirie Street came out with a marvellous campaign of stopping the job rot and it proceeded to do that. It cut 3 700 jobs from the State Public Service. It paid people to stop working, it paid people to become unemployed and to go on the dole. That is not stopping the job rot; that is creating unemployment, and as part of its measure of small government, on which it campaigned, it decided to do away with a number of things. It decided to cut down

on the number of people employed in departments. It decided to cut down on services made available to the public of South Australia, and the areas in which there is a cut back and in which there will be a significant effect, not now but in the future, will be the areas of occupational safety and health.

The Government has cut back on the availability of inspectors in the Department of Employment and Industrial Affairs and on the number of visits they can make; it has frustrated those people in the carrying out of their duties. For example, I have been informed that, in one factory which has four large boilers, the inspections will now be at longer intervals. It is obvious that members on the other side of the House have no idea or understanding of what can happen to a boiler if it is not properly maintained or properly surveyed. If it blows up it makes a mess, and it is unfortunate if a person happens to be nearby at the time, because he will get hurt. One has only to recall what happened in Tasmania a few years ago, when a boiler blew up and demolished a whole building. People just do not seem to understand that there must be regular and annual checks of boilers.

We see a proposal to change the method of inspection of lifts: there is an idea to ask lift companies to verify that the lifts are safe. I suppose the next thing in reducing costs, on the same basis and using the same criteria, will be that the Government will want the prisoners at Yatala to be the warders as well. What will be the effect of this? More people will be stuck in lifts and more people will be injured. More people will suffer from industrial diseases. We will have no checking of these things, and no measures to provide new safety proposals to cover the introduction of toxic chemicals and new processes in industry in South Australia. We do not know what is going to happen, and I suggest that the Government does not know either, but people will be hurt.

I can give an example of how insidious industrial diseases can be. During my campaign I was door-knocking and discussing with an elector her views about some of the policies of our Party. She told me that her father had worked at Islington and had recently died at the age of 64. I asked whether he was a welder and she said 'Yes.' I asked whether he had died of asbestosis and she said, 'How do you know?' I said that it was simple. If people die of industrial diseases, if they have been welders, and if they are around the age of 63 or 64, one often finds that they have been welding with arc rods covered with asbestos. As the rod is laid out on the metal and the metal is joined together asbestos fibres are released and the welders breathe the fumes. Consequently, some 40 years later they die from an industrial disease caused by their employment. If inspectors are not examining these things in industry more people will die later. Employers can say, 'It is not my fault.' I suggest to members opposite that they need to seriously consider their actions in this area, because that is what will happen.

One has only to see the inspection of buses to understand that some people are unscrupulous, will take short cuts, and will put people's lives in jeopardy. In 1980 a bus crashed killing a number of people because the person who built the bus did not build it properly. We have now seen the Government introducing legislation for tougher and more stringent bus inspections. I suppose we in this Parliament will have to wait for hundreds of people to be killed in industry before the Government will toughen up on industrial safety. We have seen the Government's actions and its attitude toward workers in this introduction of amendments to the Workers Compensation Act. If payments had been increased on a c.p.i. basis, workers suffering total disability would have received \$22 000 more than they currently receive. If the Government had accepted the proposal to index those lump sum payments there would not be the

irregular track back to Parliament to increase those amounts. It was done on the basis of saving employers money. Since these amounts have been amended some employers have complained about the high premiums. Of course they are paying high premiums because they do not ensure that their workers are working in complete safety. One has only to work within industry to understand what happens. Some employers have a very good record and others do not.

An insurance consultant described to me the incredulous remarks of an employer when told that he was having too many injuries in his factory and that his rates would have to go up. The employer said, 'What are you complaining about? I have lost only 34 joints this year?' He was talking about joints on fingers! Employees had lost 34 joints from their hands. He was talking not about joints of meat but about fingers that would not grow back. That was an employer's callous and unfeeling approach to employees working in his factory. If he had to pay high premiums, one of two things would happen. One would be that he would be driven out of business and people would be saved, or, secondly, he would have to take action to reduce his costs so that he would save the high premiums.

Another example is in the timber industry. Tree felling in this State at one time attracted one of the highest premiums. However, the Timber Industry Training Council undertook a training course in tree felling. In the first sitting it introduced a tree-felling bench, training people in proper tree-felling techniques, and insurance premiums went down markedly.

It meant that the premiums were going down, and also that the injury rates were going down. That is what needs to be done. The approach of small government has meant that the Government is not interfering out there on behalf of the people. In one area the Government is going to create a number of industrial cripples; people who can never regain their health, people whom no operations and no medicine will ever bring back. They will be permanently and tragically scarred for life.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): First, I take this opportunity to welcome into this Parliament the new member for Florey. I am convinced as, I am sure, are other members on this side, and in their own hearts many members opposite, that the new member for Florey will handle his task as the representative for that electorate with unsurpassed skill. It is a pleasure to have seen the heavy swing going his way at the most recent by-election. As has been quite rightly pointed out, that swing at an election would clearly see the Labor Party on the Government benches with a majority rivalling that obtained in 1977. I would suggest that there would be good cause for a grey pallor on the face of those sitting on the back benches opposite, with the exception of the member for Flinders, as they analyse the effects of the by-election of 4 September.

Mr Trainer: At least they are not blaming Flinders this time.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The Country Party is quite innocent this time. The Premier tried to work out how he could attack it, but it was not quite able to be done. Of course, I share with the member for Florey his sadness on the occasion that has brought about the by-election and the change of member. I repeat what I have said on another occasion that it is greatly to be regretted that Mr Howard O'Neill is not able to continue the very dedicated job that he was doing as the member for Florey. As one who came into this House at the same time as he did, I looked forward to a long Parliamentary career, sharing him as one of my colleagues.

I want to address myself to a couple of other matters in my speech this afternoon. The first matter in some ways might appear somewhat whimsical, but I do not know why

the Minister of Education chose to mislead me in an answer to Question on Notice No. 142, wherein I asked the following:

Since appointment as Minister of Education, how many press releases have been issued partly under the title of Minister of Education or through the Press Secretary of the Minister that deal with matters that fall more properly under his capacity as member for Mount Gambier?

I have analysed the situation since I raised this matter. I quite understand the situation of Ministers being very busy people and often not being able to give the attention that they should to matters concerning their local areas. I realise that one of the ways in which a Minister can partly compensate for that is to on occasions call on Ministerial staff to perhaps help them out with some local matters: that being an occasional occurrence. I understand that, but what amazes me is that the answer that came back today from the Minister of Education was not that sort of statement. In answer to how many press releases there had been, the Minister replied that there had been none. By means of this forum, I now want to ask the Minister a number of supplementary questions. Will the Minister explain the educational impact of the press release issued from his office on 19 November 1981, about which we were advised that further inquiries could go to his then Press Secretary, Liz Blieschke. The news release of 19 November 1981 stated:

Late night shopping will be held in Mount Gambier on Wednesday 23 December, as well as Christmas Eve and New Years Eve.

Mr Keneally: Very educational!

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Well, it is very educational, I suppose; it taught me something. The news release further stated:

The Minister of Education and member for Mount Gambier, Mr Harold Allison, said that this had been formally approved by Executive Council this morning.

Earlier, on 29 September 1981, a news release, again from his Press Secretary, Liz Blieschke, stated:

Harold Allison, Minister of Education, advises us that an additional weekend bus service between Adelaide and Mount Gambier will begin soon.

I do not know whether that will be a portable classroom that moves up and down the road from Adelaide to Mount Gambier, picking up children at various places. On 30 September the Minister of Education and member for Mount Gambier said that the South Australian Health Commission was preparing a poster to inform pregnant women about the effect of nitrates in drinking water. That is a commendable subject but it really does not fit in with the Minister of Education's portfolio. While I do not criticise that, I am commenting again on the answer given by the Minister, that is, that none of them related to non-education areas.

On 15 September, which was the time we were engaged in the heat of the kindergarten fees debate, a time when a lot of pressure was being applied to the Minister, he was busy telling us about bus services to the South-East. On 15 September the Minister of Education said that the Mount Gambier Trotting Club had been successful in its application for financial support to upgrade track lighting—very edifying. However, I suppose the press release that takes the cake was that issued by the Minister on 15 April 1981, and it is labelled 'Easter Message'—a release from the Minister of Education alias the Easter bunny, as follows:

Too often the traditions of Easter are forgotten in the commercialism of advertising and our own sporting and leisure activities—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Hear, hear!

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I concur with that sentiment—

in what has become just another holiday weekend. Perhaps we can learn a lesson from the traditions of our European neighbours. Eggs, the symbol of fertility and birth and the resurrection of Christ—

that is a religious message that is quite profound—

are used in many celebrations during this time. Dyed and painted after being hardboiled—

in case we did not know, the Minister is teaching us something; perhaps this is where the Education portfolio comes in—

now sugar-coated confectionary and chocolate eggs have taken their place. Children sent in search of them are told they have been laid by hens, hares or rabbits depending on the region.

I do not know what happens in the South-East; perhaps the eggs have been laid by the Minister of Education.

Mr Trainer: The Minister would probably lay a few.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, perhaps he lays a lot of chocolate eggs around the place. Those press releases from the Minister of Education refer to his press secretary as the person who can be contacted for further information about the chocolate eggs in the South-East. In reply to a question, the Minister told me today that no press releases had been issued by his office under his by-line that did not come within his role as the member for Mount Gambier. I would like to know why the Minister misled me in that particular answer. I believe that it was singularly inappropriate of the Minister to deal with the House and myself as a member of this House in that way.

I will address my next comments in greater length on another occasion: I refer to an employment practice which has been drawn to my attention, and it involves a major retailer in this State. I understand that some months ago Woolworths, in Rundle Mall, converted the employment of a significant number of their permanent employees to casual employment. Without any notice, the company simply told them this would occur and, in so doing, wiped out any accumulated sick leave or annual leave accrued by these people. I believe that that is a shocking misuse of might by an employer, that is, threatening that if people did not accept the situation they could simply say 'Goodbye' and walk down the street.

Mr Randall: Were they members of the union?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: These people are members of the union. I believe the company had some obligation to recompense these employees for the loss of accumulated benefits that occurred on their conversion from permanent employment to part-time employment.

In one particular instance an employee had accumulated a number of weeks sick leave, and they disappeared overnight. She was a person who had a practice of not taking sick days off except in dire emergencies, because she believed, as many people do, that one must accumulate sick days for that occasion when one might desperately need them. She was somewhat reassured prior to the conversion that she had these days to spare in case a medical emergency hit her. She now has absolutely nothing. She also had some weeks annual leave accumulated but, again, that has totally disappeared. When she told the manager that she would like some annual leave this year she was told that the best he could give her was two weeks without pay. That was the alternative offered to her. That company used its might to take advantage of its employees at that branch of Woolworths, and for all I know it may have occurred at other Woolworths branches.

Then people have the gall to ask, 'Why do people suggest there are times when a close eye must be kept on employers?' Here is a company which I would have thought held its own name in good stead, and which felt its own name needed a good image, yet this is the way it acts.

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

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): I join with other members in congratulating the member for Florey on his election, and I welcome him to this Parliament. He will be in Parliament

for a long time and will no doubt make some very significant contributions to debates in this House. I had the honour of being President of the United Trades and Labor Council in his early days as Secretary of that body and, if the member for Florey is as efficient in Parliament as he was as Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, he will go a long way.

In the short time I have been the Opposition's spokesman for transport I have received a number of approaches from members of the public about their being severely inconvenienced by over-crowding on bus services, and about a lack of morning peak hour train services and complementing bus connections. In addition, Australian National is discussing time-tables which could bring the Adelaide train service into Mount Gambier at the ridiculous hour of 2.30 in the morning, together with a reduction in the service by six trains per week. I understand that the member for Mount Gambier is not too concerned about this, and neither is the Government or the Minister of Transport. I will come back to this later. A letter to the General Manager of the State Transport Authority from a resident of Valley View states:

Once again I wish to draw your attention to the grossly inefficient transport service your Authority is supplying on the 544 and 505 bus run in the north-eastern suburbs.

May I draw your attention to the fact that this particular area of Adelaide is rapidly expanding, which to me would indicate a gradual increase in the capacity of your service.

The general feeling of bus users in my area is extremely hostile, especially when up to four buses go past several times a week without stopping for passengers. Even if viewed from a safety viewpoint, should passengers be standing on the bottom step and practically sit on the driver's knee?

If this letter, like untold others, fails to bring about change in the service, must we and thousands of other new home buyers (and therefore new voters in our area) initiate a change of system by a change of Government at the next election? You may believe me when I make such statements because feeling is definitely running that high.

Come on fellers, it's our State . . . great?

A letter written to me on 24 August by a resident of Parafield Gardens states:

Many Salisbury and Parafield Gardens people are being severely inconvenienced by a lack of morning peak-hour train services and complementing connecting buses.

In peak-hours the trains leaving Greenfields are an hour apart at 7.03 a.m. and 8.06 and 9.12 a.m. Quite ridiculously, after that, most morning trains run every 30 minutes. An extra service between 8.06 a.m. and 9.12 is urgently needed for city workers. The 8.06 bus and train are extremely overcrowded.

Parafield Gardens is a rapidly expanding suburb with increasing numbers of people needing efficient, convenient public transport. The relevant services are the North Gawler, Penfield and Northfield train service and the route 411 Salisbury to Greenfields station via Parafield Gardens bus service.

I ask you to take up this matter on behalf of the residents. I look forward to a prompt reply to this letter. Copies also have been sent to Mr Lynn Arnold, our local M.P., the local newspaper and the Minister of Transport, Mr Wilson.

I intend to follow up this matter with the Minister, because it seems to me that a complete review of those services is absolutely necessary. Coming back to the matter of the proposed new timetables on the Adelaide to Mount Gambier train service, I believe that, if this proposal is approved, it will be detrimental to train travellers, workers and residents of the whole South-East area of South Australia. It will also have an effect on tourists and holiday-makers.

The Government has been boasting about its tourism achievements, and the South-East, particularly Mount Gambier, has as much, if not more, to offer in regard to tourism than have most places, but now the Government is considering a proposal to cut services and alter timetables that will see trains arriving from Adelaide at the stupid hour of 2.30 a.m. To have a train arrive at its destination at 2.30 a.m. is absolutely ludicrous and certainly would not encourage patronage of the service.

The survey conducted by P.A. Consultants on behalf of Australian National apparently did not take into consideration the effect of the arrival time on passenger patronage. Certainly it is daunting and can only create further heartaches for frustrated patrons. The matter has received a lot of publicity, particularly in the *Border Watch*, and the editorial on 20 August is worth quoting. Under the heading, 'Don't shunt us off', it is stated:

It seems the situation regarding the South-East passenger train services is not what it seemed earlier this week. Railway workers contend that a survey has been completed and the decisions made already. This differs from announcements that the people of the South-East would be consulted before changes were implemented. Clarification is needed.

However, it does seem Australian National has engaged the services of a firm of consultants to make a survey and has reached some conclusions. No matter how professional the consultants might be, they need to talk with residents of the South-East before arriving at any decision. Delving into the statistics of the South-East line would not provide the information on which to base a programme of new timetables.

Cutting losses is one thing, but upgrading a service and encouraging greater rail patronage requires a deep investigation of the travel habits of residents and the geography of the district. Railways don't pay, but country people deserve the fullest consideration in the operation of any public utility established for their benefit and use. There is more behind the new S.E. rail service than meets the eye and we need to be more fully informed of what is happening, before our trains are shunted off, perhaps never to be returned.

If the State Minister agrees to the proposed changes, it shows quite clearly that the Government is not at all sincere about its efforts to boost the Tourism trade in this State. In the interests of all travellers, particularly the patrons in the South-East, I urge the Minister not to agree to those proposals.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): I would like to use my time in this grievance debate to express some of the points of view that I would have made during the Budget debate had it not ended about five minutes before I returned from attending a Mitcham citizenship ceremony. First, I extend my congratulations to the new member for Florey. I would like to say how delighted I am that the honourable member is here, because I am not now the newest member in this House. One of the concerns that I would like to express was touched on earlier today by the member for Salisbury, and it deals particularly with the position of Aboriginal education in this State.

I question the commitment of the Government to the principle of consultation with Aboriginal people and the role of Aboriginal teachers in decision making within the department. I refer specifically to the inclusion of only \$13 000 in the Budget for the South Australian Aboriginal Education Consultative Committee, which was previously funded by the Commonwealth Government. The function of this committee is to give advice to the Minister (if and when he asks for it), but the amount allocated is barely sufficient to cover the cost of fares for proper consultations.

There is insufficient money for full-time salaried staff, which would enable them to be a meaningful advisory body. At present they work in their own spare time. Also, I have been informed that teachers going out to Aboriginal schools for the first time are given almost no pre-service preparation. I believe that last year they had half a day's training.

Also, there are no particular incentives for teachers moving into this field, as it is very difficult to get relief teachers to allow them to attend in-service training. I understand that there is no Aboriginal teacher in a position where that teacher is able to influence decision making on Aboriginal education in the department and that decisions are made by people with little or no experience in teaching in Aboriginal schools.

There appears to be a lack of policy, priority, resources and status for Aboriginal education, and certainly no career

opportunities. I am not suggesting that funds should be taken away from other areas of need, but I point out that the provision of funds by the Federal Government for salaries of Aboriginal education workers allows the State Government to save money it would otherwise have had to spend in providing school assistants. Also, I would like to point out that the Aboriginal education workers are paid by the Commonwealth Government to carry out a special role, but in South Australia they are also expected to carry out the usual task of school assistants.

I would hope that the relevant recommendations of the Keeves Report will be implemented, particularly R10.3(a), which relates to changes in staffing formulae to provide increased staffing ratios for schools with more than 10 Aboriginal students, and R10.3(b), which calls for current programmes for Aboriginal students to be maintained at full strength, and that changes in the balance of State and Commonwealth responsibility, as referred to by the Minister earlier, should not lead to a reduction in the financial resources available for such programmes.

The Department of Aboriginal Affairs provides \$163 000 for curriculum initiatives in Aboriginal education, and I will be seeking assurances during the Estimates Committees that these funds are used in new initiatives rather than being spent on existing programmes. Conditions of Aboriginal education workers offer only limited tenure appointment. There is no security of employment. There are poor salary levels in view of the skills that they are expected to display, such as language, community liaison and teacher liaison and support, and, because of their award, there is no pay for sickness or during school holidays.

Unless they have more security of tenure, those who have already developed school related expertise may be lost to more secure and better paid jobs. Another concern of mine relating to Aboriginal education is the report of possible staff cuts in the Aboriginal studies area at the South Australian College of Advanced Education. The staff of seven at present is made up of two full-time and five contract positions. However, it is reported that only two of the five contract positions will be renewed, thus reducing staff levels from seven to four positions.

In another related area, I will be searching during the Estimates Committees for a specific answer to the question that I asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs about what will happen to the Aboriginal Community Youth Services Programme now that Federal funding has ceased. In his Ministerial statement, the Minister suggested that some of the successful programmes may be maintained. I will be interested to know which they are, and what will happen to the others. Another avenue I will be pursuing during the Estimates Committees is whether sufficient staffing has been provided to the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Care which shares, with the Education Advisory Committee of the Education Department, the functions and responsibilities carried out by the former Childhood Services Council.

The Education Advisory Committee has a secretariat of four people, including a project officer, most of whom were previously employed by the Childhood Services Council. However, the Community Welfare Early Childhood Care Advisory Committee has no secretariat and no project officer. The question is who will carry out the evaluation of the effectiveness of money being spent in the area and who will provide support and advice for community groups. The Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Early Childhood Care was established to advise on play groups, family day care, day care, child care in women's shelters, occasional and emergency child care, children of offenders, and the family support scheme.

The committee is serviced by the Childhood Services Unit of the Department for Community Welfare which also has the responsibility of setting and maintaining standards, and advising and licensing child care centres. The unit does not appear to have been given any additional staff to cope with its new responsibilities. Since its inception, there has been little communication between this committee and child care organisations.

Another area of concern that I raise relates to the level of staffing for the Working Women's Centre. There is at present a dedicated staff of three who have been working under an extremely heavy work load. I understand that staffing may be reviewed in the new year, but I stress the immediate need for a staff increase, and particularly for the appointment of an Italian-speaking staff member.

The centre, having just launched the first stage of a repetition injuries campaign, is receiving many inquiries. The campaign draws attention to the high cost to business and the community of repetition injuries, both to men and women. Particular occupations at risk are typists, data process operators, visual display unit operators, and so on. Although most of those affected at present are women, particularly migrant women, men are also affected. These occupational injuries are extremely painful, very widespread and can cause permanent disablement. However, they are preventable, provided that sufficient staff is available to carry out the proposed education campaign. The saving to employers and the community by preventing these injuries, which lead to claims for workers compensation, is obvious. I hope that the Premier will consider as a matter of urgency supplementing the staff of the Working Women's Centre. Also, I hope that all sections of the community, including employers, insurance companies and the medical profession, will cooperate in the present campaign.

I would like to comment favourably on the \$60 000 that appears in the Budget for the Attorney-General for the provision of an information and resource centre to co-ordinate resources for the provision of information and assistance to disabled people, their families and interested organisations. However, I was disappointed that it has been located at the Julia Farr Centre, because I believe that the whole concept of an advisory and resource centre being placed in a home that had the former title, and the connotations attached thereto, of 'Home for Incurables', is most unfortunate. The resource centre will be of great use to non-government voluntary organisations that need this continuing support as their running costs escalate and their sources of donations diminish.

The sharing of facilities is much to be welcomed, and I am sure will be appreciated by many.

Another small voluntary organisation in need of assured support is DOME—Don't Overlook Mature Expertise. This small self-help group, which is the only group in this State that caters for the over 40s, has been in existence for less than a year but now has a membership of more than 500 people. This group needs to be assured that premises will be available to it on a continuing basis, and I have been making representations on its behalf to the Minister concerned. It is most important that this meeting place for these people continues to be available, because the loss of morale for people over 40, when they suddenly become unemployed, is very great. They arrive at the centre in great distress, and the presence of other people there helps to restore their lost self esteem and gives them confidence to go out and seek employment.

Dr BILLARD (Newland): The Leader of the Opposition, when he spoke earlier this afternoon, called for honesty and realism in the debate over the South Australian economy. I would certainly support any call for that sort of debate. I

was concerned, however, that the Labor Party had been distributing throughout my electorate a pamphlet which sought to blame the Tonkin Government for the increased interest rates that have occurred over the past three years. I wonder how honest and realistic that sort of claim is. In that pamphlet the Labor Party made a number of other claims about price increases which had occurred over the past three years and which the Labor Party was blaming on the Tonkin Government.

The fact is (and I think most members would recognise this) that the Australian economy exists within a world economy and that the South Australian economy exists within a national economy. There are certain things which the Australian Government can do and which would vary up or down the state of the national economy from the trends that occur internationally, and there are things which the South Australian Government can do and which will make us perform either better or worse than the national average.

So, the truth is that we ought to be examining whether the economic indicators for South Australia are improving more than the national economic indicators or whether the economic indicators that are getting worse at a national level are getting worse at a lower level or are improving within the South Australian scene. That is the sort of comparison which ought to be made and to which I want to refer in the few minutes that I have to speak.

First, the pamphlet distributed by the Labor Party sought to imply, I believe quite dishonestly, that the Government had done something terrible with prices in South Australia. The truth is that prices have increased less in South Australia over the past year than they have in all but two State capitals. The increase in South Australia over the past year has been 10.3 per cent, and nationally the increase was 10.7 per cent. Over the three years of this Tonkin Government,

South Australia has had a better figure than the national figure every year, all but the first year during which this Government assumed office.

If one looks at the previous nine years of the former Government, one sees that the inflation rate in South Australia exceeded the national average on five years of those nine years. So, one can see that the performance of the Tonkin Government in being better than the national average on two out of its three years in office (the only year in which it was worse was the year in which it assumed office half way through), is quite good.

Let us now turn to the housing figures. I believe that we can show that South Australian housing figures hold up well against the national average. I refer to the 1982 annual report of the Indicative Planning Council, which has made projections for this coming year that shows that it expects South Australia to record a 4 per cent increase in housing commencements during this current financial year, that is, a 4 per cent increase compared with a national decrease of 16 per cent. That shows that South Australia is holding out against the national trend, and that is the true comparison of where South Australia holds relative to national trends.

I know that in the past the Opposition has always sought to point to this when it was to its advantage, but is unwilling to look at it now that it is not to its advantage. In addition, commencements by the Housing Trust this year will be up another 20 per cent over the record figure of last year. So, Housing trust commencements again will have an overall contribution of a 2 per cent increase for the State's building activity. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical table that shows the number of housing loans made to individuals by significant lenders for each of the States in Australia.

Leave granted.

Number of Housing Loans to Individuals by Significant Lenders

	For New Dwellings June Quarters			For Total Dwellings June Quarters		
	1981	1982	Per Cent Change	1981	1982	Per Cent Change
New South Wales	5 454	3 898	-28.5	19 580	14 430	-26.3
Victoria	4 493	3 823	-14.9	18 653	16 483	-11.6
Queensland	3 779	2 741	-27.5	9 851	7 743	-21.4
South Australia	1 043	898	-13.9	5 051	4 811	-4.8
Western Australia	2 140	1 590	-25.7	6 828	5 400	-20.9
Tasmania	303	190	-37.3	1 426	1 120	-21.5
Northern Territory	212	139	-34.4	589	430	-27.0
Australian Capital Territory	530	458	-13.6	1 514	1 294	-14.5
Australia	17 954	13 737	-23.7	63 492	51 711	-18.6

Dr BILLARD: That table shows quite clearly that the number of housing loans to individuals in South Australia is holding up a lot better than in any other State. The comparison for the June quarters between 1981 and 1982 shows that nationally there has been an 18.6 per cent decline. For example, there was a 26.3 per cent decline in New South Wales.

The decline in South Australia would be 4.8 per cent, and the next nearest State is Victoria, with an 11.6 per cent decline. So, their expectations of housing loans to individuals show that South Australia is performing far better than the Australian average. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it figures relating to motor vehicle registrations comparing South Australia with the Australian average over the last year.

The SPEAKER: Am I assured that it is purely statistical?

Dr BILLARD: Yes.

Leave granted.

Motor Vehicle Registrations
Per cent changes for month compared with same month a year before

	South Australia	Australia
May 1982	+13.7	+4.9
June 1982	+ 6.6	+5.4
July 1982	+15.9	-6.3

South Australia's share of Australian registrations was 7.5 per cent for 1981-82, 7.7 per cent in June quarter of 1982, and 7.9 per cent in July 1982.

Dr BILLARD: Those figures also show that South Australia is performing very much better than the Australian average. For example, in July 1982, compared with the same month in the previous year, the number of vehicle registrations was up by 15.9 per cent. That is not a decline, but an increase of almost 16 per cent, when nationally the figure was down by 6.3 per cent. One cannot deny those figures.

Mr Keneally: So, things are all right in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart will be able to advise the House whether or not things are all right in due course.

Dr BILLARD: I also seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them comparison figures of the movement in unemployment between August 1981 and August 1982 for each of the Australian States.

Leave granted.

Unemployment

In year from August 1981 to August 1982, unemployment has risen by:

Australia	+21.72 per cent
New South Wales	+32.28 per cent
Western Australia	+31.51 per cent
Tasmania	+26.28 per cent
Queensland	+14.00 per cent
Victoria	+11.08 per cent
South Australia	+ 4.14 per cent

Dr BILLARD: Again, those figures show that, although across Australia unemployment over the last year has increased by nearly 22 per cent, the increase in South Australia has been 4 per cent—less than half (nearly a third) of that of the next nearest State, being Victoria, with an increase of 11 per cent. Again, unemployment in South Australia has increased by much less than the Australian average over that period. Unless members think we are looking at unreal

figures, let them go back and compare the figures that applied during the last years of the Labor Administration. We can refer back to the Budget papers presented to us in this House in regard to unemployment figures for the May quarter. Members will recall that month by month figures were not kept until about 1976 or 1977 when the change was made from quarterly to monthly figures. The figures for the May quarter between 1976 and 1979, comparing the South Australian performance with the national performance, show that between those periods unemployment in South Australia increased by 87 per cent compared to a national increase of 41 per cent. So, we were twice as bad as the rest of Australia during that period of Labor Administration. Now, we are performing much better than the national average. We ought to make this comparison.

The final point I wish to make is that the figures I have just quoted are the result of the efforts of this Government in trying to draw investment into this State. The figures have been quoted recently in the press. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them figures showing trends in investment in manufacturing and mining, comparing South Australia with Australia, over the past three years.

Leave granted.

Investment Surveys
Planned Investment Project Expenditures
(Committed and final feasibility)
(Millions of dollars)

Manufacturing and Mining:	Apr. 79	Oct. 79	June 80	Dec. 80	June 81	Dec. 81	June 81
South Australia	255	300	3 410	2 640	2 910	3 480	4 030
Australia	12 444	16 350	28 920	33 380	35 520	32 820	31 990
S.A. per cent of Aust.	2.0	1.8	11.8	7.9	8.2	10.6	12.6

Dr BILLARD: Those figures also show—

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

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): Following that outburst from the member for Newland, I do not know whether I ought to speak on the subject about which I intended to speak in this debate. The impression that the member for Newland conveys is that the unemployment situation in this country is nothing to worry about at all.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: No, he did not say that.

Mr MAX BROWN: His comments certainly implied to me, if not to the Minister of Agriculture, that the 22 per cent of the population which is unemployed in this nation is something that has occurred along the line and something that should be put aside, as though it has not happened at all, and that in fact, the fact of 50 000-odd unemployed people in South Australia is nothing really to worry about, that it is an insignificant situation.

First, I point out that it ill behoves the member for Newland to make a contribution in this debate along the lines that he has done. The question of unemployment in this country is the greatest problem that any political party of whatever colour has had to face and it is a problem that should be faced immediately.

I refer now to an article in the business and finance columns of this afternoon's *News*. I read the business and finance columns because, naturally, I am rather interested in those matters. The article to which I refer, titled 'B.H.P. steel mills face showdown' states, in part:

Today is conference day at B.H.P.'s Newcastle steelworks and thousands of jobs hang in the balance. B.H.P. will first confer with major unions involved at the steelworks and later the Newcastle manager, Mr J. Rigby, will outline the company's future plans. The total shutdown of the Newcastle steelmaking plant is only one of many options considered by the company in recent weeks.

If I have time, I intend to deal with the question of the possible closedown of the Newcastle Steelworks. If I deal with that matter it will certainly give the lie to the statements made recently by the member for Newland.

The manufacturing industries in Australia are in real need, and I make no apologies for referring again to this matter. Those industries are in immediate need of some sort of Government assistance. The line of reasoning taken by the newspapers of this country, and particularly of this State, regarding the question of possible assistance for manufacturing industries, ill behoves them. No manufacturing industry, no matter what form it takes, can hope to compete with unfair trade practices. In that regard I refer particularly to the Japanese steel industry, because it is the Japanese steel industry, particularly in America and in this country, which is dumping. They are the people we must face up to in real terms if we are going to solve the problems of our manufacturing industries.

Governments, particularly the Federal Government, as well as the trade union movement (I do not rule it out, I never have and never will), must be consulted, together with the big industry chiefs, on the basis of co-operation. Assistance should be given by the Federal Government, but on a basis of real participation. I was more than pleased that the Federal shadow spokesman for commerce, Chris Hurford, went on record as having said that a Labor Government would in fact buy into a proposition such as that proposed by the B.H.P. steel industry. I was also pleased to note that the hierarchy of B.H.P. welcomed that.

Mr Gunn: But Mr Hayden and Mr Hawke didn't.

Mr MAX BROWN: If I have time I will have something to say about that for the benefit of the member for Eyre. I believe that that type of proposition is feasible and proper. However, for the member for Eyre's benefit, I realise that no political Party in Government can immediately undertake such an operation. Of course, it is really necessary to look

at the type of immediate assistance that can be given. I believe that is what Mr Hayden was referring to.

I now refer to the question of Japanese employees. As I have said, the Japanese are the main offenders in relation to dumping. I recall very vividly that at one time we said that Japanese workers were underpaid compared to Australian workers. We said that we could not compete with the Japanese on that basis. However, following further investigation into this question we found that that was a complete fallacy. We then said that industry had to have new techniques because Japan was accepting new techniques and we were not. I believe it is rather interesting that in Whyalla B.H.P. has invested no less than \$1 700 000 000 over the last ten years in upgrading and establishing new techniques. I accept that.

The issues that have been raised over a number of years about Australia not accepting new techniques, and about our wages being too high are, I repeat, not questions that will solve our problems in our manufacturing industries and, in particular, our steel industry. I have previously referred in this House to the role of the Minister of Industrial Affairs in this situation. I refer again to an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* where the Minister stated that we had to get off our backsides and get out and sell. I was particularly interested in that part of the article which states:

We are further advanced in establishing high technology than any other State.

That statement by the Minister gives the lie to what has been said on so many occasions. The article continues:

There is as much responsibility on the general work force as there is on management to ensure high productivity and quality to increase competitiveness.

That same Minister when he was a member of the Opposition was the world's greatest knocker of, for example, worker participation. However, the Minister is quoted in the article in the terms that I have just expressed.

Of course we need worker participation; of course we want workers' involvement, if we are going to have any sort of success in our manufacturing industry. Anybody who says otherwise is not facing up to the problems we have in the manufacturing industry. Unfortunately, I do not have time to go through all the other problems, but I leave the matter on this basis—

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I want to stress the importance of agriculture to the South Australian economy, especially in

view of the difficult drought conditions we are facing. Agriculture is vitally important to the economic welfare and development of South Australia. Despite rapid growth in the manufacturing and mining sectors, agriculture continues to underpin the economy. The gross value of agricultural production in South Australia in 1980-81 was approximately \$1 825 000 000. The income generated by the agricultural sector is six times that generated by mining. There are more than 23 000 farming establishments in South Australia, which is 12 times the number of manufacturing establishments. Agriculture contributes proportionately more in this State to the economy than it does in any other state except Queensland. It is the predominant primary industry. It is easily this State's most important export earner—exports of agricultural commodities from South Australia are worth nearly \$1 000 000 000 dollars per annum, which is two-thirds of the total value of South Australia's exports. Exports of wheat, barley and wool alone generate nearly 50 per cent of South Australia's export income.

Clearly, agriculture is a vital sector of South Australia's economy. Furthermore, the agricultural sector is instrumental in generating much income and employment in other sectors of the economy. The importance of agriculture compared with other sectors may be gauged by comparing the relative magnitudes of the output and employment multipliers of each sector. These multipliers indicate the additional output and employment generated in the economy as a result of a \$1 increase in the value of production in a particular sector. The output and employment multipliers in the agricultural sector are amongst the highest in the economy. For example, an extra dollar's worth of agricultural production generates more than \$2.50 worth of growth in the South Australian economy. In comparison, an extra dollar's worth of coal production generates \$1.60 worth of growth, while a \$1 increase in the value of petrochemical production leads to \$1.95 worth of growth. These figures indicate how important it is to continue to develop our mining industry and to make sure that we develop the huge mining resources in the north of the State. In view of the relatively high multiplier effects which flow from changes in activity in the rural sector, any diminution in the economic health of this sector will have widespread effects throughout the State. It is therefore clear that the present drought spells disaster not only for farmers but for the entire State. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Effects of Drought on Cereal Production and Farm Income in S.A.

Commodity	Production ('000 tonnes)		Estimated Percentage Decline in Production	Estimated Farm Income Lost (\$m)
	1981-82	1982-83 (estimated)		
Wheat	1 688	966	43	108.3
Barley	1 266	833	34	56.3
Oats	129	98	24	4.0
				168.6

Mr Keneally: Why don't you incorporate the whole paper?

Mr GUNN: I understand that the honourable member who is interjecting will have the opportunity to say something: whether he has anything constructive to say we will of course learn fairly soon. If he is up to his usual standard he will have nothing concrete to say. I understand that he is known as Mr 'Canardly' in his electorate; he can hardly do anything.

Mr KENEALLY: On a point of order, I think the member for Eyre is trying to make fun of my surname in the guise of using the English language—and using it very poorly. I

think you are aware, Mr Speaker, as the House would be, that he was using my surname. He should describe me as the honourable member for Stuart and ought not reflect on me, as it is against Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I am quite sure that the honourable member for Stuart will be able to defend himself in due course. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As you would be aware, the last thing I would want to do is offend Standing

Orders. There was no reflection; the reference to the honourable member was just a passing observation.

The effects of the drought on cattle properties have not been as severe as for sheep, largely because of the existence of ongoing destocking programmes (such as the brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication programme). Nevertheless, \$2 000 000 is expected to be lost due to the poorer condition of cattle, and \$25 000 000 will be lost due to the effect of the drought on calving.

Thus, the drought will lead to a total loss of farm income of at least \$271 000. Due to multiplier effects, this implies a loss to the South Australian economy of nearly \$700 000 000. Apart from farmers, those most severely affected are firms servicing farms (for example, machinery manufacturers) and businesses in country towns. Clearly, the drought has major implications not only for farmers but also for the whole of South Australia, and the impact of the drought serves to highlight the vital role that agriculture plays in underpinning the South Australian economy.

I believe that those comments clearly indicate the importance of ensuring that we adopt realistic policies in relation to agriculture. The other matter to which I want to refer briefly is the effect of the 10 per cent surcharge on electricity in my district. I have spoken about this matter on a number of occasions. There appear to be great anomalies. One house can be connected directly to the ETSA supply, and another can be connected to a supply from a scheme that is operated by the district council: one person has to pay a 10 per cent surcharge, but the other person does not. All of the electricity comes from Port Augusta on Northern Eyre Peninsula.

Let me make clear that I am very keen to see the electricity system extended to all parts of my district that currently have no electricity connected, that is, to the west of Penong in the Coorabie area and in the Flinders Range up as far as Blinman. I believe it is essential. If it is good enough for the Government to subsidise the metropolitan transport system, which amounts to millions and millions of dollars every month, it is good enough for it to charge electricity on the same basis to all citizens of the State. Therefore, I hope that the Premier will be in a position to phase in a scheme during the next three years that will allow the suggestions that I have put forward to come into effect.

The current situation, whereby people find that electricity charges are increasing, is not good. Having very carefully read the annual report of ETSA, I can see the need to secure long term supplies of gas, and that is causing concern. I have discussed this matter with officers of the trust on many occasions. I fully understand that the Country Areas Subsidy Act currently costs the Treasury about \$2 500 000, and that cost has been increasing quite rapidly over the past few years.

However, one has to bear in mind the other subsidies, such as transport costs, which readily come to mind. I realise it is essential to have a properly organised transport system in the metropolitan area, but I believe that, in today's situation, it is not too much to ask not only that people in country areas have a reliable electricity supply but also that they receive that supply at the same rate as does anyone else in South Australia. In some of those areas people do not have the luxury of adequate supplies of reticulated water, they have limited communications systems (such as the telephone) and they do not have access to the range of cultural activities as do people in large towns. The Government makes a considerable contribution to those areas.

I believe that this matter needs urgent attention, and I appeal to the Premier to do something about it in view of the fact that the Outback Areas Trust has been involved in taking over some of the activities that are currently run by Australian National. In places like Marree, where Australian

National greatly subsidised electricity and other activities, the costs have increased considerably. I am sure that the Premier, in his usual diligent fashion, will give his urgent attention to the matters I have raised.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): First, I congratulate the member for Florey on his election, and also on the address he gave the House this afternoon. The events that led to the by-election are indeed sad. I want to pay a tribute to the former member for Florey, Howard O'Neill. Further, I should congratulate the electors of Florey on their wisdom in electing the present member to that position. During the course of the Leader's and the member for Florey's remarks, reference was made to the type of campaign that was conducted during that by-election. It is nothing new, because we have seen this fear-and-smear tactic employed previously.

Mr Randall: What do we call you?

Mr SLATER: If the member for Henley Beach is fair and reasonable he will recall that, at the State election in 1979, some of the tactics employed were beyond the bounds of responsibility. In particular, I refer to the campaign on law and order. It was a scare and fear campaign. We can well remember the advertisements, the 'stocking over the head' advertisements.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr SLATER: We have never been able to ascertain whose head was under that stocking, and I do not suggest that the Minister for Agriculture was involved, but the member for Stuart, a person of great perception, even though he may not be able to recognise the head of the person under the stocking, believes he recognised the person who owns the stocking, and I might say it is not the Minister of Health.

The tactics he employed then certainly did not portray a feeling of good will in regard to politics in South Australia. The idea was to convey that in some way the responsibility for the crime rate lay with the Labor Government, yet nothing can be further from the truth. Certainly, the Labor Government was not responsible for the upsurge in crime, but the advertisements suggested that the people of this State were not safe if they walked out of their homes at night. Again, I refer to the current situation because, if honourable members are fair and reasonable, they will accept that present statistics show that crime in South Australia has increased significantly, particularly crimes of violence. Indeed, I refer to the number of bizarre murders in South Australia, although in no way do I blame the Government for those events.

Mr Keneally: That is quite different from the Liberal Party's tactics.

Mr SLATER: It is quite different from the attitude conveyed to the public at large by our opponents during the 1979 State election, and to some degree they tried to do that during this by-election for the seat of Florey. This is a pointer to what we can expect in the near future at the next State election campaign. I hope that it is not. I do not believe that that should be a tactic employed in politics, and my Leader has made that point this afternoon.

I believe the game should be played fairly and reasonably, without involving that type of politics. Recent Federal events have shown not only the upsurge in the volume of crime but also the crime that occurs, encompassing white-collar crime and tax avoidance. It shows just how prevalent such crime is in the community. In passing, I indicate that the recent Select Committee on the Casino Bill scratched the surface, more or less, in regard to the amount of organised crime that occurs within the community. The committee did not have the powers of a royal commission but at least it did take evidence and submissions from various people not only in this State but also in other States which indicated

the sort of situation that has been revealed by the Costigan Royal Commission.

It was interesting to note the Chief Secretary of South Australia being quoted in the press on 8 September as stating that evidence of organised crime had been found in this State. That statement arose as a result of certain evidence that came forward in the Costigan Report. For the information of the Chief Secretary, that is nothing new, because, had the Minister read the evidence that was given to the casino select committee, he would have seen that there were indications in certain statements that that sort of crime existed throughout Australia and that it had tentacles reaching into this State. The public is greatly concerned, about the incidence not only of violent crime to which I have referred but also of organised crime. It is clear that Governments, both at State and Federal level, need to move quickly and positively to give our law enforcement agencies the support that they need, and wherever possible to combat this epidemic.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SLATER: There is talk of forming an Australian Crimes Commission. That may or may not assist in this situation. There must be a different attitude in the community generally. We can only set an example. Parliament makes the laws and the courts enforce them. By the time laws are proposed, there are smarties in the community endeavouring to beat those laws for personal gain or advantage.

I want now to comment on the casino select committee. I believe that the Government should assist committees and commissions in every way possible. The work of the South Australian casino select committee was somewhat impeded by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer of Queensland, Dr Lew Edwards, who stopped a top public servant, Mr Leysdon, from attending before and giving evidence to that committee. Arrangements had been made for him to come to Adelaide to give evidence to the committee. In the late afternoon, prior to Mr Latham's proposed attendance, a telephone call was received by the Secretary of the committee advising that Mr Latham would not be attending, as the Deputy Premier and Treasurer of Queensland had not given him permission to attend.

Mr Hemmings: That's shameful.

Mr SLATER: Well, that is what happened. Members of the committee were anxious to interview Mr Latham and obtain information relating to the method employed in issuing licences for Queensland casinos and other associated matters. I believe that no valid explanation was given for that refusal of permission for Mr Latham, Chairman of the Casino Commission in Queensland, which is responsible for issuing casino licenses in that State, to attend. A few days later the select committee received a written document, which was forwarded through its Secretary to the committee. My point is that the committee did not have an opportunity to question that person and to obtain information further than that provided by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer of Queensland. That was standard information. I believe that Mr Edwards was prompted (if I might use that term) to provide the written documents after refusing permission for a public servant to attend that committee. I understand that the comment was made by the person who telephoned that the veto was imposed because the Queensland Government 'did not want to stir things up in that state on the casino issue again because everything was quiet at the moment'.

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

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I begin by placing on record my appreciation to the member for Mawson and also to the doctor, whose name I forget, to whom the honourable member referred in his question this afternoon, for continuing to give publicity to the proposition by my Party to build what is called a polyclinic in the South. It is very good of these people to continue to remind my constituents and the constituents of the member for Mawson that this benefit will flow to them from the election of a Labor Government. I hope that they keep giving us this publicity.

In view of the interest that the member and the Minister have shown in this matter, I thought that I should rehearse with the House one or two matters in relation to the whole question. Of course, this has been a long saga. One can go back to 1973—and I hope I am not misrepresenting the position—when the Liberal Party promised to build a community hospital in the south. Of course, no political Party can promise to build a community hospital because a community hospital is contingent on funding being available from the local area, probably through local government and, hence, having its source in rates.

Unless there is a commitment from local government in the south (and there never has been) for that to happen, then there is no way that any Government of any political persuasion can make it happen. My understanding has always been that the city of Noarlunga has seen that it is sufficiently tied up with the McLaren Vale Hospital not to want to put additional funds in other directions.

Be that by the way, let us return to what the honourable member, who seems to be so keen to raise this matter, was saying at the time of the 1979 State election. I have a photostat copy of an election pamphlet which that gentleman distributed at that time. It says, 'September 1979—The people of Mawson wait. Here is the 'hospital' today.' The member was there referring to the earlier proposition, and what was then regarded as still being a viable proposition, to build a private hospital in the area.

On this pamphlet there is a photograph of an empty paddock and a hoarding headed 'Noarlunga District Hospital'. There is some sort of diagram—a side elevation, perhaps a perspective, of the hospital. On the right-hand side (and I only realised this in re-examining the document today) is what looks a bit like a Rorschach ink blot, but what is, in fact, the member with his hands in his pockets examining the hoarding. That is not a reflection on the honourable member's physiognomy: it is rather a reflection on the quality of the print that I have in front of me. The honourable member is making the point that nothing is happening and 'you deserve better than this', the pamphlet says. On the other side of the pamphlet it says, 'Vote Liberal, Schmidt 1 for Mawson'.

So, the clear implication is that if people 'vote Liberal, Schmidt for Mawson' the sign will be taken down and will be replaced by reality, by a hospital. In fact, people in Mawson did Vote Schmidt—or at least in sufficient numbers for that candidate to become the member for Mawson in this place. Yet, the sign eventually went down but has not been replaced by any reality.

Let us quickly rehearse what has happened in those three years. On 30 October 1979 I received from the Minister of Health a reply to a question I had earlier placed on notice. The question said:

1. Does the Government intend that a hospital be built adjacent to the Noarlunga Regional Centre, and if so, will this hospital be public, community or private and when will work commence?

2. If it is to be a private hospital, will it be built by the consortium which negotiated with the former Government and will a guarantee be available?

3. Will the hospital include casualty, maternity and out-patients services?

The answer was:

1. Yes, a private hospital.
2. Yes and yes.

3. These services were not included in the approval given by the former Government for the scheme to proceed. These two matters are being re-examined.

Then, on 6 November, the member for Mawson asked the Minister of Health what was happening in relation to this matter. The Minister replied:

The position with the hospital at Christies Beach is that the processing of legal documents in respect of the loan guarantee which this Government and the previous Government proposed is now proceeding in an orderly fashion, and will be completed as soon as practicable; I would say in the very near future.

So the reply goes on. Somebody called 'Nearly 1980' (and I think I can guess who the person probably was—I think it was the inexhaustible Mr W.B. Wreford), wrote to the *Southern Times* on 19 December a little worried that there seemed to have been not much progress. The heading was, 'Government neglects southern hospital.' On 1 February the heading we had in the *Southern Times* was 'Hospital for the south—at last', and a reference to the announcement the day before by the Minister of Health, Mrs Adamson, as follows:

... that construction of the \$3 000 000 Noarlunga District Hospital will begin next month, brought an enthusiastic response ...

The report goes on again to refer to the Mr W.B. Wreford, to whom I referred earlier. Perhaps we should have been warned by a statement through Barry Hailstone, the medical writer for the *Advertiser*, quoting Mr B. V. McKay of the Health Commission. He said:

South Australia had too many hospital beds and many of them were too expensive, the chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, Mr B. V. McKay, told the Commission of Inquiry into the Efficiency and Administration of Hospitals yesterday.

Instead, on 16 July 1980 we had a heading: 'Hopes rise for hospital'. Why had hopes risen? Because Mr Grant Chapman had been brought into the process. Mr Grant Chapman had lobbied the Federal Treasurer, John Howard, and the Foreign Investment Review Board to get the go-ahead for the project. I do not know whether that was the difference between success and failure, but what we do know was that virtually nothing further happened. There was a further exchange in the columns of the *Southern Times* about the whole matter.

Then the Noarlunga Consultative Group came out with a strong statement saying, 'The south is still waiting. When are we going to get some sort of answer?' This was in October 1981. Within that week the member for Mawson asked a question of the Minister of Health in this place, and the burden of her answer was that there would be no proceeding with this proposition. So there it is. People were invited to vote for the Liberal candidate in that area and that paddock would be covered by a hospital. The vacant paddock is there, the sign has gone down and nothing is there. What instead there is, of course, a proposition that is realistic, being put forward by my Party, to do something. I cannot understand why the Liberal Party is so keen to advertise its eagerness to do absolutely nothing, why it would want to shoot down this proposition. The Labor Party has realistically concluded that it is not possible at present to spend vast sums of money on a hospital facility. We understand, for example, that there are another 100 beds to be commissioned at Flinders Medical Centre before further beds are put in the south, and there is not at present the immediate demand for that to happen. Therefore, it would be quite wasteful to be going in for a duplication of anything like Flinders or even anything like Modbury in the south at present. We have examined the polyclinic at Mount Druitt. We know that it has had a very successful life for 10 or more years. We know that it has provided

casualty facilities. These, of course, are no longer necessary because the 130 000 population area is about to get its hospital but, nonetheless, it met a great need in this area for many years. It has been able to co-exist with about 160 general practitioners who are in that local area.

What the Labor Party proposes is, I believe, a realistic response to the perceived needs of the people of the area. I cannot understand why the Minister is so keen to paint such a rosy picture of the situation in the south as against what is obviously seen as the overwhelming wish of the people in that area. I do not know what sort of favour she thinks she is doing to her candidates who seek election or re-election in that area, but I simply want to place on record that what we propose is realistic, can be funded, will certainly commence within the first term of a Labor Government, and there has never been any secret about the matter, despite an enigmatic reference in the House from a member opposite who said that there had been no date put on the commencement of it. It will proceed to the benefit of local people in the area.

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I am compelled to respond to the comments made by the member for Baudin. When the Labor Party has no grounds on which to make an argument it attacks the person in question in the hope of creating a smear around that person. It tries to create a screen behind which to hide. If the member for Baudin looked at his own campaign in the 1973, 1975, 1977 and 1979 elections, he would find that that very same issue had been flogged to death by the Labor Party. The member for Baudin is correct when he holds up a small pamphlet which I issued during the last election. If members opposite would listen they would realise that earlier in the year the Labor Party had made promises to the constituents in that area through big banner headlines saying, 'Hospital on the Way'. The member for Baudin now has the audacity to criticise when the same persons who agreed to go ahead with the project told the current Minister that they would go ahead and when the Minister announced that the project is well under way; he then criticised her for saying that the hospital is about to be built.

The previous Minister of Health did the same thing when he thought the project would go ahead. The people in the south were led to believe over four consecutive elections that there would be some form of hospital in that region. We know the history of it is that Mr Wreford, who has been referred to, campaigned strongly on that hospital because, at the time (when he began campaigning in the late 1960s and early 1970s), a great vacuum existed in regard to medical services available.

Since coming to office, this Government has done much to encourage, as was stated in my pamphlet for the 1979 election. I said that, as a Party, we would not stand in the way of the development of that private hospital. We emphasised that it was a private hospital and did not, as the previous Labor Government had done, imply that it was going to be some form of Government hospital. As a last desperate measure the former Minister, the member for Elizabeth, came up with the idea that the Labor Party would add on a maternity wing to try to win the maternity vote. The former Government realised that it was a private hospital all along, that it could not force a private company to build a hospital. The company believed it was not viable to go ahead and hence pulled out of the project. In order to save face, it appears that the Labor Party has now gone off on a tangent to try to win the emotional vote in the south in regard to medical services. Honourable members have been talking about the need to be efficient. We heard the member for Baudin say that his own committee realises that a community or district hospital is not warranted in

that area at this time. An article in the *Southern Times* states:

The Labor Party examined all of these options very carefully but rejected them.

The Labor Party rejected all possibilities. However, it then went ahead and floated the idea of a polyclinic and stated that it would be provided on a 24-hour basis and would be modelled on the Mount Druitt polyclinic. As I said in Question Time, I went to Mount Druitt on Friday and spoke to Dr Mooy. I state categorically that that polyclinic at Mount Druitt is not functional 24 hours a day.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Ours will be.

Mr SCHMIDT: I am glad it will be. The Director said that the polyclinic was in no way designed to be in competition with other services available in the area. It acted to provide a service until such time as that service became available and, as it becomes available, the whole structure of the clinic would be reorganised and modified to provide other services. The main thrust of the clinic is to provide preventive health. That is exactly what the Government is endeavouring to do each year through our health clinics. As I have said, there is one at Christies Beach and one at Morphett Vale.

The other matter that Dr Mooy pointed out is that it is very essential before one embarks upon the setting of a polyclinic to examine very carefully the requirements of the district involved. That is exactly what is occurring at the moment. Through the Morphett Vale Community Health Clinic, researchers are assigned, through the Flinders Medical Research Centre, to carefully research not only the medical requirements, but, more importantly, the definitive health and back-up services required in the southern area. Until such time as that research group concludes its thorough investigations (there have been some preliminary investigations to date, but further investigations are continuing), it would be ludicrous to say categorically that a polyclinic will be built to provide X, Y and Z, when the nature of X, Y and Z had not been determined by (and I hesitate to say it) a more qualified research group than the two, three or four members of the Labor Party's rank and file.

The research group from the Flinders Medical Research Centre is currently in the process of undertaking research in that area. As I have pointed out in regard to the Mount Druitt situation, when that area was set up some 10 years ago the ratio of doctors to other people was one to every 5 000. Therefore, one realises that there was certainly a great scarcity of doctors for that area; they were almost like hens teeth. There were no services at all. The nearest hospital was at Parramatta and another was at Penrith. Therefore, special attention was given to the Mount Druitt area because it was (and everyone agrees) subject to very poor planning on behalf of the Housing Commission at the time. Masses and masses of people were put *en masse* in that locality, with no back-up services whatsoever; so, the polyclinic was built.

We know that in the southern area, and this was mentioned this afternoon during Question Time, there is a whole range of services available to the community either through the community health centres or through private practitioners, and there is also a vast range of services available through various specialist clinics.

The other matter that Dr Mooy pointed out to me concerned the fact that the so-called casualty section of the polyclinic at Mount Druitt would no longer be functional within the next few months, because it was to be transferred to a new hospital which is about to be commissioned, and which I believe will be commissioned when the Queen arrives in New South Wales and opens the new hospital. The casualty facilities will go to the new hospital. The Health Commission in New South Wales itself undertook

a study to determine whether or not the hours of operation of the casualty section of the polyclinic should be extended beyond 10 p.m. The New South Wales Health Commission (if the Labor Party is happy to listen to the research carried out under the Wran Labor Government) found that the extension of casualty services beyond 10 p.m. was not warranted because it was found that only two or three people ever required emergency service. When people required the service of a doctor they could make use of the *locum* service that was available in the Mount Druitt area. A similar service is available in the southern suburbs.

Dr Mooy was also very impressed with the idea that private enterprise in South Australia had taken the initiative in establishing a 24-hour service to the people. We have such a service at Christies Beach and another now at Reynella, where people can go at any time during the night and obtain the services of a doctor and a qualified nurse who are in attendance.

A letter to the Editor in last week's paper criticised the fact that services were not continuing after 10 o'clock and that doctors from the clinic would not go out to see people. However, it is not so much the role of doctors to go out and see people. If they have the time they do, but importantly doctors endeavour to stay in attendance. Even if we had a polyclinic, I doubt very much whether doctors would go out and visit people at home: people would still have to go to the clinic to receive attention.

The New South Wales Health Commission found that the cost of establishing a 24-hour emergency service was not warranted unless such a service was part of the overall running of a major hospital, or certainly a larger hospital than that which would be a polyclinic. Only when it could be encompassed within the costing of that hospital could the provision of services be warranted for 24 hours a day. I think the Labor Party is way off beam when it says that it will provide a polyclinic which will give emergency service.

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

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): Two weeks ago all members of this House received a letter from the Munno Para Primary School Council which set out its concern about the future of its school. In part the letter states:

As a 'holding school' Munno Para buildings have never been intended to accommodate children for longer than three years duration. The site is at present inadequate for the instruction of even the basic needs. No hard play area, substandard toilets—both in size and construction, and open areas of mud and dirt. A decent playground surface cannot be established because of doubts concerning future building siting. A feeling of apathy abounds—not only amongst parents and community members but also within the children and teaching staff.

As a school in its fourth year of operation this establishment is an embarrassment to the community and the Education Department. Our Premier speaks of the good example set by South Australia in the field of education yet the Government does little to foster this image at Munno Para: a school containing approximately 40 per cent of R.A.A.F. children destined to conclude their education in other States. The parents of these children compare: compare and remember the inadequacies of their children's education within our State.

The Munno Para Primary School is, I think, a classic example of the results of this Government's cut-backs in public works programmes which have denied children in holding schools the right to receive their education in a decent environment. I will outline the history of the Munno Para primary holding school, which was the first established in this State. In fact, it was set up under the previous Labor Government. The idea was that, in areas where there was a growing community, a solid construction school would not be built in the first instance; instead, the department would wait and see how the community developed. I attended the first meeting of the Munno Para Primary School Parents' Committee and I

voiced my protest. As a result of that protest I approached the then Minister, my colleague the member for Baudin, who assured me that this was a result not of Government policy but of Education Department policy.

Because of my protest, and because I felt for the people in that area, I received a letter which stated, in effect, that in 1982, or when the enrolments reached 400 students, a solid construction school would be built in the Munno Para area. The community was advised to participate in the structure of the new school. A glossy pamphlet, which was released by the Education Department, and which was given to all parents moving into that area, states in the first paragraph:

It is planned to be a holding school of timber construction to serve the Munno Para community for three years. During this time the community will take part in planning for a permanent school.

The community played its part and participated, but it seems that, despite the promises made by the previous Labor Government, in 1979 and despite funding set aside within the Education Department for a solid construction school, in 1982 this Government has just wiped them off. On 15 September 1981, I asked the present Minister the following question:

1. When was the decision taken to establish a holding school at Munno Para, and when was it opened?
2. What is the present enrolment and how does that compare with the anticipated enrolment?
3. Will the solid-construction school be built in one or more stages and what completion date is proposed for each stage?

This was the rather glib reply from the Minister of Education:

The anticipated capacity is 300—

he was talking about the enrolment—

and the latest July figure was 402. The construction of the solid stage of all existing holding schools will be deferred for at least three years.

I have always maintained that the commitment made to parents and the community at Munno Para was that the solid construction school would be built in 1982. Things have gone from bad to worse. I have received numerous letters and numerous deputations from people in that area, asking why a solid construction school could not be built there. On 16 August this year I wrote to the Minister, stating in the last paragraph:

The situation now is that the toilets are in a disgusting state and totally inadequate for the number of students at the school. I am sure that if the local board of health inspected them they would be closed. I am not considered by my colleagues to be a pessimist but I feel that my secretary's time will be wasted typing this letter as the needs of the Munno Para Primary School will, as usual, be placed at the bottom of the list.

That is exactly how the Minister of Education views the needs of the Munno Para Primary School. Two days later, on 18 August, I received a reply from the Minister's Secretary, as follows:

Thank you for your letter to the Minister of Education . . . The matter is being investigated and the Minister will write to you as soon as possible.

We are dealing with toilets—temporary toilets—which have to be cleaned by the teaching staff and which adequately cater for only half the number of the children in that school. The matter is being investigated, but I still have no reply from the Minister. People have written to me but have asked that their names be deleted from their letterhead because they are frightened of recriminations from the Minister.

Mr Mathwin: Come on!

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Glenelg says, 'Come on!' The people of Munno Para feel they are being discriminated against: they are being discriminated against, and the Minister is not in the least concerned.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HEMMINGS: I do not give warnings or make threats lightly, but if this Government does not do anything about the Munno Para Primary School toilet facilities I will contact the local board of health and get the toilets closed. When they are closed this Government will be forced to take some action. Members opposite are laughing, but they do not realise what it is like, because in their own areas they are well served. It is only in working-class areas such as Munno Para that the Minister does not care what is going on.

If the Minister does not take any action, I will ensure that the toilets are closed, and, when they are closed, the school will be closed. There will be such a wave of indignation against this Government that it will be forced to do something. The Minister rather facetiously, and the member for Glenelg, said, 'We gave you a multi-purpose hall.' This is like the days of the French Revolution—give them cake.

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

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I thought that one of the more perceptive comments from the conservative forces in our community following Mr Gregory's successful win in the Florey by-election was the comment in the *Australian* on Monday 6 September. In an article written by Peter Ward and Brian Hill, it was suggested, in a very clear fashion to the State and Federal Liberal Governments, that the message of the Florey by-election was a warning on the effects of unemployment in the electorate.

I believe that that is a very realistic and accurate comment, and in that regard one need only reflect on the State and Federal Budgets (as I have done briefly in previous speeches in this House in recent weeks), and on the provisions in those Budgets for the unemployed in our community and in particular for positive job creation programmes. Indeed, that reflection is very distressing indeed. I believe that the Florey by-election result shows clearly that the community will not tolerate the heartless attitude of the Federal Government towards the unemployed, and the Government must come to some positive resolution of the problems of unemployment in our community.

Indeed, the Budget attacked those fundamental industries in our State in which we place so much hope to provide employment. I refer to the increase in sales tax on white-goods production and motor vehicles. One need only assess the Federal Budget and the State Budget right across the board to see the attitude of this Government to those who are most in need in our community. It is pertinent to refer to the statements made in another place last week and today by the Premier on tax evasion and tax avoidance, which, as we all know, is a massive industry in Australian society today.

The leaflet that the Minister of Industrial Affairs quoted today is one of the many circulars which legal practitioners and, no doubt, other professional groups in the community receive and which advertise very blatantly ways in which taxation can be minimised. Indeed, the comments of the Attorney-General indicated that that, in fact, was par for the course, so he eliminated from his comments any degree of moral responsibility by practitioners of the law and accountants to advise their clients on alternative methods and their responsibilities to pay proper levels of taxation. The Prime Minister's comments, as biting as they were in regard to his own Parliamentary colleagues and members of his Party throughout this country, were very apt indeed, because he said (as I recall) that the lawyers and accountants who are involved in promoting these schemes are 1 000 times more harmful to the community than the Norm Gallaghers, the builders laborers unions, and other unions in our community.

I want to refer very briefly tonight to the effect of tax evasion on the delivery of services at both the Federal and State levels, because it is the poorest people in our community who pay for the loss of revenue. While some people enjoy great luxuries and riches, other people are forced to live in substandard and subhuman conditions. Indeed, the whole community suffers because of the lower level of services that is provided because of the lack of taxation revenue. It has been estimated that as much as \$6 billion has been lost nationally to revenue by tax avoidance and tax evasion in recent years. That is an incredible figure indeed.

Even if that figure is an over-estimation of the amount of revenue lost in tax avoidance and evasion (and I suggest that it is not), then one can only envisage the increased services that could be provided to the Australian community with a fraction of that money. I look to my electorate, for instance, and to some of the decisions made by this Government to diminish services or to defer improvements that are badly needed in the community. One such decision concerned the upgrading of Glynburn Road, which forms one of the boundaries of my district. That road is in an appalling condition. It is one of the few major roads in the metropolitan area with dirt verges. The dust from those verges, and the noise from that road is a source of inconvenience to motorists, pedestrians and people living in the suburbs adjoining it, yet the Minister of Transport says that nothing can be done about it for some years.

I have received complaints from constituents about class sizes in schools, the lack of repairs to buildings and facilities provided in schools, and the deferral of building programmes. There have also been complaints about the lack of staff and the staff/student ratio in kindergartens. There have been complaints from people who are not receiving the level of services in our hospitals that they received in the past as either inpatients or outpatients. They have complained, also, about the increased cost of medical care in the community, and about the lack of money available for the purchase of recreation space. My district is one that has little recreation space available to residents. It is expensive for local government authorities, in particular, to buy the small amount of vacant land that is available to use for that purpose. Indeed, the monetary reserves that are available from State Government coffers for that purpose are much depleted causing the deferral of purchase of land for recreation purposes by local government authorities. That opportunity is lost and so the community suffers.

Cutbacks in welfare expenditure directly touch on those most in need in our community. All of these factors are further exacerbated by the lack of funds coming from the Federal Government because of tax avoidance in our society. That fact is that tax avoidance has become institutionalised and acceptable to so many people (as we see from the comments made by the Premier today and by the Attorney-General, the first law officer of this State, in recent weeks). I will refer now to some comments which have been made by persons from organisations in Victoria and which were compiled by the Victorian Council of Social Services. They relate to reductions in services that will occur in that State as a result of the recent Federal Budget and of the inability of that State Government to pick up the tab for many of the services from which funds have been depleted. The first of these comments is pertinent to the outburst about health services earlier this evening by the member for Mawson. The Community Health Coalition in Victoria is reported as saying the following:

The Federal Budget has made it quite clear that the Federal Government sees its role in health care provision as restricted to subsidising the private sector treatment of illness through fee-for-

service medical practice, pharmaceutical services, and private nursing homes.

Of the \$466 000 000 increase in direct Commonwealth health funding (a 16 per cent increase on 1981-82), 82 per cent goes directly to doctors, chemists and private nursing homes. \$52 000 000 of the increase for medical benefits is to provide for increases in scheduled medical fees.

We see from those remarks the real reason why the Minister of Health made the statements she made today about the provision of a community health centre in the southern suburbs. We see also that the miserly increase to young unemployed people, the first for some six years, is hopelessly insufficient.

The cut-backs for Aboriginal health services and for those who are suffering from physical and mental disabilities are having serious effects. Money is not forthcoming to solve the housing needs of our community. The cuts in foreign aid, the cuts in community legal services (which, indeed, are a very real problem in this State) and the cuts in education and welfare programmes, I suggest are a direct result of the inability of the current Federal Government and State Government to come to grips with tax evasion and a more equitable distribution of the wealth in our society.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): Over the past few months I have listened to various members complaining about the treatment they have received from Ministers. In particular, the member for Spence recently complained about the delay in receiving replies from Ministers. The member for Salisbury has also complained, and tonight the member for Napier complained about the Minister of Education and the delay in receiving replies.

Tonight I want to talk about the delays in connection with the Chief Secretary. When the Chief Secretary was elevated to the Ministerial ranks, I thought that he was a man with compassion, a man who would think about things, and a man who would do things. Unfortunately, I have been very much disillusioned.

An honourable member: They try to be nice.

Mr WHITTEN: They do. I received a request from a lady for assistance to enable her to have a child—not by me, but by artificial insemination.

Mr Mathwin: Was it a shock, George?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg knows full well that he should not address any member in this House by other than his electorate name.

Mr WHITTEN: This lady is married to a prisoner, a person in Yatala who I would think would be there for quite some time. Some 18 to 20 months ago this lady and her husband wrote to the then Chief Secretary, the now member for Victoria, and requested assistance to enable them to have a child. They received no reply from the Chief Secretary at that time.

This couple then approached their doctor, who also wrote to the then Chief Secretary and the Director of Correctional Services. The doctor received no reply and then referred the lady to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Fertility Clinic; I believe that the doctor in charge is Dr Read. The doctor performed certain tests on the lady and found that she was able to conceive by artificial insemination, but that the husband would be required to attend the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to make that donation.

Much compassion and thought is needed in this case. This lady married this prisoner after his conviction and when he was serving time in Yatala. The then Chief Secretary, the now member for Victoria, allowed that prisoner to come out of Yatala and be married at the Uniting Church in Bowden. Of course, the marriage has not been consummated. Clearly this couple dearly desire to have children or, at

least, one child. This lady would now be 39 years of age and her doctor has advised her that it is necessary, if she is to become pregnant, to do so as soon as possible because she is getting to the age where it would be damaging to her and perhaps to the child.

I wrote to the now Chief Secretary and appealed to him to show some compassion. To give the House more appreciation of the situation, in the letter I said:

I wish to advise that Mrs (X of an address) has sought my assistance in her efforts to obtain permission to have a child by artificial insemination procedure.

Mrs (X's) husband is (X), who is an inmate at Yatala Prison and since 17 July 1979 has been serving a life sentence on 2 July 1980, permission was granted for him to leave Adelaide Gaol to be married at the Uniting Church at Brompton.

Early in 1981, this lady sought the advice of her own doctor, regarding the possibility of her having a child, which she desperately desires. The doctor referred her to Dr M. Read, President Obstetrician at Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Tests were conducted at Professor Cox Clinic at the hospital which showed that the lady could conceive by artificial insemination. Dr Read wrote to the local doctor on 27 March 1981 that permission would have to be obtained from the Department of Correctional Services.

The local doctor has advised me that he wrote to the Prisons Medical Officer but received no reply. I am also advised that the prisoner wrote to the Director of Correctional Services on 15 June 1982 seeking permission for the procedure, but as yet no reply has been received.

The lady was born on 19 April 1943, and has been advised that if she is to have a child it should be in the near future.

I would appeal to you to use your good offices to enable this lady to have the child she dearly desires.

Yours Sincerely,

George T. Whitten
Member for Price

The Hon. J. W. Olsen: What was the date of your letter?

Mr WHITTEN: The date of my letter to the Minister was 9 July 1982. I will say that the Minister replied fairly promptly, on 19 July, and I thought when he wrote it that I was going to get somewhere because it started off, 'Dear George'. I thought that this was going to be all right. He wrote:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter 9 July 1982, on behalf of this lady, regarding her efforts to obtain permission to have a child by artificial insemination.

I am having inquiries made into this matter and will write to you again upon receipt of the advice.

The Minister replied to me on 19 July. I believe that nothing has been done about it. I believe that this Minister is afraid. He lacks the intestinal fortitude to front up to this matter. I cannot see why in 18 to 20 months something has not been done to tell that lady, 'No, you are not going to have a child.'

The Hon. J. W. Olsen: Six weeks I have had it, not 18 months.

Mr WHITTEN: I am saying that the previous Minister—

The Hon. J. W. Olsen: I have had it six weeks.

Mr WHITTEN: I do not want to argue the point with the Minister across the Chamber. They are Liberals. It does not matter: they are both Liberal Ministers. I would say that the previous Minister was also a man of compassion. I thought he was, but he delayed the matter as much as he could. He does not intend to do anything about it. Probably after this exposure tonight he will do nothing about it, either, because I think that would put the black alley in. But I had to do this. The lady telephoned me last week, and said, 'Please, Mr Whitten, can you help me? I dearly want that child.' I said, 'I will raise the matter with the Minister as soon as I can.'

The Hon. J. W. Olsen: I have not had a telephone call from you.

Mr WHITTEN: Of course the Minister has not.

The Hon. J. W. Olsen: I am reasonably accessible on the phone.

Mr WHITTEN: If the Minister is reasonably accessible on the phone, surely to God he can be reasonably accessible on a typewriter. Surely he can do something about it. But it is not only the Minister. I am complaining not only about the Minister: I am complaining about the Director of Correctional Services. I am complaining about the doctor or the medical officer at Yatala, who has not had the decency to reply to the local doctor. I have given you the names; I have given you all the information: the dates on which the letters were written and the dates on which the prisoner wrote to the Director of Correctional Services.

Mr Keneally: It sounds as if they've—

Mr WHITTEN: It appears to me that they have been instructed to do nothing whatsoever. Members may laugh and think that this is a joke, but it is not a joke to that lady.

The Hon. J. W. Olsen: It's no joke, and it is being treated seriously.

Mr WHITTEN: I hope it is. I warned the Minister that I would bring the matter to the attention of the House tonight because I considered it to be serious, and that I would line him up. I would not have done it tonight had he not been here. I do not attack a Minister or any member of this Parliament unless he is here to hear it. I have never done that yet. That is why I wanted to ensure that he was here; otherwise, I would have spoken on some other matter. I appeal to the Chief Secretary to look at the matter and get the full facts.

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

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I rise in this grievance debate to set the record straight, particularly in regard to a grievance debate speech by the member for Baudin on 2 September when he criticised my colleague, friend and neighbour (the member for Brighton) for his attitude in criticising the Gilbertson Gully Protection Committee in relation to a meeting which it called and about which he, as the member, was not informed. The member for Baudin said that he had been approached by a group of people associated with the committee and that some people had asked him to put the record straight. He claimed that no such meeting had been called for Sunday 22 August. I inform the member for Baudin that a meeting was called by members of that committee. That meeting was held in secret, and many people, including the member for Brighton, many members of the Brighton City Council, the Town Clerk, and I were not informed.

The meeting, on 22 August, was called and, incidentally, was canvassed by Labor Party members who undertook a doorknock of the area. The member who hopes, of course with no chance, to take over the seat of Brighton (she has no show at all) and her colleague who has nominated for the Federal seat of Kingston, did a doorknock of the area, informing people that a meeting was to be held on Sunday 22 August. Also, people of the neighbourhood were told that the gully was to be filled in, and indeed were also told by some people that it would be filled with rubbish, car bodies and any old refuse from the Brighton City Council. They said that the gully was to be piped and filled up level. Of course, it is absolute piffle and rubbish to say that the Brighton council intended to fill up that gully.

The two aspirants, one for Federal Parliament and one for State Parliament, did a doorknock of the area stating that the meeting was on. What makes it more confusing, as far as I am concerned, is that the member for Baudin was misinformed by the people who told him that there was no such meeting. The member for Baudin said that the Channel 7 State Affairs team wanted to film the gully. Is the member suggesting that they plucked the idea out of the air and said, 'We want to film Gilbertson Gully and make a good pro-

gramme out of it, but let's keep it a secret and not tell anyone? Is the member for Baudin trying to suggest to us that the idea was to take a television programme of Gilbertson Gully and not let anyone know?

It must have been instigated by some organisation. Indeed, it was instigated by some members of the Gilbertson Gully Committee. The member for Baudin said that one or two people were contacted who canvassed other neighbours, but the honourable member said that he did not know how on earth the two Labor candidates knew that the television cameras were to be there at 10 o'clock. The member for Baudin went on to say that he was assured that no meeting of the group took place that day and, further, that it is difficult to invite anyone to a meeting that does not even take place. That is a lot of cods wallop: the member for Baudin ought to know, and I would be very surprised if he did not know, that the whole matter was organised and was so arranged that the T.V. cameras would be there at 10 a.m. as well as the candidate for the seat of Kingston and also the Labor candidate for the District of Brighton.

The member for Brighton, my friend and colleague, and I found out the long way round: I found out as a resident of the area. Incidentally, I am the longest serving resident, as I have lived there for many years ago. I was told that the meeting was to be at 11 o'clock, yet the television cameras and the Labor Party candidates were there at 10 o'clock.

Mr McRae: Which channel was this?

Mr MATHWIN: Channel 7, and the programme involved was *Statewide*. What really happened was that, together with my daughter and son-in-law who live next door to me and some other people from the area, I went to the meeting at 11 o'clock. I complained about the fact that I thought the meeting was arranged for 11 o'clock and that I had been told that it had been arranged for that time. One of the members of the committee said, 'You lot were not supposed to be here until after the meeting, after we had decided what action we wanted to take.' I replied that I did not know what was meant by 'you lot', that I happened to be a resident of the area and was concerned about the situation and that from long experience gained from having lived in the area over 25 years I know of the problems of that gully.

Mr McRae: But you are not blaming us, are you?

Mr MATHWIN: It is hard to understand who would spread untruths that the Brighton council was to fill the gully with rubbish, old car bodies, and the like. As I pointed out, the area was canvassed by two Labor candidates with an interest in the area, and it is pretty obvious what has happened.

The whole situation is wrong and something must happen in regard to the gully. There is long Kikuyu grass there which must be attended to; it is impossible to maintain the slopes of the gully in their present condition and some development must take place. The gully must be terraced so that it can be maintained properly. The broken glass and so on in the gully at the moment makes it impossible for parents to allow their children to play in the gully. Many years ago, when I was in that area and when my children were younger, for many hours they played in the gully in its natural state, as it was then. Since that time the area has become more built-up, there is more rain and surface run-off, and there is now a drain that comes from the Marion council area. That open drain flows into Gilbertson Gully and continues down to Seacombe Road.

It would be far more sensible if that run-off were piped down to Seacombe Road and the existing drain could be filled level to the top of that drain. The solution is as simple as that. The area could then be landscaped and terraced and left in its natural state for children to play on. The member for Baudin said in this place that he could assure

the House that the member for Brighton was not ignored on that Sunday. He said that no meeting took place at the instigation of the Gilbertson Gully Preservation Committee. The assurance of the member for Baudin is not fact; it is quite wrong and untrue, because there was a meeting organised by those people. It was organised at 10 o'clock but many people such as the member for Brighton and members of the Brighton City Council were told that it was to be at 11 o'clock.

They went down there at 11 o'clock and found that the television cameras had been there for some time and that the two Labor candidates had had the opportunity to flaunt themselves in front of those cameras.

Mr McRae: Flaunted?

Mr MATHWIN: Well, for the member for Playford's benefit, they tiptoed through the tulips. It seems that as far as the Labor Party is concerned, and the two Labor candidates for those areas, it was a fully organised function. It is quite wrong for the member for Baudin to assure the House that no meeting occurred, because that is what took place.

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

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): During Question Time I asked a question about the loudness of rock concerts held at Memorial Drive. I make it clear that I do not object to young people being able to go to rock concerts and listen to music, be it loud or otherwise. However, I think there should be some protection for other people in the community, whether they be aged people or workers who have to get up for work the next day. Those people should not be subjected to noise during the day or at night. There has been an extensive programme in South Australia about what people are permitted to do, even in relation to the mowing of lawns during the day.

On 11 and 12 September a rock concert was held at Memorial Drive, organised and promoted by radio station Five double SA-FM, featuring Cold Chisel, Swanee and Mickey Finn. Earlier today I asked the Minister a question about this concert and the member for Henley Beach interjected and said that they were very good groups. I take it that the member for Henley Beach attended this particular function. I do not blame him, because he is a younger person and he likes loud music. He said that they were good bands. I am disappointed that the member for Henley Beach is not in the House tonight. I suggest that in future, and it may be for the benefit of the people who support the member for Henley Beach as a surfie and rock music connoisseur, that he recommends that a function of this type be held at Henley Beach on the foreshore.

Mr Whitten: Or in the square!

Mr PLUNKETT: Yes, or in the square, which is on the foreshore and which is an ideal place for such a function. If the member for Henley Beach is so inclined and prefers this type of music and would like this type of disruption in his own electorate, the member for Henley Beach should recommend that Cold Chisel, Mickey Finn and Swanee perform there or at Football Park. The member for Henley Beach has much to say about Football Park at various times and perhaps he should recommend that such a function be held at Football Park to see how the people who vote for the Liberal Party and support him as a member would react and to see how other residents who live in that area would react.

I would like it understood that I do not object to younger people having any sort of music or entertainment, but I do not believe that any thought had been given to the type of venue at which these functions can be held. Certainly, they cannot be held in the city. If it was 10, 15 or 20 miles away that would be better. There have been a few functions

further down, near Victor Harbor, and that was ideal. Everyone enjoyed themselves, because they were people who enjoyed that type of music: everyone appreciated it. When such functions are held in the city, where the bulk of the population lives, a large number of people are disrupted.

Mr Lewis: I can't hear what you are saying.

Mr PLUNKETT: I do not think I need a microphone to put my point. I always speak plainly and simply, and I have no problems. If any member on the other side has a problem, that is his concern, not mine.

Returning to the situation on Saturday and Sunday nights, last Saturday I was at the Royal Show until 10 o'clock, and after returning home I had three telephone calls from constituents complaining about the Memorial Drive function. I ask members opposite, and I ask the Minister, where one goes to complain. The Minister of Environment and Planning is not here, although I told him earlier I was bringing this matter up. I do not blame the Minister for not being here, because there is nowhere one can go. If someone rings the police, the police immediately say that a licence has been granted for the concert. Other than the Minister, there is no one to complain to. It does not matter who organises the function, the organisers sit back laughing: all they do is count the money. There are no teeth in the Act.

I think members in this House have to start thinking of people other than the groups presenting this sort of function, and upsetting everyone on the western side of Adelaide. Ten minutes is not enough time for me but I want to explain to members that when functions are held at Memorial Drive (which is on the Torrens River) the river creates a funnel for the next five or six miles. Members opposite do not want to listen: you are not interested, but the area goes through a Labor electorate, right through the creeks, and if you, as member for—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to members by their district or by their designated title.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Agriculture.

Mr PLUNKETT: If the Minister of Agriculture knew anything about the country he would know how noise travels. On a creek or on a river, if there is a noise, that noise can be heard four or five miles away as clearly as at the place of origin. If a fox or a hound yelped it could be heard four or five miles away. That is what happens at Memorial Drive: a funnel-like effect takes noise down the river, down Holbrooks Road, and through Brooklyn Park—all that area. Members opposite stupidly take no notice. It is not only old people who ring me; I am talking about people who are workers, husbands and wives; they are the people I am concerned about.

Apparently, the member for Henley Beach is not concerned, and the Minister of Agriculture worries about no one but himself. I would expect a few members opposite to consider the people who have to live and work in the area and who have to put up with the noise. I would like to talk to the Minister tomorrow morning before his meeting to ensure that some of these functions are held perhaps in the Liberal areas, but certainly away from the river. For God's sake, keep them away from the Torrens. The noise will drive people off their heads. One cannot hear the noise a mile from the function, but the noise travels down the river through the funnel.

Mr Lewis: What about up the river?

Mr PLUNKETT: I suggest that the member for Mallee should look after his district and I will look after mine. I am disappointed at the reception I have received from members opposite.

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

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): The Chief Secretary is always trying to get into me: I see that he has just got into me for about 15 seconds. However, I will forgive him for that, considering his fine personality. The Chief Secretary is a fine, decent, honest person, who is trying to achieve a limited amount in his present portfolio. While the Minister of Recreation and Sport is present (and also the Chief Secretary, because this matter may involve him), I refer to a letter that I received from a person in Whyalla Norrie complaining about the fact that he had been supplied with beer tickets which—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth has the floor.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The beer tickets were supplied by Roly Nunn, 144 Days Road, Ferrymen Park, South Australia, and both had exactly the same serial number, Hotel Spencer, N.W.F.C. licence No. A238, the code underneath is 003, and the numbers are exactly the same—1511 in each case. This person, quite rightly, complained to me that he cannot see how a fair competition of this type can be run fairly when there are two tickets with the same number in a sequence or series. This person expresses grave concern about the fact that, needless to say, neither of these is a winning ticket in this competition.

When I have resumed my seat, I intend to hand these tickets to the Minister and ask him to investigate the matter, because it seems to me that there is something quite snifty about this. The person who has written to me describes it as a big rip-off. He says that he is an aged pensioner and can afford only a couple of tickets now and then: he does not particularly want to buy tickets in such competitions if there are fewer winning tickets than there ought to be, or at least, putting it more precisely, more losing tickets than there ought to be. I will bring those tickets to the Minister's attention in a moment.

Further, I want to raise another matter that is also in the province of the Minister who conveniently is in the House tonight. I have written to the Minister about this matter, but I believe that it should be brought to the attention of the House, because it involves a wider issue than just simply the constituency of Elizabeth. This matter concerns particularly bus stops on the Main North Road that the Highways Department or the Department of Transport built but did not seal. Of course, the result is that, because the bus stops are not surfaced in any way, there are problems during both the winter and summer.

In wet weather bus stops become muddy ponds, passengers' footwear becomes muddy and wet and their clothes mud splattered as buses pull in and move out. Buses, in turn, become dirty, and this increases cleaning costs for both the passengers and the State Transport Authority. On the other hand, in the summer those bus stops become dust bowls. As buses pull in the stops are surrounded by dust and as the bus doors are opened the buses suck in that dust. Not only are passengers' clothes and hair filled with dust but they are forced to breathe in that dust. This makes people's eyes sore and irritated. Constituents have also pointed out to me that if passengers are affected in this way the situation is a great deal worse for the drivers and could in fact be quite dangerous for them if they get grit in their eyes as a result of this situation.

I ask the Minister to consider this matter with a view to taking proper action to ensure that these bus stops are sealed. I have no doubt that the Main North Road is not the only area where this problem exists. While I can see that it would be reasonably expensive to remedy this matter, I think that having bus stops that are virtually unusable during both summer and winter because of this unpleasantness that I have mentioned is a bit much to ask people to bear, particularly in light of the efforts made in recent years to make bus travel more pleasant in South Australia.

I turn now to the Emergency Housing Office. I spoke about this office during the Address in Reply debate and pointed out that prospective private sector tenants who are poor and disadvantaged and who seek the advice of the Emergency Housing Office can miss out because that office insists that prospective tenants return to that office, once they have inspected a property, before they can obtain a cheque to meet the bond money. I received from the Minister of Housing a reply to a question I asked about this matter. In that reply he pointed out at some length the reasons why the Emergency Housing Office takes the course of action that it does take. However, I do not believe that he has answered the point, which is that the poorest and most disadvantaged people, the people who do not even have a bond and who seek the assistance of the Emergency Housing Office, are disadvantaged, because in this day and age, when there are far more tenants than there are tenable properties, the effect is that the poor tenant goes along to inspect a property, there other prospective tenants present who have the bond money, and the poor tenant misses out.

I have found out about an even more extraordinary matter involving the Emergency Housing Office. I do not know who drew up the regulations for that office, but it almost seems as though those regulations have been drawn to make it as difficult as possible for the disadvantaged people who seek the assistance of that office. I was advised by a Mr Sutton today that he was told that the Emergency Housing Office was not prepared to pay a bond on a property that was to be leased for a period of 12 months. Apparently that office is prepared to provide bond money only for houses let on a weekly tenancy. If a lease is involved, it will not make bond moneys available.

The sad thing about that is that this administrative humbug simply turns prospective tenants into people who will manipulate the system. As I understand from this gentleman, all a person needs to say is that a landlord is not looking for a lease, and the Emergency Housing Office will then give that person the bond cheque. In those circumstances it seems to be a pretty empty gesture, in any event, but nonetheless another one of those nit-picking little rules that make it all the more difficult for poor people to obtain housing.

Mr McRae: The Victorian insurance scheme would have been very helpful.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Indeed. I cannot see why that cannot be introduced here at an early date. There is no reason at all why an insurance scheme similar to the one that operates in Victoria cannot be introduced in South Australia. While I am on the question of housing, I want to briefly deal with one other matter which I have raised before, and that involves the Housing Trust.

I cannot understand why the Housing Trust is not prepared to list for housing people who do not have a fixed address. As I understand it, the Housing Trust is not prepared to list people for housing until they are able to supply the Housing Trust with a fixed address for contact. Very often the people in most need of housing are living in cars or caravans and do not have a fixed address and are not in a situation where they are able to provide the Housing Trust with a nice middle-class residential address.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I, too, would like to welcome the new member for Florey. We are all aware of Bob Gregory's involvement in the working class struggle in this State, particularly his involvement in the trade union movement as Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: He was good on the S.T.A. Board, too.

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member can fill just about any position in the community. There is no doubt that Bob's future in the Parliament is clear, and we on this side look forward to the leadership he has shown in the past. There is no doubt in my mind that in the years to come Bob will be one of the Ministers in a future Labor Government.

Moving on to issues in my electorate, I have raised the matter of traffic control problems continually over the years since 1979, in particular in the vicinity of the West Lakes area. After the football match last Sunday I received a number of complaints from constituents, one of whom was a member of my Party and who is an ex-Senator. This man was most vocal about the way in which he and his close residents were redirected away from Football Park by the police officers in charge of traffic control. I make clear that I am not reflecting on the Police Department or the officers in charge.

I have highlighted before the problem involving people who live in the area and who, when trying to get to their own homes when football crowds are leaving the area, have to detour kilometres out of their way. The Government, in conjunction with the local government authority and the S.A.N.F.L., should examine this problem. It seems that these local residents, who have paid thousands of dollars for their properties in the area, have no rights when trying to get to their properties.

Another aspect of this problem is that there is no direction for emergency services wanting to get into the area. I have raised this matter before in Parliament and have received no response from any of the Ministers to whom I have directed this problem. I have also raised the question of a woman who was concerned about what would happen if her husband, or one of her relatives (or anyone in the area for that matter), had a heart attack or was seriously ill. What happens if an ambulance is required to get into the area at a particular time when a crowd is leaving Football Park?

I raise the question: do these authorities have that information? What signs are erected to direct these emergency services on those days? What directions or signboards are there, or what notification is given to local residents as to the routes or directions they should take on those days when these Football Park crowds are coming out? I believe that it is outrageous that those people should have to detour four, five or six kilometres out of their way to get to their homes in that area. It is long overdue that something should be done on this.

I am looking also to the local government authority, the Woodville council, to enact those West Lakes regulations that have not been invoked since a public meeting in the Semaphore Park Football Club in April last year. The recommendations have gone to the Woodville council, and it is tardy, to say the least, in relation to the enactment of those regulations. That is coupled with the problems that my constituents are experiencing in that area. I say that because of the football crowds. Some of them are ignorant, to say the least, when they park across people's driveways, park on their lawns, park across private properties, park

close to the intersections, without any concern, it would appear, for those residents living in the area. It is high time that something was done in relation to these people, who were told by the company down there when they purchased their properties, 'This is another way of life—a quiet area where you can live in peace.' Particularly for those people who are in the twilight of their lives and who have to be subjected to this, it is well overdue, as I said, for something to be done in that area.

The other question in relation to Football Park is the car-parking facilities available. Woolworths down there have extended in West Lakes Mall. Consequently, we now see that there are less car-parking facilities in the area. Hence, the problems that I have just related. Therefore, it certainly needs a proper survey to be conducted in that area. As I have highlighted previously, if we have a national or international event in that area over a long holiday weekend I can imagine the enormous crowds who will get down there. What will happen to the local residents? It would appear that they can go to hell!

The other question in relation to the West Lakes area and the Semaphore Park area, which is a somewhat intertwined community, is the need for a community centre. In that area of West Lakes Shore and Semaphore Park, we have in the Housing Trust estates alone something like 800 homes. Based on the Housing Trust information that I gathered from listening to a radio station the other night, the average number of people in a Housing Trust home was 3.74 or 3.75. Therefore, we are looking at something like 3 000 people in that area who have not got a community centre at all to cater for their needs. As I highlighted here in the Parliament recently, unless we provide these facilities for those people in the area we will have a continuation of the problems that we have now. One is the problem of increasing vandalism, because many of those kids have nowhere to go. They wander around the streets and get into mischief. I must acknowledge that the Woodville council attempted to do something by way of a meeting at the Bower Cottages some two months ago during which it was looking at the needs of some of those people in the community, but that is only a short way towards the proper needs in that community.

This Government sold off land on Delfin Island which I believe could have been used for a community centre in that area. Alas, that is lost. I would like to know from the Government what surveys were conducted in relation to the needs of the community in that area for a community centre for soft ball, basketball, calisthenics or whatever. However, it was not done. It annoys me immensely that the Government put up the land for sale in January of this year and it was to be sold off in February. It did not give the local residents time to organise themselves to protest on the issue. I would like to know what surveys were done in relation to community needs in the area which will ultimately have something like 20 000 to 25 000 people. In my opinion in the long term, unless these facilities are provided in that area, we will pay. When I say, 'we', I mean that the community will pay; whether it be through crime prevention or through the provision of community centres, we will pay. I would certainly prefer to see community facilities provided in that area for the needs of the young, the teenagers, the elderly citizens and future generations.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I would like to take the unusual step, for someone in the Opposition, of complimenting the Government on some action it has taken. The compliment I would like to extend is in regard to a letter which arrived in our electorate offices recently, from the Minister of Public Works stating that Cabinet has approved the provision of a photocopier in the electorate office of

each member of the House of Assembly. I am delighted that we should be moving into the twentieth century.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: We will need about five for the member for Albert Park.

Mr TRAINER: That may be so but he works five times as hard as any Liberal. The letter states:

As the Supply and Tender Board has entered into a contract with Oce Reprographics Ltd. for the purchase of Minolta copiers, it is proposed to purchase Minolta Model EP310 machines for use in electorate offices.

I have checked with some of my contacts in the business and they have assured me that it is an excellent machine. It seems that the Government has made a good choice, which shows that it has done something properly in its three years in office. The letter further states:

An 'All In Copy Agreement', under which the copiers are guaranteed for five years, and which covers all consumables (except paper), service parts and labour has been offered by Oce Reprographics, at 1.1 cents per copy.

I am advised, after making some inquiries, that these machines are due to arrive within a couple of weeks. I will be checking to see who gets a machine first; whether they go to Liberal members first and whether Opposition members will have to wait until later before being equipped for the twentieth century. I would prefer that the machines were delivered according to the alphabetical order of electorates. I would not advocate delivery being in alphabetical order of members names. The member for Adelaide is in agreement with me and I am sure the member for Albert Park would also agree with me in regard to his receiving the five machines which the Minister for Transport suggests he would need.

Perhaps when we were in Government we should have taken this step. Electorate offices were introduced in 1973 and I think it was not until 1979 that the pressure of work in the offices had built up to the point where a step like this had probably become due. Now another three years have lapsed, but finally this step has been taken. One could take a cynical interpretation—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: They are afraid of losing the election.

Mr TRAINER: Yes, I was about to give two cynical interpretations one could place on the Government's action in this regard.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I thought this was a serious speech.

Mr TRAINER: It is serious. Whenever one deals with this Government, no matter how much it is a laughing matter, one has to say that a serious problem is presented to the community by the Government's very existence. The two cynical interpretations that could be placed on the action are, first, that the Government back benchers need the photo copiers for their electioneering in the coming weeks or, secondly, it could be that the Government is expecting to lose office very soon. Knowing how much harder it is to obtain facilities for Opposition members, they are preparing themselves for another period in the wilderness. I will be watching closely to see who gets the machines first.

It is also possible to make a not-so-cynical interpretation of the Government's action on this occasion. The Government's response could well be due to my remarks made during the Address in Reply debate on 11 August when I made a heartfelt plea for the Government to take electorate offices away from the quill pen era and into the latter half of the 20th century. I believe that members have an important job to do which entails a great deal of responsibility and that, to enable members to meet those responsibilities, electorate offices should be fully equipped. On that occasion when I spoke I paraphrased, as I recall, Churchill's comments during World War II about giving us the tools so that we can do the job properly. In view of my remarks during that Address in Reply debate members can imagine how delighted

I was that this step was taken by the Government, because having to take material into Parliament House in the city to use the photocopier two or three times a week has been a ridiculous waste of time. Indeed, it has regularly wasted quite a few hours of my time which I could have used on other duties appropriate to the role of a member of Parliament.

Whatever the Government's motives may have been this is one move for which I can congratulate Government members.

I will now be able much more effectively to communicate with my constituents. No longer will a constituent need to wait several days for a copy of a reply that I have received from a Government department or for a copy of information that I have been requested to provide. I hope that my briefcases can be a little lighter. Currently a lot of space within my briefcases is taken up by bulky files or bound documents that I must carry around with me, like a pack-horse, for several days at a time, carrying them around until I could find an opportunity to use the Parliament House photocopier. A few other steps can still be taken to allow members to carry out their role much more effectively. The member for Albert Park on several occasions has stressed the need for a second telephone line to electorate offices, and, having tried to phone him on several occasions, I can vouch for the importance of that suggestion. Certainly, the step that the Government has just taken in regard to a photocopier is at least one move in the right direction, and I hope that when the Labor Party is in government in a few weeks time we will take some further steps in regard to allowing members to carry out their responsibilities fully.

I do not think that that day can be very far away, judging from the recent Florey by-election where the Labor Party achieved an 11.4 per cent overall swing. It was also significant that the percentage of Democrat preferences that had been allocated towards the Labor Party by people who voted for the Democrats went up from 37 per cent in 1979 to 55 per cent in the result recorded a few days ago, the net result being an increase in the two-Party preferred vote from 53.7 per cent in 1979 to 65 per cent in Florey on 4 September. That figure of 65 per cent is very close to the 1977 result of 67 per cent, particularly when one takes into account the fact that there was a very low turnout in this poll of only 75 per cent; in other words, about a quarter of the electorate did not vote. I suspect that, had that quarter voted, there would have been a further 2 per cent or 3 per cent, perhaps even 3 per cent or 4 per cent swing towards the Labor Party.

To a certain extent, an elector could not be blamed for not voting on that occasion, because it was a by-election that took place a matter of weeks before a general election, and it could well be that many of that 25 per cent who did not vote on this occasion were saving their vote to use in a few weeks, when they can take advantage of the opportunity to throw out the present Government and to return it to the political wilderness from which it should never have emerged.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: When is the general election? Can you tell us?

Mr TRAINER: I was hoping the Minister might let slip a suitable date.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I wouldn't mind a few bob on 4 December.

Mr TRAINER: That is one of the possibilities. I now refer to the way in which the turnout in by-elections has dropped in the case of the three by-elections the present Government has lost during its term of office. At the Norwood by-election held on 16 February 1980, there was a quite respectable turnout of 88.8 per cent of electors on the roll, which was very close to that of a general election. The

turnout for the Mitcham by-election was still reasonably close to that figure. That by-election was held on 8 May 1982 and there was a turnout of 85.5 per cent of electors. However, for the Florey by-election held a few days ago on 4 September (and I stress that the figure that I have is not final, although it is very close to a final figure), the percentage of electors who turned out to vote, compared with the other two by-elections, dropped to 74.7 per cent.

That is a fairly substantial drop. A great deal of that would be due to the phenomenon that I just mentioned, namely, of people perhaps preferring not to exercise their vote on this occasion (regardless of what the Electoral Act may specify) and preferring to save it for the general election which is to be held in the not too far distant future. However, on this occasion I suggest that the Government may not have sufficiently encouraged the Electoral Department when one considers the wonderful set of advertisements that were placed during the Mitcham by-election to encourage people to participate.

A good series of advertisements appeared on three themes. I refer, first, to a 'situations vacant' advertisement with a photograph of the vacant member for Mitcham's seat; secondly, an advertisement telling people to 'stand up and be counted'; and, thirdly, a '6 o'clock closing' advertisement pointing out that polling booths would close at 6 p.m. The amount of advertising for the Florey by-election seems to have been substantially less, for the Mitcham by-election, advertisements appeared on three occasions in the *News* and on three occasions in the *Advertiser*. In addition, one advertisement even appeared in the *Australian*. However, for the Florey by-election only two advertisements appeared in the *News* and two in the *Advertiser*. Those advertisements did not seem to be as effectively designed or as effectively placed, and I suspect a little less encouragement was given to the Electoral Department to encourage people to vote on this occasion, on the assumption that a low turnout of voters would be less beneficial to the Labor Party than a good one.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): At the moment we are involved in a very wide and varied debate: members have chosen their own particular subjects to discuss. However, I wish to speak about what I believe is the most serious subject in South Australia at the moment, that is, the unemployment situation. Some months ago, I forecast that unemployment would go beyond 50 000 in South Australia. At that time both the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Premier scoffed at me and said that there was no possibility of that occurring. Of course, the latest figures reveal that my forecast was correct.

I do not like being right in relation to this particular subject, because I am very concerned about it. I do not like being able to rise in this House and say that my forecast was correct. In fact, my forecast was correct, because unemployment in South Australia has now risen beyond 50 000; in fact, it has reached 8.3 per cent. However, the Government does not seem to be concerned about it whatsoever. One of the most disturbing features that I have found in my research on this subject is that there has been a change. It has taken some time for this change to occur in the unemployment structure in South Australia. For a long time it was the unemployed youth, school leavers and those people between 19 years and 25 years of age, particularly males rather than females, who suffered in South Australia.

The most disturbing feature at the moment is that research clearly reveals that breadwinners are now losing their jobs. The latest figure which I saw quite recently indicates that the 25 to 34 years age group is now in a dreadful situation

in South Australia. In fact, unemployment in that particular age group in South Australia has increased by some 8 per cent in the last 12 months. What has the Government attempted to do about this situation? Absolutely nothing! There have been no job creation schemes, no innovative means and no suggestions by this Government, which has sat back and looked at the situation, doing nothing whatsoever about it.

The other disturbing feature is that people 35 years of age and over are also being drastically affected by the unemployment situation. That was not the case two years ago. As I said earlier, we had a problem with our youth and people between the ages of 19 years and 25 years as the people most affected by unemployment. However, we now have people of 35 years of age and over who are affected. The increase in that category has been as high as 37 per cent. Therefore, one can understand why an organisation such as DOME was recently established, I believe in the past 12 months. Most members would know of that organisation and that it stands for 'Don't overlook mature expertise'.

That is why it is called DOME. I have had a complaint from DOME that it applied to the Minister of Industrial Affairs for some furniture to be provided, some partitions and furniture for its offices. The Minister has not provided any furniture and, in fact, has not even answered that organisation. Also, DOME informs me that it has asked for a reply from the Minister in relation to the office space it is presently renting. I understand that, in the first instance, the Government did provide some rental allowance for DOME and that contractual arrangement, as I understand it, finishes some time later this month, or certainly next month. Up to the last time I talked to the DOME people, there was no suggestion from the Government that the rental arrangement would be adhered to or honoured by the Government. I believe that the Government ought to at least tell these people where they stand and what is going to happen to them; whether they are going to be provided with these very few pieces of furniture they have asked the Minister to provide.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Did they tell you we have given them \$8 000?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: One has to look at where unemployment is occurring in South Australia.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You wait until you hear the true facts.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister is getting disturbed; he is interjecting although he knows that interjections are out of order. One has to look at the situation where the unemployment is increasing and the categories involved. The construction, transport, storage, recreation and manufacturing industries are the industries in which unemployment is rising (and rising fast) in South Australia. The member for Newland has continually tried to explain away in this House the employment and unemployment situation as it is affected by the Liberal Government of South Australia. Today, he again attempted to try to explain the position following my Leader—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He failed!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Of course he failed, and he has failed on every occasion. There is no way that the member for Newland can justify the current situation in South Australia which has 8.3 per cent unemployment. There is no way the Government can justify that. I believe that every member on the Government bench stands condemned over this particular issue because they are not serious about tackling the issue. I could go on about unemployment, but I want to talk about hidden unemployment. I have had research done which suggests very strongly to

me that in fact the real unemployment figure in South Australia is in excess of 105 000 people.

The member for Newland smiles while I talk about the most serious consequences affecting South Australia. The member for Newland is not just smiling, he is laughing, and so is the Minister of Health. They are laughing about this serious situation, yet the Minister of Health tries to kid South Australian women that she is on their side. Let me say this: the majority of hidden unemployment in South Australia is amongst the women—that is what it is about.

Mr Becker: What about one man, one job?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is good to know that after 11 years in this House I can still stir up the Liberals; that is excellent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is good to know that I can get on my feet and cause some sort of sensation in the House whilst other members have spoken in the House and said nothing—that is good and I am pleased and delighted about that. I refer now to three or four matters because, with all the interjections, I will not have time to comment further. Perhaps we should consider three or four of the matters that have caused the very sudden but determined increase in unemployment in South Australia.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Even the Premier is interjecting. I never interject on the Premier: I always behave myself in this place. The Premier knows that I have him on a sore spot, so he has to come in and interject. I believe that we should make more maiden speeches in this place so that we could get more facts across. The four facts are as follows. The most important fact is the unparalleled increases in the power and water costs in this State. That is the most important thing that has happened to this State. There have been very large increases by the Tonkin Government in the costs of water and power, which are unparalleled in Australia.

The Tonkin Government has discouraged industry from coming to this State, because it has increased the power and water rates so much. People come to my office every day saying that they cannot pay their water and power costs. Let honourable members recall that we are only two months away from an election, and the real story will be told then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is that grievances be noted.

Motion carried.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

That the proposed expenditure for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) be referred, as follows, to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by 5 October 1982.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Transport
Highways
Minister of Transport and Minister of Recreation and Sport,
Miscellaneous
Marine and Harbors
Minister of Marine, Miscellaneous
Local Government
Minister of Local Government, Minister of Housing, and Minister
Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous
Arts
Minister of Arts, Miscellaneous
Environment and Planning
Minister of Environment and Planning, Miscellaneous
Education
Technical and Further Education
Minister of Education, Miscellaneous
Legislative Council
House of Assembly

Parliamentary Library
 Joint House Committee
 Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works
 Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement
 Legislature, Miscellaneous
 State Governor's Establishment
 Premier and Cabinet
 Public Service Board
 Premier, Minister of State Development and Minister of Ethnic Affairs, Miscellaneous
 Treasury
 Treasurer, Miscellaneous
 Minister of Health, Miscellaneous
 Tourism
 Minister of Tourism, Miscellaneous
 Agriculture
 Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous
 Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature)
 Department of Transport
 State Transport Authority
 Highways Department
 Department of Marine and Harbours
 Department of Local Government
 Department of Environment and Planning
 North Haven Trust
 Education Department
 Department of Technical and Further Education
 South Australian Teacher Housing Authority
 State Bank of South Australia
 Treasury Department
 South Australian Health Commission
 Department of Agriculture
 Woods and Forests Department

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Services and Supply
 Deputy Premier, Miscellaneous
 Mines and Energy
 Minister of Mines and Energy, Miscellaneous
 Community Welfare
 Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous
 Public and Consumer Affairs
 Industrial Affairs and Employment
 Trade and Industry
 Minister of Industrial Affairs, Miscellaneous
 Public Buildings
 Minister of Public Works, Miscellaneous
 Engineering and Water Supply
 Minister of Water Resources and Minister of Irrigation, Miscellaneous
 Lands
 Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous
 Attorney-General's
 Courts
 Attorney-General, Miscellaneous
 Corporate Affairs Commission
 Minister of Corporate Affairs, Miscellaneous
 Electoral
 Police
 Auditor-General's
 Correctional Services
 Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous
 Fisheries
 Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous
 Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature)
 Department of Services and Supply
 Department of Mines and Energy
 Australian Mineral Development Laboratories
 Public Buildings Department
 Engineering and Water Supply Department
 South-Eastern Drainage Board
 Department of Lands
 Department of Fisheries

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee A be appointed consisting of Messrs Abbott, Becker, Glazbrook, Gregory, Hamilton, Randall, Rodda, Slater and the Chairman of Committees.

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee B be appointed consisting of Mr Ashenden, Dr Billard, Messrs Mathwin and Oswald, the Hon.

R. G. Payne, Messrs Russack, Trainer and Whitten, and the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
 (Continued from 1 September. Page 916.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is a short Bill of only three clauses. The third clause deals at some length with new credit and guarantee arrangements envisaged by the Bill. In his second reading explanation, the Premier and Treasurer evinced three major reasons why this amending Bill was necessary. He said that the present legislation governing capital raising by statutory authorities was deficient in at least three areas; first, that the Treasurer's approval, while being required for borrowings to be made, is not required for other financing arrangements which have the same purpose and effect as borrowings and which can be very large.

There are, in fact, many financial arrangements being explored presently (creative arrangements, one might call them, which are necessary in the present economic climate) which do require some Treasury approval. Yet, in terms of the Act, at this stage the necessity for such approval could be avoided. Secondly, the premier referred to the fact that while present legislation provides for the borrowings of statutory bodies to be guaranteed by the Treasurer, there is no similar provision in relation to these other financial arrangements. Again, the gap applies in that respect.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: We are more or less catching up.

Mr BANNON: Exactly. There are areas where straight borrowing in an orthodox fashion is covered, but obviously these other financial arrangements are not. Thirdly, the Premier says that current legislation makes no provision for fees to be charged by the Government in respect of guarantees it gives to statutory corporations or other entities; such fees are common in the commercial world.

In respect of those matters, the Opposition supports the Bill and its intentions. In the current economic climate, the more flexibility available for borrowings and financial arrangements the better, because we are in a high interest rate climate, a recessed economic state, and these are obviously times which call for different financial measures (pump priming would probably be the most accurate expression one could use) from Government and statutory authorities. To the extent that this Bill allows the Treasurer to have greater cognisance of what is being done and will ask the Treasurer to provide guarantees, it should be supported.

As to the question of fees, I am not so convinced by the premier's arguments. He cites, in support of his argument on this concept, the Campbell Committee and its findings. The Campbell Committee's findings have had a mixed reception and in many respects the full implementation of its proposals would be quite disastrous, especially for the housing industry and interest rates, in particular. That does not mean that we must dismiss the Campbell Committee out of hand, as there is much valuable material contained in that comprehensive report and obviously some positive proposals that can be taken up.

However, I say that we should not get too carried away with the Campbell Committee and its implications, because the free market monetarist base on which it argues I believe cuts across economic reality in our mixed economy. It certainly cuts right across the Federal-State relationship we have in this country in relation to finance and, therefore, its recommendations ought to be approached with great

caution. This is only a minor aspect of that Campbell Committee recommendation. The Premier quoted the Campbell Committee report as follows:

... if a government considers that a particular sector or activity should be assisted ... it is best done through a direct subsidy, grant or tax concession' so that 'the costs of the subsidy are visible and quantified ...'

That is one point I would not argue with; I believe that is true. The precise financial assistance is being provided and the cost ought to be quantified. However, to my mind that does not suggest that fees should be charged. The benefit of not having such fees may be something taken into account in looking at the financial arrangements. I do not think that it should go any further than that.

The Government, in this Bill, believes that the power to charge fees is desirable. To the extent that this is a power which is exercisable at discretion (in other words, under what would be new section 32n of the Act), the Treasurer may, during the currency of the guarantee or indemnity, charge periodical fees. To the extent that that is expressed as 'may', then the Opposition is not going to the barricades against it. A discretionary power exists. But, I would urge considerable caution by the Government in contemplating any such fees. I ask the Premier what he contemplates in terms of the fees? Who is to be charged? What is the level of fees and what imposition will that place?

After all, we are talking about the total Government sector. It is a case of shuffling money between the various authorities and that really seems to be quite unnecessary, quite bureaucratic, and a notional accounting exercise which imposes a particular imposition on the authority. So, to the extent that the Bill states 'may' charge fees, fair enough. But, I would like those questions answered.

The only other matter I wish to refer to is contained in the lead-up to the Premier's examination of the provisions of the Bill. The Premier refers to the fact that leverage leasing is no longer to apply. We have seen an extraordinary saga of incompetence in this area on the part of the Government. It is worth reminding the House that this is a matter that has been of great concern to the State authorities and, indeed, that concern has been expressed by the Opposition for some time.

Unfortunately, when the first threat was made for leverage leasing, when announcements were made by Federal Treasurer Howard last year about the intention of the Federal Government to eliminate such financial arrangements, while most other States protested quite vociferously and indicated the implications for them, South Australia stood alone in apparently being quite sanguine about it. In fact, on 21 December last year the Premier is reported as having said:

A Federal Government clamp-down on Government borrowing outside the Loan Council would not hit South Australia. South Australia was well adapted to State Government borrowing being subject to Loan Council approval.

That was an extraordinary statement, because it demonstrated very clear ignorance of the fact that a number of our statutory bodies had already resorted to leverage leasing arrangements to their benefit. In fact, there were other arrangements in train which would have profound financial significance. Following that extraordinary statement by the Premier that it really did not affect South Australia and that we were not too worried about it, I issued a statement on 4 January pointing out that the attitude of the Premier was extraordinarily short sighted, that this option might well be something South Australia would need in the future, and that we were already using leverage leasing deals.

Now, that statement was not based on inside information. It was, in fact, quite clear that the Government had had resort to it. For instance, the Minister of Transport had said, during the Estimates Committees in October 1981, in

answer to a question from the member for Albert Park, that the S.T.A. was using leverage leasing and was finding it of great financial advantage. The Minister was supported in that by comments made by the S.T.A. Chairman, Mr Rump, before the committee after the question had been referred on to him by the Minister.

In fact, 10 days before the statement that it really was irrelevant and of no significance to us in South Australia, the Premier had tabled a Treasury document in which reference was made to this method of financing, and in which it was pointed out that it was already in operation in South Australia.

The Treasurer's document pointed out that the Electricity Trust of South Australia leased equipment to the value of \$9 300 000 in 1980-81 and S.T.A. to the value of \$15 200 000, both by way of so-called leverage leasing arrangements. The document states that ETSA and the S.T.A. can be expected to arrange further amounts of around \$7 400 000 and \$8 500 000 respectively in 1981-82. The Treasurer went on to say:

It seems likely that for various reasons the use of more varied techniques of the kind referred to above will continue and indeed become more common.

Therefore, far from it being irrelevant to South Australia and something that would not hit us, it was hitting us very directly and very precisely, particularly as far as the S.T.A. and the Electricity Trust were concerned. A few days later I issued a statement in which I again referred to the Premier's odd reaction to this and suggested that he had better make some representations to the Prime Minister as a matter of urgency, because there could be financial arrangements in South Australia being affected by this so-called clamp-down on funding outside the Loan Council.

On 13 January the Premier finally decided that it was a matter of some importance to the State, and in a complete turn-around from his earlier statements announced that he was going to put the case to Mr Fraser. I thought it was quite extraordinary to read in the *News*, under the headline 'Tonkin takes fight to Canberra' on 19 January, almost one month to a day after he had said that the whole thing was irrelevant, an article stating:

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, will fight the Federal Government over South Australia's right to use private finance for State projects. Today he accused the Federal Government of being 'unreasonable' in attempting to prevent the State raising private finance to fund projects. 'If the Federal Government does not give us a proper share of funds then we are going to have to make other arrangements,' he said. 'There is no earthly reason why we should not persuade other people to finance the construction of certain projects.'

That is precisely what I had been saying some two or three weeks before that and precisely the opposite to what the Premier had been saying just a month before. The Premier demonstrates an extraordinary ignorance in this issue. In fact, this Bill demonstrates just how ignorant he was, because at the end of this extraordinary statement in the *News*, which I was surprised that a responsible newspaper would just print *verbatim* without referring to its files and the earlier statement and pointing out the inconsistency, we see the following:

Mr Tonkin dismissed claims by the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, that the \$500 million northern power station at Port Augusta was in jeopardy because of the Federal clampdown. 'The power station will be financed by funds already approved by the Loan Council,' he said. 'Mr Bannon's claims are rubbish.'

In his second reading explanation of this Bill, the Premier says:

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

Electricity Trust will now be able to raise funds in a more straightforward fashion.

That is just extraordinary, because in January he was saying that my claims about the ETSA proposal to raise funds for the northern power project were going to be affected by this clamp-down on leverage leasing. The Premier said, 'That is absolute rubbish,' and he even got a little tag line: 'Rubbish'. However, here in this second reading explanation he admitted the facts, that ETSA had in place in the weeks before the Federal Government finally took action a very large leverage leasing arrangement to the benefit of the trust and the benefit of the financing of that project. As it happened, Victoria and New South Wales were able to set up their arrangements just before the final decision was made. At that very Premier's Conference (and I doubt that the Premier had much credibility in view of his statements in December), the trust was within a week, as I understand it, of finalising its arrangements, and all those arrangements had to be cancelled.

That is apparently worthy of only a line or two in the second reading explanation. Again, I would like to ask the Premier a question. How much did the Electricity Trust spend on setting up those financial arrangements? Let us face it: one does not just send out a few memorandums or dockets; one has to embark on a fairly elaborate fund-raising process and put a lot of resources into dealing with bankers and others who will act on one's behalf in the money market to set up the leverage leasing arrangements. That costs money: fees and interest have to be paid. I would like to know how much expense the trust incurred on those aborted arrangements.

Any so-called advantage that may be gained by the trust having some independent loan-raising power through Loan Council ought to be set off against what happened to it within a week by the cancellation of these proposals. At the time that decision was announced, I urged the Premier to make representations to have the implementation of it delayed sufficiently to allow the Electricity Trust arrangement to be finalised. After that date, fine: if leverage was to be abolished and other arrangements were to come into force, well and good. Surely all that work and all that setting in place of a financial arrangement should not have been thrown out of the window because of the matter of a few days prior to signing.

The Victorian Government has been able to tie up its agreement prior to the meeting, and that was not affected. The Eraring power station deal had been completed and was not affected. South Australia was the one State with a major leverage leasing proposal ready for signature that lost out, and we heard not a word of protest from our Premier. It is pretty scandalous but symptomatic of his incompetent handling of this whole area.

The Opposition supports the Bill. I would like to know more about the fee-charging power required, and I also think we are owed an explanation on the leverage leasing question and, most particularly, on the cost to the Electricity Trust of the extraordinary bungling by the Treasurer.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Insertion of new Part VIC.'

Mr BANNON: The insertion of Part VIC is the bulk of the Bill and contains all its clauses. A few moments ago the Treasurer showed gross discourtesy in refusing to respond to valid questions asked in the course of the second reading debate. However, that is how he chooses to behave as Treasurer. In the course of the Committee debate I will put those questions to him quite precisely. Certain further credit arrangements are being included in the purview of this

clause—particular arrangements which were previously outside the Treasurer's jurisdiction. I ask the Premier whether or not leverage leasing is to continue in any form as an alternative credit arrangement. I also ask him what was the cost to the Electricity Trust of the aborted leverage leasing deal for the power station which he said was utter rubbish when I first raised the matter but which in the second reading explanation (which surely is relevant to this clause of the Bill) he said would not proceed.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition is really grandstanding on a most amazing scale.

Mr Keneally: Just answer the question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Was there any suggestion that I was not going to answer the question? I can see that not only is the Leader of the Opposition grandstanding but also his colleagues intend to make a Federal case out of it.

The Electricity Trust was looking at the question of financing some of the expenditure in regard to the mining operation and at the Northern Power Station under leverage leasing. They are now very pleased indeed to be able to raise funds in a more straightforward fashion. The costs involved so far are those normal running costs of the department and there have been no abnormal costs incurred. The Leader asks what sort of situation is there; he has made a great number of claims that do not hold water in the slightest way. I can say only that at present the situation in regard to the relaxation of restrictions by the Loan Council on borrowings by electricity generating authorities basically comes to a break-even point. I am not too sure what the Leader is making all the fuss about.

Mr BANNON: I am not too sure what claims I made that are not true. I shall try to be more precise, as the Premier's answer indicates that he cannot understand the question. Is it true that the Electricity Trust had, at the time that the decision was made to outlaw leverage leasing, a major financial arrangement fully set up, simply awaiting final signature? It would be better if the Minister of Transport did not distract the Premier, because his powers of concentration are suffering.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: What a shame.

Mr BANNON: Yes, it is, because I would rather like to ask the Premier some questions; I think that that is the purpose of the debate. I am sorry to be so sensitive, but I would rather like the questions met.

Mr Keneally: The Leader obviously believes in Parliament, but the Premier doesn't.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Mathwin): Order!

Mr BANNON: I repeat: Is it not true that the Electricity Trust had set up a major financial arrangement under leverage leasing conditions which was on the point of signature but which was aborted by the decision made by the Federal Government? Further, is it not true that in the arrangement of this leverage leasing deal, in the course of setting up this deal, the trust incurred a quite considerable financial outlay, which outlay cannot be recovered? Also, did the Premier voice any protest whatsoever at that time concerning the timing of the Federal Government's decision and ask for some special arrangements to be made to allow that arrangement to be completed?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition really does amaze me with his rather juvenile approach to these things. May I say that he would do far better to look at the effect of leasing arrangements concerning the State Transport Authority. Its leasing arrangements were very close to the point of fruition which—

Mr Keneally: Why don't you answer; it is a simple question and certainly a simple person like you ought to be able to answer it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Stuart does like to make a fool of himself. As I was saying, in regard to the State Transport Authority, where leasing arrangements were in train, we were able to make representations to the Federal Treasurer that those arrangements were so far down the track that they should be considered as having been completed before the time of application of the ban on leverage leasing arrangements. I have made quite clear the position concerning the Electricity Trust. The Leader of the Opposition has previously made authoritative assertions which on many occasions have proved to be quite false and I refer to his latest such assertion made in this place only today concerning the question of gas prices and an arrangement that had been made.

Mr Bannon: What is this all about?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is all about the Leader of the Opposition's credibility, which is at just about zero. Of course, the point about this is that the Electricity Trust was looking at leasing arrangements. Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, it has not incurred great sums of additional expenditure. In fact, the freeing by the Federal Government of electricity generating authorities from the provisions of the Loan Council more than makes up for any expenditure which has been incurred in setting up leasing arrangements.

Mr Keneally: How much expenditure was incurred?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have not the slightest idea of the exact sum, nor does the honourable member expect me to have that information. I believe that the honourable member should give the Federal Government credit for freeing electricity generating authorities from the constraints of the Loan Council. If he were to do that he would see quite clearly that we have gained considerably on the arrangements. In relation to the Leader of the Opposition's accusations, I was not going to mention them. They are so petty, carping and whingeing it is not really worth answering them; that is why I did not bother to reply to his second reading speech. He said that I refused to respond and that that was an act of great discourtesy. I point out that the Leader's rather puerile objections at that stage were just not worth answering.

Mr BANNON: I do not think there is any point in pursuing that matter, particularly in view of the manner adopted by the Premier. I did ask another question and I believe it was a gross discourtesy for the Premier not to respond to it, particularly in view of the Opposition's support for this Bill. I asked the Premier about new section 32n (2) of the Bill, which refers to the amount of the periodical fee to be charged by the Treasurer, which will be subject to regulations. New subsection (1) states that the Treasurer may charge periodical fees. What is the Government's intention in relation to such fees? What level of fee does the Government intend to charge? What particular conditions will govern whether or not the Treasurer exercises his discretion and imposes a fee?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition has at last talked some sense in relation to this matter. It is entirely a question for Committee. Therefore, I will give an answer in Committee. Basically, the answer is that the usual fee charged commercially is between 0.5 per cent and 1 per cent. That fee is normally charged on commercial transactions. In the past it has not been charged in relation to Government statutory authorities. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition has only to read the second reading explanation to find the answer to his question. Basically, it is not a question of charging a fee for any return because, as a Government statutory authority, it is a charge upon total Government finances anyway.

As with the introduction of programme performance budgeting, it is necessary to get a true indication of the

costs of the administration of any particular statutory authority. Therefore, the normal commercial fee of 0.5 per cent up to 1 per cent will be put forward and taken into account on matters relating to the total cost of providing services by any statutory authority. That is a proper thing to do. At the present time, the effect of not making that entry is that the cost of providing services and so on is being subsidised to the extent of between 0.5 per cent and 1 per cent of the sum involved in the guarantees. This simply means that those statutory authorities will have to take that proportion or fee into account when providing services, so they can be strictly comparable with services provided by private enterprise companies.

They will be required to enter the charges that normally are payable by private enterprise companies. I think that is a very satisfactory situation. It is simply a question of bringing into account things that are normally brought into account by other bodies.

Mr BANNON: Mr Chairman—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Ashenden): The Leader of the Opposition has the opportunity to ask only three questions, and he has already done so.

Mr KENEALLY: I want to take a little further the question that the Leader is unable to ask. I find that the Premier's whole attitude in this Committee debate most objectionable, and, at times, even patronising. What has happened here is a classic example of a Minister refusing to answer legitimate questions during a Committee debate. By so doing, he has forced the Leader of the Opposition to exercise his three opportunities to ask questions and seek information. The Minister is then able to hide behind the Standing Orders, because the Leader (who is in charge of this debate for the Opposition) is unable to carry on the questioning. This matter has the Opposition's support, and the Opposition ought to be treated with some respect. I think that the Premier obviously has something to hide, because he has not addressed himself.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Stuart to come to the question on the clause that is under consideration.

Mr KENEALLY: I am speaking in the Committee debate to the very points that the—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You have not said anything yet.

Mr KENEALLY: What I have said is obviously very hurtful and embarrassing to the Premier, because he has precipitated the statements that I am now making. The Opposition would like to know from the Premier the statutory bodies that are to have the discretion that he says they will have. He points out to the Committee that, if he had read the second reading speech, we would have found all the answers to the questions that we have asked. Yet nowhere in the second reading explanation were statements made about the charges that he is now pointing out to us.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You're getting around to it finally.

Mr KENEALLY: The Premier is delighted because he says that I have finally got to that point that I wanted to make. The Premier wishes to use this forum to evade questions, and he is not prepared to acknowledge the right of the Opposition to ask questions. How is the 0.5 per cent calculated, and what authorities will be charged? Is this a discretion? Will all charge, or will only some charge this 0.5 per cent? Is the Premier now able to—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: When you sit down, I can stand up.

Mr KENEALLY: I am giving the Premier ample opportunity to understand the question, because he obviously requires it. He has been unable to answer the very simple points that were made before I rose. Perhaps the Premier might address himself to the matter at this time and stop

treating the Committee in a manner that I can only describe as contemptuous.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think that the best thing I can do is read out an extract from the second reading explanation, as follows:

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

That is the situation, and I realise that the Leader of the Opposition is giving detailed instructions to his colleague. In fact, I cannot hear myself think because of the way in which he is carrying on.

Fortunately, I am quite firm in these proposals. That sums up the situation. The statutory bodies, as anyone with any intelligence in this place would be able to see for himself, would include those that are providing a service to the community and for which some costing is necessary so that a cost benefit analysis can be done of the efficiency or otherwise of providing those services. If the member for Stuart is not able to work that out for himself, I very much fear for his future anywhere, not only in this House but also in the big wide world. The fee of 0.5 per cent to 1 per cent is a normally charged commercial fee. I do not know on what basis it is levied, but that is the accepted commercial fee.

Mr KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order. Because I was out of the House earlier, I am not sure whether the time for adjourning the House has been moved beyond 10 p.m.

Members interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: If the rabble opposite is quiet, I will direct my question to you, Mr Chairman.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that honourable members contain themselves for a moment. One point of order has been taken by the member for Stuart. When that point of order has been dealt with, I will call the member for Hanson.

Mr KENEALLY: I have finished my question.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the honourable member, I can assure him that the Chief Secretary moved the appropriate motion.

Mr BECKER: Mr Chairman, my point of order is that the member for Stuart referred to members of the Government as rabble. I take exception to that remark, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Let him go, if it makes him better.

Mr BECKER: In no way will I do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Hanson has taken exception to the comments made by the honourable member for Stuart. Does the honourable member for Stuart care to withdraw his remarks?

Mr KENEALLY: The member for Hanson is the Chairman of the committee to which I belong, and I value his chairmanship. Therefore, I will exclude him from my description.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 September. Page 918.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): On the surface, this measure is sensible and not terribly controversial. It involves the formation of a new statutory authority. The present Government, which used to inveigh such things, is now beginning to understand that, as a method of public administration, statutory authorities can be very necessary and, indeed, desirable. The sum total of authorities that have been created well exceeds the total of authorities that have been abolished, contrary to the Government's grandiose election promises.

However, we must excuse the Government, because at that stage members opposite had no experience of government or the necessity for statutory bodies as part of the public administration framework. This Bill establishes a new authority to be known as the South Australian Government Financing Authority, which will have very wide powers in relation to loan raisings on behalf of semi-government authorities that are proclaimed for the purposes of the Act.

There is one exclusion from that rule: the Act does not include a council as defined in the Local Government Act. As it reads, any semi-Government authority can be proclaimed and can come within the aegis of this statutory body which then may be given the authority to do all the loan arranging on its behalf, to re-arrange its finances and debts, and to generally act for it in the market place and subsequently on lend moneys that it has so raised.

On the face of it, it is a fairly sensible and practical proposition. It is only when one examines the powers contained in the Bill that one sees that it perhaps goes somewhat further than a first glance would suggest. While in principle we certainly support this sort of financial arrangement (indeed, it is central to much of the Opposition's economic planning and our belief in the ways in which the public sector finances can be organised and used in conjunction with private sector finances), nonetheless, I think some care ought to be exercised in examining the implications of some of the clauses. I intend to do that later during the second reading debate and I hope that this time the Premier will respond. If he does not respond then, we can always question him during the Committee stage of this Bill.

I turn now to the Campbell Report. This is yet another recommendation of the Australian financial system inquiry. That report is basically about deregulation of the financial system. In his second reading explanation the Premier referred to it as, 'this excellent report'. The Campbell report has not been officially adopted by either Federal or State Governments. However, bits and pieces of the changed financial arrangements are introduced and Campbell is usually relied upon as the authority for such decisions.

The shadow financial spokesman federally, Mr Ralph Willis, has already identified about two dozen Campbell Report recommendations which have already been implemented even though the Report has not been adopted wholly. That suggests, as I said on another occasion, that there is in the Campbell report some good things that certainly require examination and perhaps implementation, but there are also many things in it (and I suggest, also, a basic philosophy running through it) that we must reject, particularly at the State level.

Some of the things in that report have been implemented Federally and include deregulation of bank deposit rates. The effect of that has been for rates to go up. I am not so sure that that has had a good effect in the market place, particularly for home buyers. It has certainly intensified pressures on bank lending rates for home loans. It has certainly put much pressure on building societies and others. The Federal Treasurer has also reduced the minimum term for bank deposit rates to 14 days in some cases. This has made bank term deposits more competitive with those of building societies.

This, together with what has happened in Australian Savings Bonds and with other movements in the market place, has put enormous pressures on building society finances. In fact, the exodus of funds from societies nationally (because in such a fluid situation they are attempting to ensure that they have adequate reserves) and its effect on the amount they are able to lend, has been very marked and is causing some alarm, not just at the State level but nationally, in the building society movement. That is another of the implications of what I would suggest is a piecemeal adoption of the Campbell recommendation. All rates have by this means, in effect, been computed up to a new level that has had an effect on home interest rates. There have been studies which say that a deregulation of mortgage rates in terms of pure Campbell doctrine would lift those rates to 2 per cent or 3 per cent above the 15 per cent long-term bond rates. So, one has to be very wary of the Campbell report and its implications. I repeat, that is not to say that there are not some sound suggestions contained in that study. It would be a pity if there were not, because it was a very thorough and long-ranging study.

Campbell recommended that an inquiry something like this be implemented. This new statutory authority is basically the result of problems caused by high interest rates which have resulted from a number of State and Federal measures. In other words, the authority itself is a product of the pressures caused by deregulation which have made the obtainable finances by semi-government authorities, particularly at reasonable rates, very much harder.

The Premier described the move to establish the authority as new and innovative, and that it has been under notice for several years in this State. He said that in his second reading explanation. The *Financial Review* article, which was published on 16 June 1982, in which the Premier's proposals were given considerable prominence, pointed out that Western Australia already had legislation on its books at that stage. In fact, many other Governments had moved quite smartly in this area.

It was a major proposal of the Victorian Labor Opposition in the run-up to the election and is something they obviously have been implementing in that State. In the Campbell Report section on Government borrowing, there is no reference to any such moves by South Australia. However, other States do rate a mention. At the time of the Campbell inquiry quite concrete moves had been made by other States. I have mentioned Western Australian legislation. In Victoria, under the Liberal Government, moves had already been made in the area. New South Wales and Queensland had already established such procedures. In Queensland, for instance, authorities had been grouped together for borrowing purposes.

So, I do not think that we should put too high a claim on its newness or innovative nature. It is certainly something that we should do, but I suggest that it is something that perhaps should have been done somewhat earlier. As I have pointed out, it involves—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: How much earlier? Some time in the mid-1970s?

Mr BANNON: It certainly was under examination by the previous Government. As I have pointed out, the pressure of interest rates at that stage, and as this State did not have the same number of statutory authorities with separate borrowing powers, meant that there was no great urgency. Certainly, that has increased over the past few years. All I am saying is that, to suggest that in September 1982 we are undertaking a remarkable innovation, is nonsense. It is something that needs to be done, but I would not put it any higher than that.

If this Bill is the result of an initiative by the present Government, as is claimed, then it would appear that the measure could result in further Federal Government control over borrowing by State authorities. At this point I would like to look at the implications of what I said at the beginning, which was that it was, in principle, a very sensible move and a fairly simple measure. But it has a number of implications that should not be passed over at this stage of consideration. The question of Federal Government control over State borrowing is a key point and I think that this should be explored in some detail.

In the *News* on the day of the Premiers' Conference (23 June 1982) under the heading 'Greater freedom for the States to raise money outside the Loan Council will be pressed for by the Premier, Mr Tonkin' the Premier said:

Loan Council should impose fewer restrictions on the way in which State or semi-government authorities raise funds.

It is important here to note the distinction between large and small Government authorities. The latter of those are below the annual borrowing limit of up to \$1 500 000.

I point out that this Bill goes beyond that. It potentially includes all semi-government authorities. There is no bar embodied in the Bill. However, this distinction between larger and smaller Government authorities was part of a question that was being raised at this time. Individual borrowings by smaller authorities have been outside the control of Loan Council and the so-called gentleman's agreement. Only the terms and conditions of borrowing have been subject to control. Therefore, there was this area of State borrowing through semi-government authorities up to this limit, but there could be any number of them, a proliferation—Victoria is one State, I think, that has made particular recourse to this over the years—that were outside the control of Loan Council.

I believe that the Premier should explain whether the aggregate amount borrowed by all the smaller authorities together in South Australia was outside the above controls before this central borrowing authority proposal was adopted, because the implications of this, by aggregating the borrowings and putting them under the one statutory authority, are that we are now subjecting that to the approval of the Federal Treasurer in a way that was not required when each of them was raised separately I think that the Premier should tell the House whether the effect of his Bill now is to put the aggregate borrowing by smaller Government authorities in South Australia under the control of the Commonwealth Treasury, because, as I say, that is one implication of this system. I do not think that I will get any answer because I do not think that the Premier is listening.

If that is true, because it would appear from the Premier's speech—and I am basing it only on the information we have been given so far, which needs elaboration—that aggregate borrowings by smaller authorities now come under Commonwealth control, we have lost out to Canberra in this instance. It is certainly abundantly clear that the Premier failed at the Premiers' Conference to gain support for his view that 'if a State wishes to work to a central borrowing authority as recommended by the Campbell Committee, Loan Council rules should not be such as to impede it'. It is clear that the Chairman of Loan Council, who is the

Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr Howard), will have the final say as to the amount of borrowing by the proposed South Australian central borrowing authority. Therefore, in aggregating and arranging our borrowing in this way, as I understand it—and if I am wrong I hope that the Premier can correct me—we are making the amount of borrowing by that central authority subject to the Commonwealth Treasurer's approval. To that extent, we have given away an individual or separate power that we had outside Loan Council and outside Commonwealth power.

I would like to make some general points on the way in which this authority operates. It is to borrow on behalf of all State authorities, but, according to the second reading explanation, it excludes the Electricity Trust, which has been given more freedom to borrow this year. It has its own separate authority under the new Loan Council arrangements. Neither is local government to be covered by the proposed new body. Both of those statements are made in the second reading explanation, but an examination of the Bill makes clear that, whilst this does not include a council as defined in the Local Government Act, it could include the Electricity Trust, and I would like the Premier to make it clear whether that is so.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: The Electricity Trust has been freed.

Mr BANNON: I understand that, but I am suggesting that the Bill—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Keep that in mind, because you won't make a fool of yourself if you do.

Mr BANNON: This is a pitiful performance. In the second reading explanation the Premier says that the Electricity Trust is excluded from these arrangements. I am saying that, whether or not the Electricity Trust has separate borrowing arrangements, I cannot find in the Bill a clause saying that the Electricity Trust is excluded, and I would like the Premier in his reply to point out where the clause is.

If I am misreading the Bill, and if the Electricity Trust is excluded from the Bill, well and good. As I see it, whatever the separate arrangements are, nonetheless the trust could be brought within the purview of the Bill. It may be wrong; I simply raise the point. During 1982-83, the basic borrowing programme by larger State authorities in South Australia is to be \$30 400 000, excluding ETSA. However, this includes a special temporary addition of \$4 500 000 for Spencer Gulf city waters, which leaves a \$25 900 000 programme. Borrowing by smaller State authorities—those that go up to \$1 500 000—is to total \$20 000 000. It suggests that borrowing in the vicinity of \$45 000 000 seems likely to occur and this could be the scale of the authority.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We will have one speech at a time.

Mr BANNON: We certainly express support for the proposal to the extent that it reduces the cost of statutory authority borrowing. We certainly welcome its possible effect in developing a secondary market or trading in semi-government securities. It would make them more marketable. If the Bill enables the public to invest more readily in South Australian semi-government securities, again that is to be welcomed. I would see its potential and possibilities there.

The Opposition has plans for a South Australian enterprise fund. We believe that it would create extra opportunities for the South Australian public to invest in projects to build up the State. Our fund would operate in the commercial sector of the economy rather than in the semi-government area which this Bill covers. It would have the same sort of objectives and opportunities that the Premier suggests for investing in the State. So, I see this Bill and this authority

dovetailing in well with the economic proposals that we are currently developing.

I turn to clause 16, which enables the Minister to direct that any surplus funds of semi-government authorities are to be deposited with or lent to the central borrowing authority. Key questions are raised by this clause, including the definition of a surplus of funds held by a semi-government authority. How is that ascertained and what is envisaged in that concept? What criteria are to be laid down? According to the Bill the Treasurer and the responsible Minister determine the terms and conditions of transfer of surplus Government authority funds to the central borrowing authority. In fact, it is the Treasurer who does so, because he has the power and is required to consult with the Minister.

This Bill certainly puts enormous powers in the hands of the Treasurer. These are not only the semi-government authorities but also Ministers in charge of those authorities with the requirement of consultation. The Treasurer, nonetheless, makes the final decision and has the ultimate power. This question of a surplus, the determination of the terms and conditions of transfer of surplus funds to the authority, ought to be spelt out in more detail and is not really covered in the second reading explanation.

I ask whether the views of Government authorities have been sought on this clause. I am thinking of the larger authorities—the State Transport Authority, Samcor, and the South Australian Housing Trust—which have large borrowings and are used as financial conjurants in this sense at the present moment. The clause potentially offers a better way of using liquid assets. Any review of cash holdings and liquidity with this machinery in place would be very valuable to the proper direction and use of our State finances.

The powers I have referred to under clause 16 and also clause 18 are indeed sweeping. If the Treasurer so directs, an authority shall borrow moneys from the authority (that is, a semi-government body shall borrow moneys from the authority) rather than from other lenders. They can be directed to regardless of other financial arrangements or desires in this matter.

If the Treasurer so directs, the Government shall deposit or lend to the authority any moneys of a semi-government authority not immediately required for the purpose of that authority. Clause 18 provides that the Treasurer may, after consultation, rearrange the finances of a semi-government authority in a number of ways, if he thinks fit. I would hope that proper consultation of the machinery concerning the way in which this would operate would be applied.

In another context reference was made to a major financial arrangement with the Housing Trust and I think it was also referred to in a Bill that we dealt with previously. In that instance, as I understand, the Trust is investing moneys, or in fact is building with moneys put into it by the Superannuation Trust and, I think, the S.G.I.C. at a particular rate. In the present Housing Trust Act, which one can examine in this context, it is clear that the board of the Housing Trust has certain discretions. It can be directed by the Minister responsible (and I think this applies to other statutory bodies as well, but I am just using the trust as an example) to do certain things, but that direction obviously must be explicit. Reference is made at section 3a (2) of the Housing Trust Act to such a direction being given (and this is the standing direction clause to which statutory authorities are subjected), which states:

Where any direction given in pursuance of subsection (1) of this section adversely affects the accounts of the trust the Chairman shall notify the Minister and the amount of any loss occasioned by any such direction shall, if certified by the Auditor-General, be paid to the trust out of moneys to be provided by Parliament.

That is the provision that the trust enjoys at the moment. I imagine that there are other arrangements, whether con-

tained in Acts or wherever, that the S.T.A. and other major bodies have as well. However, in regard to the Housing Trust there is a specific protection.

As I understand it, the relevant provision could override the provision concerning the Minister's discretion, because it seems to give the Treasurer absolute discretion in these matters. I think that is a matter that should be taken up with those various bodies. I hope that we can have the Premier's assurance on this matter, because basically the Opposition believes that the powers under this Bill and the concept of the authority is a very good thing, but the provisions certainly have wide-ranging implications.

Samcor is a body that we ought to look at. The Premier referred to liabilities of Samcor and to the fact that the Bill would enable such liabilities to be rearranged. It was also stated that the Samcor liabilities have been taken over by the Crown or by a Minister of the Crown. Oddly enough, recently the Minister of Agriculture claimed that Samcor is profitable under his administration, so one wonders what sort of rearrangement of liabilities would have had to take place if that is true. In fact, I do not think the Minister is right because an examination of the Budget reveals that there is to be an increase in the Samcor deficit from \$2 900 000 in 1981-82 to \$3 900 000 in 1982-83. Perhaps there is a need for a rearrangement referred to in this Bill.

The concept is sound; it is something that we should move to but, as I have suggested, what is on the face of it a fairly simple administrative arrangement in fact has considerable implications on the autonomy of the authority and its ability to raise funds. It certainly increases the power of the Treasurer, and I would suggest that these arrangements might bring State loan borrowings for those smaller authorities under the ultimate control in regard to the total amounts of Federal Treasurer, something that does not happen at the moment. I think the implications of this ought to be examined.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I have never known anyone to stand up and purport to support legislation who has taken so long in such a querulous fashion to pour cold water on almost every aspect of it. I think the Leader of the Opposition must make his position quite clear: he either supports the legislation or he does not. Having said that he supported the legislation he has gone on with the most arrant nonsense about so many parts of it. I will deal with three matters. First, he referred to the question of surplus funds. He asked how we will determine what is a surplus and how a statutory authority will know when it has surplus funds. I suggest that statutory authorities will know that they have surplus funds when their accounts are in the black; in other words, when they have an excess of receipts over payments, which is the normal state of affairs.

When a statutory authority has additional sums it can then invest in the central borrowing authority in exactly the same way as any other body can invest, and it will draw interest and receive income from that investment. I believe that that is a reasonably simple state of affairs. I believe that it is perfectly straightforward. I hope the Leader of the Opposition is reassured by that simple explanation. The second point raised by the Leader, and he mentioned it three times in his rather tedious monologue, is that the control over statutory bodies is now in the hands of the Federal Treasurer as a result of the setting up of a central borrowing authority.

I refer the Leader to the second reading explanation in which the history and details of the controls over existing statutory authorities and semi-government borrowings under the so-called gentlemen's agreement are set out quite clearly. I suggest that the Leader reads it clearly. If I can reassure

him I would be happy to do so. The funds available to each semi-government authority were limited to \$1 200 000 in any one year. At a recent meeting of Loan Council that sum was raised to \$1 500 000 per year. That gentlemen's agreement means that semi-government authorities can borrow sums up to that amount without seeking Loan Council approval. I think that is a very satisfactory arrangement.

As a result of representations I made at Loan Council and my requests for elucidation, it was possible to obtain from the Federal Treasurer an undertaking that the total sums to be borrowed by a central borrowing authority would be equivalent to the number of semi-government authorities on whose behalf the central borrowing authority is acting, multiplied by \$1 500 000. The central borrowing authority would have the flexibility to allocate Loan funds from that total to each statutory authority, and to each semi-government authority, according to its—

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: For goodness sake, Mr Deputy Speaker, the member is really making a fool of himself. It will allocate Loan funds out of the total sum available. Therefore, we are pooling all of the sums available under the gentlemen's agreement into one sum for the central borrowing authority, which can then allocate it out to the semi-government authorities involved. I would have thought that that was a bit of a break-through. How on earth the Federal Treasurer could have any additional control over those borrowings over and above that which he has at the present time I am totally unable to ascertain. I cannot understand the point being made by the Leader, and I suspect that he does not really understand it, either.

I believe that this is a move in the right direction. I support all of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks in support of this Bill. I totally refute all of his remarks which poured cold water on it. I really suggest that, if he is going to support the Bill, he should support it; if he is going to find fault with it, he should find fault with it and oppose it, and we will then know where we are going. The Leader's tendency to do this has become more and more apparent in recent months, that is, he is having two bob each way and sitting on the fence. I suggest that the Leader should make up his mind one way or the other: he either supports the legislation and goes along with it, or he does not. I now turn to the third point. The Leader said that this legislation was the product of high interest rates.

What arrant nonsense! This legislation has been under consideration for some considerable time. I suspect it was under consideration in the 1970's, in the days of former Governments, but was never followed through. This Government at least has followed it through. It certainly has nothing to do with the level of interest rates. The point is, whatever the level of interest rates, the formation of the central borrowing authority is going to give us a margin on the scale of borrowing which will be of enormous benefit to the semi-government authorities of this State, and this is all that matters.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

Mr BANNON: In his second reading explanation the Premier referred to 'the arrangements for raising funds for semi-government authorities other than ETSA'. He reiterates that it is not intended that his should apply to ETSA. However, on examining the definition of 'semi-government authority' I do not see how it precludes ETSA from being declared by proclamation. The only exclusion I can find relates to councils. If it is the intention that ETSA should

be specifically excluded, why is that not contained in the Bill?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: ETSA has been exempted from the Loan Council borrowing provisions. Clause 4 provides:

(2) The Governor may, by proclamation, declare a body corporate to be a semi-government authority for the purposes of this Act.

(3) The Governor may, by proclamation, vary or revoke a declaration under subsection (2).

This gives the Government and the Governor all the power that is necessary to exempt ETSA from those provisions.

Mr BANNON: That is not an answer to my question. One could use the same argument in relation to councils. There seems to be no need to refer to councils specifically, but simply to unproclaim them, if that is what is required. Subsection (3) is not necessary if ETSA is not a proclaimed body. If it is the specific intention of the Government that ETSA should be excluded, surely that should be spelt out. Where the definition states 'but does not include a council as defined', it could say at that point 'nor the Electricity Trust of South Australia'. That would entrench it in the Act. If it is contemplated that ETSA may be brought within the purview of the Bill, let the Government say so; otherwise, I do not see why it should not be specifically excluded.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would have thought that even the Leader could have worked that one out. Councils are specifically mentioned because at the present time there is no intention to bring councils under the central borrowing authority. At present ETSA, as an electricity generating authority, is exempt from the provisions of the Loan Council. How long that situation will obtain I have no idea: it may be for the next year; it may be to the next two or three years.

However, undoubtedly there will come a time when electricity generating authorities are no longer exempt from the provisions of the Loan Council. That being so, it is obvious that we should have the power, as set out in the Bill, to declare or revoke such declarations in regard to any particular body. Surely that is the most sensible, logical and practical way of proceeding.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Power of semi-government authorities to borrow moneys from or deposit moneys with the Authority.'

Mr BANNON: This is the clause to which I referred in the second reading stage. It gives the Treasurer very strong powers in relation to the semi-government authorities. A semi-government authority may borrow moneys from the authority, but this clause goes further and states:

... if the Treasurer so directs, shall borrow moneys from the authority rather than from any other lender; and ... if the Treasurer so directs, shall, deposit with or lend to the authority any moneys of the semi-government authority that are not immediately required for the purposes of the semi-government authority.

In the case of the smaller semi-government authorities, this would not involve any particular problems. In a sense, it would not involve any major rearrangement of their finances: it would be quite convenient and it would certainly aid the administration. There are some larger bodies that have their own statutory powers and I refer particularly to the State Transport Authority, Samcor, and the South Australian Housing Trust.

I ask the Premier directly whether those bodies were consulted and whether they are happy that they, in particular, will be subject to this clause. What is to be the situation where some special provision exists, such as section 3a of the South Australian Housing Trust Act (which I have cited) in relation to powers exercised under this Act? Does that override the authority of the board where a direction has

been given to obtain reimbursement on certification of the Auditor-General?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Again, I would have thought that the matter is far more simple than the Leader of the Opposition makes out. Obviously, the whole point of setting up a central borrowing authority is so that those authorities can obtain a better deal in terms of interest rate margins, charges, and costs involved in raising funds than they can obtain under their own steam. If, in fact, a borrowing authority is able to achieve those savings for a semi-government authority, the Treasurer would be quite justified in asking and requiring those semi-government authorities to borrow through the central borrowing authority.

If a statutory authority or semi-government authority can prove that it is able to provide a better deal in borrowing money, two things apply. First, I would have thought that the Treasurer of the day would be extremely foolish to require that that semi-government authority borrow from the C.B.A. rather than making its own arrangements, and I am quite certain that that would not happen. Equally, if a semi-government authority is able to swing a deal that is better than that which is currently enjoyed by the C.B.A., I would think that the C.B.A. would immediately take steps to investigate and explore those avenues to obtain the same deal. Really, the points that the Leader has made are of no terribly great import in this matter. It is a matter of obtaining the best deal we can basically for the semi-government authorities and ultimately for the tax payers.

Mr BANNON: There may be hypothetical situations in which, as a matter of policy, the Treasurer would like investment directed, whether the deal is better or worse, through the authority. I think that that is most unlikely.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Under what circumstances? Could you elucidate so that I can understand it?

Mr BANNON: I cannot describe the precise circumstances under which that might happen. The question which I am asking but which the Premier has not yet answered is what impact this clause will have on those statutory bodies that at the moment have some statutory protection. Does it override that protection? If it does, to what extent have those bodies been consulted about the implications of this clause?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Treasury has had discussions with all of these semi-government authorities over some three or four years. As for protection, the whole point of setting up a C.B.A. is so that there is the protection of the Government because, if a C.B.A. is not protected by Government when that Government is setting it up, I cannot think of anything stronger than that. Again, the autonomy of each semi-government authority in these matters will depend entirely on how well it is able to raise funds and on what terms—whether they are less advantageous or more advantageous than the way in which a C.B.A. could raise those funds. I cannot see what objection the Leader has to that.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (17 to 27) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 September. Page 967.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition does not object to this amendment. Of course, a degree of grandstanding and cynicism is involved in the Premier's attitude to this issue, and lofty sentiments have been

expressed about examples of wage restraint being shown to the community, and so on. I make quite clear that, if the Opposition felt that this formulation, and this kind of instruction to an industrial tribunal was going to extend beyond the fixation of salaries of members of Parliament, we would be objecting to it most vigorously and vociferously.

Tribunals have been established under Conciliation and Arbitration Acts going back to the turn of the century. They have been given wide powers to make determinations. They have embedded in those Acts economic considerations and other matters that can be taken into account in their primary purpose of settling disputes and setting fair remuneration rates. We believe strongly, in relation to Parliamentary salaries, that those general principals of fixation should apply, that Parliamentarians are not a class apart. They should not be allowed to fix their own salaries or determine their own rates of pay; nor should any section of the community.

It is interesting to see that those board members and others can fix their own rates without too much community criticism and calls to set examples of community leadership. But, that is fine. The Opposition does not believe that that should apply in the case of Parliamentary salaries, but the tribunal process, the arms-length approach to the proper fixation of remuneration of members, should be adhered to.

Let us not forget the principle behind the payment of members of Parliament. It was to open up the opportunity of Parliamentary representation to any person, whatever walk of life they might come from. Indeed, very many people in our community at all levels of income, but particularly at the working level, were precluded from representing their Party's beliefs or constituencies in Parliament by reason of financial bars. Australia was a pioneer in the concept of remuneration of members of Parliament in order to ensure that not just those of private or independent means, or those in professions that could make the time available, occupied the benches of Parliament. I think that that has been a very good thing and is a very sound principle.

It is a pity that a lot of comments made by people, sometimes by members of Parliament for their own politicking purposes, tend to undermine that very important concept. When it comes to the actual fixation of a fair rate, an independent tribunal is the only means by which it should be done. The Opposition supports that. Indeed, we, in Government, established such a tribunal.

What the tribunal should take into consideration in its fixation should be open. But, in this case, the Government wishes to put a particular requirement on the tribunal in respect of the salaries of members of Parliament. As I say, the Opposition is not objecting to that. I believe that members of Parliament can stand up to the survey of the tribunal which looks at an example of the restraint in levels of salary which should be set by members of Parliament in terms of this Act, and we have nothing to fear from that.

Perhaps, politically, the Premier thinks he has a lot to gain. Perhaps, as politicians, it may be to our advantage. I repeat that it is not something that should be imposed on other sectors of the work force, and the way in which similar measures have been brought into this Parliament has been resisted by us very strongly because of that degree of dictation to the independent tribunal which undermines the industrial system. With those remarks, and again stressing that this applies to members of Parliament only and is not to be seen as a precedent to apply in the general industrial area, the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I find myself forced to my feet in relation to the last words of the Leader of the Opposition. I firmly believe that members of Parliament are representative of the community and

that they are not above or outside the influences that affect the community as a whole. I find it quite remarkable that the Leader of the Opposition should say that, if restraint is good enough in the consideration of a tribunal to determine the salaries of members of Parliament, restraint should not also apply and be quite good enough for industrial tribunals to set the wages and salaries of members in the community.

Mr McRae: You humbug; you humbug in that case. You have always been a humbug, and you know it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot really see what the difference is. I am fascinated to hear the member for Playford being so vociferous and concerned about that statement. I personally do not put members of Parliament in a class aside. I believe that they should be and are properly representative of the community that they serve and, as such, they are members of that community.

I find the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in this respect, and supported certainly in a rather odd fashion by the member for Playford—but nevertheless supported—very much at odds with that point of view. Nevertheless, the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he has no objection to the proposal that the Government has put forward. There is no way—

Mr McRae: You are trying to drive a wedge between the Parliamentary wing and the anti-unionists. That is what you are trying to do, you humbug.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the member for Playford make those comments. I believe it is tremendously important. I have always said that members of the Labor Party and the trade union movement are one and the same, that they are controlled by the same ends. I find it fascinating that both honourable members opposite have taken it upon themselves to accept restraint in the determination of their own salaries but are not prepared to withstand the demands of the trade union movement for excessive wage demands when restraint would be a better course of action to follow.

Mr McRae: We are not as rich as you, rich man. Get that!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find myself absolutely amazed by that comment. Certainly I do not have any superannuation at present. I have no wish to become Director of Tourism in Queensland or Western Australia. I understand the position in Victoria has been taken.

Mr McRae: You humbug!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I wish the honourable member was correct. I would be delighted if he were. The problem is that he knows full well that he is not correct. I find his remarks quite fascinating. It is fascinating and revealing of the true natures of the honourable gentlemen opposite. I also found the performance by the Leader of the Opposition, for the third time this evening, to be supporting. I go too far: I should say having no objection to legislation but then damning it with fake praise. However, there was no praise for this legislation—it was damned. It was supported and damned at the same time. Lofty sentiments, they would be called in a sarcastic tone of voice. There is no need for sarcasm. The sentiments expressed are responsible indeed. The interpretation put upon the Government's motives in introducing this legislation is very revealing of the attitudes of honourable members opposite.

Having said that, I would remind honourable members that this is a complete turnaround in their attitude from that which they showed in another place when similar legislation was before this Parliament. I am very pleased indeed to see that there has been some element of responsibility

coming into the attitude of members of the Opposition on this occasion. I welcome it and congratulate them on an enlightened change of mind. I look forward to members of this Parliament setting the example which I believe the community expects of us of restraint in these difficult economic times.

Mr McRae interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford will remain silent while the Chair is directing procedural motions.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 August. Page 756.)

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): The principal object of this Bill is to correct a number of deficiencies in the present legislation by providing for the introduction of a mandatory scheme of maintenance and random inspection of passenger buses in addition to the present system of periodic inspections and the issue of certificates of inspection. I believe that it is a necessary and sensible measure and the Opposition would be remiss if it were not to support it. Also, it appears that most parties are in agreement with the proposed amendments, including the transport unions, to whom I spoke concerning certain provisions of the Bill. Whilst they raised several points, to which I will refer later, I commend the unions for their fairness and for the responsible attitude that was shown towards this measure. However, I suppose that in regard to safety issues the support and co-operation of all groups is easier to obtain than it is on more controversial issues.

The question of the present bus safety measures speaks volumes for the thinking of the former Labor Government whose initiative and foresight saw the establishment of the \$1 000 000 vehicle inspection centre at Regency Park, which was opened by the Premier on 9 July and which I and a number of Opposition members had the pleasure of attending. That centre will enhance the safety record of our bus industry in South Australia. The only blemish was that the person responsible for that initiative, who has now retired from this Parliament, had his name struck-off the guest invitation list for the official opening by the Minister.

In his second reading speech the Minister, when referring to the investigation into the safety of operation of passenger buses by the former Government and the legislation that was subsequently enacted which provided for the establishment of the central inspection authority and for the introduction of regular periodic inspections of buses and the issue of certificates of inspection, drew attention to, despite those earlier measures, the tragic bus accident which occurred in May 1980 in New South Wales in which there was considerable loss of life.

He pointed out that the bus involved was registered in South Australia and was, at the time, the subject of a current certificate of inspection but, following further investigations, it was found that the bus was, at the time of the accident, in an unsound condition. As a consequence, the Government established a bus inspection committee and the Bill before us is to give effect to the recommendations of that committee.

From the South Australian point of view, this measure is a step in the right direction. One would hope that all the other States will enact similar provisions so that some degree of uniformity will apply. It may be that the other States

have similar provisions of which I am not aware; perhaps the Minister can refer to that matter. If the other States do not have similar provisions, it may be possible for the Minister to raise the matter at a future conference of all State and Federal Ministers of Transport in an endeavour to achieve uniform provisions in the interests of safety and in the interests of all interstate bus travellers.

All honourable members can indulge in reminiscences, but I recall the tragic accident that occurred on 15 December last year, again in New South Wales, where three people died and 15 were seriously injured when a tourist bus ploughed into an overturned semi-trailer.

Thirty-seven people were on board the bus and 34 survivors were all taken to hospital. The five people heading towards Adelaide were presumably South Australians. The bus was being operated by Deluxe Coachlines, of Wangaratta, Victoria. That company had leased the bus from the Eldred Bus Company, at Leongatha, and it was heading towards Melbourne at the time of the accident. It is possible that this bus also had faulty brakes or a fault of some other kind. I could refer to many quite serious bus accidents that have occurred over the years.

Another point that I believe is worth making is the question of insurance. In the *Advertiser* of 3 December 1981 an article stated:

A dispute in which an insurance firm was ordered to reimburse a bus company for damages to a bus involved in a multiple fatality four years ago was set down yesterday for retrial. Staliner Pty Ltd had sued the Legal and General Assurance Society Ltd for failing to reimburse it \$55 750 for damage to one of its buses which crashed near Diggers Rest, Victoria, in October 1977, killing seven passengers. In an earlier hearing before Mr Justice White, the insurance firm had denied liability for damage to the bus because a clause in the insurance policy excluded cover if the vehicle had been used in an unsafe or unroadworthy condition and if the bus company could reasonably have detected the unsafe condition.

Mr Justice White had found that the insurance firm was liable. It then appealed on 15 grounds to the Full Court of the Supreme Court which comprised the Chief Justice, Mr Justice King, Justice Mitchell and Mr Justice Williams. In a unanimous decision yesterday, the Full Court ruled that a new hearing of the dispute be set.

In the main judgment, Justice Mitchell said Mr Justice White had found that the insurer had to prove that the bus's unsafe or unroadworthy condition could reasonably have been detected by the bus company, and that it had failed to prove this. Justice Mitchell said it was her opinion that the bus company had to prove it could not have reasonably detected the unsafe or unroadworthy condition. During the first hearing, evidence was given that at the time of the crash, the bus's brakes had been about 20 per cent effective.

The point I am making is very important. I believe that, when this Bill is enacted, it will certainly help in that kind of dispute. The Bill also provides severe penalties for both the owner and the driver of a bus driven for the purpose of carrying passengers whilst it is in an unsafe condition or if it has not been maintained in accordance with the prescribed maintenance procedures.

It is in relation to the severe penalties, particularly for drivers, where I believe the transport union showed a lot of common sense. Its attitude was that we must make both parties responsible. It was mentioned that whilst the union would like to think that all of its members are white men, the fact is that they are not. They have the occasional driver who is prepared to take a risk, who does not want to lose overtime, who chases an extra load, and so on. For that reason, the responsibility must work both ways. That is recognised, and I commend the union for its attitude. It is certainly a very responsible approach indeed. However, the point was made quite strongly that the driver should be responsible only for anything visual and the reporting of other known faults, such as faulty brakes and steering, when required to initial or sign inspection sheets.

Visual items would include tyres, lights, indicators and warning lamps, and so on, but faulty brake drums, drag links and king pins, for example, cannot be seen by the driver and therefore he should not be responsible for that type of fault.

I turn now to the clauses of the Bill. The provisions of new section 163c (2) seem to prevent owners demanding that a driver of a defective vehicle continue to a destination or be dismissed. The driver has a recourse in the event of his employer taking action against him and, of course, some drivers have developed a habit of not reporting faults on vehicles. Clause 6 relates to the inspection of vehicles. It is a known fact that some private operators carry out maintenance only prior to an inspection falling due, often substituting parts for the period of the inspection. As an example, when the State Transport Authority took over the private bus sector a number of coaches were included, and were found to have welded front stub axles, which is illegal. Mechanical staff taken on by the State Transport Authority from private operators have made casual comments to the supervisory staff to the effect, 'Yes, only fit a good set to get it through the inspection.' This provision will greatly assist in overcoming that problem.

It is most encouraging to see the recent general thrust toward vehicle safety. Great advances have been made with electronic analysers and computer trends in car service work. The South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce is establishing a State-wide network of vehicle inspection stations offering a basic safety check covering 27 items and a comprehensive inspection covering some 111 items. The Department of Industry inspectors are also carrying out safety tests on road coach doors to ensure that they are safe. Just the other day an article in the *News* contained an announcement by the Minister that the State Government is introducing a \$20 roadworthiness inspection fee for cars issued with defect notices by South Australian police.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They will be tested here, on these premises at Regency Park.

Mr ABBOTT: Yes, I wanted to refer to the estimated cost of \$20. I understand that some of that will not apply if it is just a visual inspection. I want to make the point that I hope that the Minister keeps that charge as low as possible in order to encourage motorists to have their vehicles inspected, from a safety point of view, as often as possible. If the charge was too high it would not encourage motorists. When this Bill comes into operation it will create a general obligation for the owner of a bus to ensure that his vehicle is in a safe, roadworthy condition when it is being used for the carriage of passengers. I have no hesitation in supporting the measure.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I, too, support the Bill. The issue of safety of buses has concerned me for some time. Members may recall that on 2 October 1980, during the Budget Estimates Committees, and as recorded on page 207 of *Hansard*, I made particular reference to this question of spot checks after inspection had taken place. In discussion with union officials, certain allegations were made to me. I have, in relation thereto, stated before (page 207 of *Hansard*):

It has been alleged to me that there are some private bus operators who, after the initial inspection by the Government inspectors, place fixed axles and bald tyres on their vehicles.

That official was very concerned and brought the matter to my attention. The Minister, in response, stated that the review committee had not been completed. He pointed out the need for a Central Inspection Authority and said that he was then having a good look at the matter. He further stated:

It is a matter that I will have to take to the Government, and I can say no more about it at this stage. We are also looking at a code of practice for maintenance of private buses, and indeed Government buses, so that after an inspection has taken place it

will be incumbent upon the operator to maintain the bus in a satisfactory condition.

I certainly welcome what the Minister has done, and I applaud him for the measures that he and the Government have taken in this regard. I further pointed out that there should be random inspection of buses, which I believe is most important. Will the Minister say how these random inspections will take place? I understand that there will possibly be random inspections on the roads, but I also believe that random inspections in the bus depots, particularly before and after a run, are most important. The inspectors should undertake the checks at random, and the times should be varied.

How many inspectors will be made available for these checks, and how many buses will be examined each year, as the Minister in the second reading explanation referred to 'random inspection of buses as considered necessary'? I hope that the Minister will elaborate on that, because it seems that there is an outlet for any Government that is not prepared to pursue the question of safety as strongly as it should be pursued. That is why I ask the Minister how many inspectors there will be and how many buses will be inspected each year.

As the member for Spence has pointed out (and, indeed, as was pointed out in the second reading explanation), this review took place, I understand, as a result of the investigation that occurred in Hay, New South Wales, in May 1980, after three people lost their lives because of faulty equipment in and the unroadworthiness of a bus. Anything that can be utilised by this Government or by successive Governments to ensure the safety of passengers on public transport will be welcomed by me and by my colleagues. I praise the Government for this measure.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): At the outset, let me welcome the member for Spence to the Road Traffic Act, which is one of the most complicated and largest pieces of legislation that we have in this Parliament, along with the Motor Vehicles Act, which is another Act that the honourable member will have to grapple with. The member for Spence has had Ministerial experience, so that should not present too much of a problem to him. However, the honourable member may recall that during the previous session we amended the Road Traffic Act, I think, 10 times. It is that sort of Act. Many amendments to that Act follow court cases and judicial decisions which find loopholes that have to be closed. That is one reason why there are so many amendments to that Act.

I congratulate the honourable member on the research that he has put into this matter. It is an important matter as both he and the member for Albert Park have said. It is a matter that is extremely important to me. As I have said in this House before, when one has Ministerial responsibility in an area in which two schoolgirls and a driver lose their lives in a bus accident, that is an extremely upsetting thing. It is certainly the most upsetting thing that I have had happen to me in the three years during which I have been a Minister. I am determined that South Australia was no longer going to be criticised, as it has been until recently, for its inspection system of its buses.

The member for Spence mentioned the Transport Ministers Council (ATAC). South Australia has been criticised severely by that body at at least three of the ATAC meetings that I have attended during the past three years because of the condition of South Australian buses travelling interstate. Most of that criticism has come from New South Wales, but I put on record the co-operation I have received, especially in the matter of the Hay bus accident, from the Hon. Peter Cox, Minister of Transport for New South Wales. Nevertheless, it is not a proud moment when one is representing one's State and it is criticised.

We are putting this matter right with what we have done at Regency Park, with what we are doing with this legislation and with what we will do with the code of practice, the maintenance practice and the regulations that will come into force once this measure becomes law. I was surprised to hear the honourable member for Spence mention the bus inspection facility of the Central Inspection Authority at Regency Park.

On reflection, however, I know why he has mentioned it. He did say that it was an initiative of the former Government when the transport portfolio was held by Mr Geoff Virgo. In fact, he condemned me because I struck Mr Virgo's name from the invitation list for the opening of that particular facility. I think I can explain to the member for Spence where he has gone wrong. He is confusing the central inspection authority of the bus inspection facility at Regency Park with the S.T.A. bus depot at Regency Park. They are close to each other and both large premises. However, the bus inspection facility cost \$1 000 000, while the S.T.A. bus depot I think cost \$8 000 000 to \$10 000 000.

Mr Virgo's name was inadvertently left off the invitation list. Of course, that was an initiative of Mr Virgo and I never tried to deny that. His name was inadvertently left off the invitation list and I apologised to him for that. I do not know whether Mr Virgo would have wanted to be invited to the opening of the Regency Park bus inspection premises, because that certainly was not his initiative. I am very happy to have Geoff Virgo come if he wants to. We have a happy relationship and I am happy to ask him, but I do not know for how many years after he retired as Minister I have to keep asking him to openings of various transport facilities. However, I am always happy to see him.

Let me assure the member for Spence that this initiative of this Government followed the Hay bus accident, when I instituted exhaustive inquiries as to the reasons why that bus was travelling in New South Wales, why the steering linkage broke, why it was welded and was not a standard part, and why the coachwork of the bus was rusted inside the padding. An intensive investigation was undertaken as to why these things occurred, if they occurred for what reasons they occurred, and what we could do to prevent that happening in the future, bearing in mind that this was the third serious bus accident which involved a loss of life in South Australian buses travelling interstate over the past few years. That is a situation that I was not prepared to tolerate.

So, the Bus Inspection Committee was set up and it was a committee that not only had Government representatives, but representatives of what was then called the Bus Proprietors Association and is now called the Bus and Coach Association. The committee brought down a very good report and it is on that report that this legislation is based. I am very happy about that, because it was the private sector itself that particularly wanted these measures instituted for the protection of buses. So, it is important that the community should realise that it was the private sector itself that was so keen to see that it did not continue to receive the opprobrium for the various accidents that had occurred through lack of maintenance or faulty maintenance.

I want to cover briefly the question of substitute parts, which was mentioned by both members who spoke. The question that owners carried out maintenance only before they went for compulsory inspection was raised. The only thing I take issue with is that the member for Spence mentioned the word 'often'. I wish to defend the private bus operators of this State, because they have been extremely responsible. Of course, some of these things have happened, and I do not deny that. If honourable members are going to get information from their contacts that these things are happening, I wish that they would let me know. It is no

good getting up in this House and saying that one person has done that, that another person has done another thing, and that another company has substituted parts and then replaced them again with worn parts later, and not providing me with the information.

Mr Hamilton: But to prove it is another thing.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: That may be. If members have information, even a suspicion, they should let me know because then we can look at the individuals concerned without necessarily going to prosecution, but we can look at the question and they will come under notice.

The point I am trying to make is that generally the private sector is extremely responsible and most bus proprietors I know are extremely responsible and maintain their buses extremely well. As I say, I do not deny that some of these things have happened. I have had reports from my own officers that things have happened, but certainly not often. I make that quite clear and I do not believe that bus operators should go undefended in that regard.

The member for Albert Park asked how many inspectors would be on the staff and how many buses we expected to handle in one year. The inspection procedures will change. At the moment buses are inspected twice yearly (every six months). In future, buses will be inspected officially at the premises once every 12 months, but they will be subject to random inspection at any time, without notice, either on the road or in the depots, and the maintenance records can be checked at that time.

The random inspections will be random, so I am not able to say how many inspections a particular bus proprietor will have to undergo, how many will occur outside the depot, or how many will occur inside the depot. The only thing I can confidently say is that there will be one full inspection at Regency Park, where the bus will be brought in and where all facilities will be able to be used in testing that bus. Information on how many inspectors there will be and the number of buses that we will be able to handle in 12 months, I will obtain for the honourable member. This legislation has come on tonight when in fact it was meant to come in on Thursday, so I do not have my officers with me to advise me on the finer points. However, I will be happy to obtain that information for the honourable member.

The question of driver responsibility was mentioned also. If the member for Spence would like to take up the matter with me later, I will get some answers for him on the question of driver responsibility. I will certainly have my officers look carefully at what the member for Spence had to say in his speech and will obtain an answer to his question. I would be very surprised if this legislation did not have to be amended at some stage during the next few years.

In an area of pioneering legislation (because this is to a great extent pioneering legislation), it is usual for a few things to come out in the wash that need to be altered. It may well be that driver responsibility is one of them. I do not know, and I cannot say; nor am I saying that we will amend the Act in that regard. Nevertheless, we are always happy to look at any constructive suggestions. That is all I wish to say. I thank the Opposition for supporting the Bill and commend it to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 15 September at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 September 1982

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SALISBURY NORTH MOVEMENT STUDY

10. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What action was undertaken, is being undertaken or is proposed to be undertaken to counter the following problems identified in the 'Salisbury North Movement Study' commissioned in 1976—

(a) 'Safer movement is needed around school gates to reduce vehicle/child conflicts';

(b) 'Street lighting along pedestrian routes is inadequate'; and

(c) 'Cycling is dangerous in the area, particularly on the main roads'?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The purpose of the Salisbury North Movement Study was to identify a programme of works for the Corporation of the City of Salisbury which would include a series of relatively small works to satisfy the needs of several small groups of people living in the Salisbury North area. Funds were provided to the corporation by the State Government to enable the study's being made.

The study was not intended to provide a basis upon which the State Government would take any action, but rather as a means whereby the views of the small groups of people living in Salisbury North could be recorded and, if applicable, quantified by the Corporation of the City of Salisbury. Therefore, I am not in a position to answer the question on behalf of the corporation, but can advise that, as far as cycling is concerned, the bicycle plan for the Adelaide Metropolitan area currently being developed will define those bicycle routes through the suburbs which are relatively safer than other routes. It is hoped that the 'Adelaide Bike Plan' will be completed and available in November 1982.

STUDENTS SCHEME

119. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Regarding the Government Assisted Students Scheme—

(a) when is it proposed that application forms will be made available to schools for the 1983 school year;

(b) will schools be provided with the number of forms they request and, if not, why not;

(c) what provisions will be entered into to guarantee that in 1983 there will not be delays similar to those that took place in 1982 in the processing of applications; and

(d) what interim support will be made available to schools which have a large number of students affected by applications pending the adjudication of those applications?

The Hon. H. ALLISON:

(a) End of October 1982.

(b) Yes, it is the practice of the Education Department to issue forms to schools based on the number of students approved for the previous year plus some additional forms to cover possible increases in applications. If school principals can substantiate that extra forms are required, then they will be supplied.

(c) It is not expected that delays will occur.

(d) It is not proposed to provide any interim support. Schools may claim reimbursement on behalf of approved students as soon as they receive approval advice from the Education Department.

SHEPHERDSON ROAD

131. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. What work has been done since 1977 by the Public Buildings Department with regard to an improved design for the road/verge treatment of Shepherdson Road in front of Parafield Gardens Primary and Junior Primary Schools?

2. Has any consideration been given to how costs for the implementing of such redesign proposals be shared between P.B.D., the Education Department and the Salisbury Council?

3. When can it be anticipated that any proposals for redesign are affected?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. Moieties were paid to the Salisbury Council in June 1977 for kerbing and footpath improvements but no work has been carried out by the Public Buildings Department on the subject road/verge.

2. The Public Buildings Department has not been requested to consider cost sharing arrangements for roadside improvements of the subject type.

3. The Public Buildings Department has not been requested to investigate the need for or to document improvements.

ABORIGINAL YOUTH

133. Mr ABBOTT (on notice) asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs: What specific additional resources have been given to youth project centres and services that benefit Aboriginal youth programmes and in what locations are these centres and services situated?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Centres and Services working with Aboriginal young offenders have recruited additional staff in the following locations: Riverland, 2; Ceduna, 1; Yalata, 1; Murray Bridge, 1.

ABORIGINAL YOUTH PROGRAMMES

134. Mr ABBOTT (on notice) asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs:

1. What are the successful elements of the Aboriginal Youth Services programmes that may be surveyed and possibly maintained?

2. What staff positions and tasks have been adjusted to enable consideration to be given to the continuation of those successful aspects of the programmes?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The discussion with the Commonwealth is to determine the successful elements of the Aboriginal service programmes. The elements of the programmes include informal recreation, camps, trips of educational interest, sporting competitions and special interest groups.

2. Ceduna. 2 staff positions—1 youth worker for Yalata; 1 group worker in Ceduna.

No adjustment—continuation of successful aspects.

Offender Aid and Rehabilitation Services. 1 worker—funding to continue from D.A.A.
Port Augusta. Funds available for sessional worker as in the past. Activities to continue.

Port Adelaide. One youth worker to organise similar activities. Some successful activities to continue.

Point Pearce. Department of Community Welfare seeking funds for a youth worker. Awaiting outcome of decisions on funds.

Murray Bridge (Murray Bridge Youth Project Centre). The centre will continue to work with Aboriginal young offenders and youth at risk. No special staff.

Port Lincoln. Funding is from the Department of Social Security for a three-quarter time youth worker. This is understood to be continuing.

Seeking additional funds from Community Welfare Grants Fund. If successful, same level of activity.

PRESS RELEASES

142. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Since appointment as Minister of Education, how many press releases have been issued partly under the title of Minister of Education or through the Press Secretary of the Minister that deal with matters that fall more properly under his capacity as member for Mount Gambier?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: None.

BETHESDA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

144. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What rental and other charges have been required of the Bethesda Christian School as a result of its use of facilities at the Vermont High School site?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The rental and other charges required of Bethesda Christian School are:

	\$
Annual rental	21 000
Electricity p.a.	1 300
Gas	600

Sewerage—based on valuation of land leased. 10.2 per cent to total property value for sewer rate.

Council rates—calculated on a per capita basis.

All costs associated with telephones, cleaning and waste disposal.

Maintenance and repair of those areas leased exclusively to Bethesda—in accordance with Public Buildings Department specifications.

Insurance and public risk insurance—the school is required to establish and pay costs associated with fire, vandalism and other extraneous hazards, to indemnify the Minister of Education against such claims.

ITALIAN CULTURAL CENTRE

146. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What support has been provided to the Italian Cultural Centre in Paralowie, when was such support made, and why was the member for Salisbury, as local member, not advised of any support that was made available?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As far as may be ascertained, the Italian Cultural Centre has received support from the Salisbury City Council, the Commonwealth Government Schools Commission and the South Australian Education Department.

In the latter case the South Australian Education Department has made a grant to the Italian Cultural Centre to assist with the Italian language school which is run there. The grant is \$28 per student per year. The school had an enrolment of 50 in the first half of this year and has an enrolment of 48 currently. It is not departmental practice, when grants are provided, to necessarily inform the local member.

EQUITABLE SERVICE SCHEME

150. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Concerning the Equitable Service Scheme, how many people and women, respectively, have—

- (a) had their country service deferred;
- (b) taken four years leave without pay;
- (c) been transferred compulsorily; and
- (d) resigned from the Department?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

(a) 166 deferrals have been granted, of which 106 were to female teachers.

(b) 87 teachers have taken four years leave without pay in lieu of country service, of these 82 are female.

(c) 19 teachers were required to go to the country at the commencement of the 1982 school year; 14 men and 5 women. A further 8 would have been required to go, but volunteered; 5 of those were men and 3 were female.

(d) The Education Department does not collect statistics on the number of teachers who resigned rather than accept a compulsory transfer to a country school. Teachers do not always state their reason for resignation.

TEACHERS ALLOWANCES

152. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are locality allowances paid to teachers employed by the Education Department taxable and if so, have any representations been made by the Minister to the Federal Government on this matter and, if so, when?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Locality allowances paid to teachers employed by the Education Department are taxable. The Minister of Education has discussed the matter with Federal Ministers. Formal enquiries made by the Director-General of Education and the South Australian Institute of Teachers to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation were not successful.

ESL TEACHERS

154. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many teachers (in total and in full-time equivalents) of English as a second language are employed in primary and secondary schools respectively, and what percentage in each category are permanent employees?

2. Concerning contract appointments of ESL teachers, how many in each category are on—

- (a) one month;
- (b) one term;
- (c) one year; and
- (d) other length,

contracts and how many contract appointments have been reappointed for—

- (a) a second year;
- (b) a third year; and
- (c) other lengths of time?

3. What plans are in hand or proposed for the conversion of contract appointments of ESL teachers to permanent appointments?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of teachers of English as a second language employed at present is:

Primary 121 (93.4 full time equivalent).

Secondary 48 (42.7 full time equivalent).

Fifty-seven per cent of the primary teachers and 43 per cent of the secondary teachers are permanent.

2. As a general rule no contract appointments are for greater than a year or shorter than one month. One primary teacher of English as a second language has a contract for one term, four have contracts for two terms and 37 have contracts for a full year.

Two secondary teachers of English as a second language have contracts for two terms and 23 have full year contracts. Two primary teachers of English as a second language have had contracts since 1979, ten since 1980 and 12 since 1981. Three secondary teachers of English as a second language have had contracts since 1979, five since 1980 and ten since 1981.

3. The matter has been under consideration for some time. However, no action is planned at the present time.

ESL TEACHERS

155. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Are English as a Second Language teachers who are employed on a permanent basis able to be appointed to promotion positions within ESL teaching in the same way as other permanent teachers and, if not, why not?

2. In secondary schools, are ESL teachers able to become seniors or heads of departments and, if not, why not?

3. What career structures exist for experienced ESL teachers in language centres?

4. Who in the Education Department is responsible for policy on ESL teachers' promotion rights and opportunities?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Permanent ESL teachers are able to be promoted in the same way as other permanent teachers, but not within ESL teaching specifically, with the exception of Levels I-III advisory positions which are short-term tenured. There are no promotion positions because the group is comparatively quite small.

2. Qualified secondary teachers are able to become seniors in the following categories which are fixed by the Secondary Promotion Committee.

English/Humanities

Maths/Science

General

Special subjects, for example: Educational Technology, Drama, Film etc.

Art

Technical Studies

Home Economics

Physical Education

Commercial Studies

3. Each language centre has a head teacher or principal.

4. The Director-General of Education is responsible for policies on ESL teachers' promotion rights and opportunities. It should be noted that he works within Government policy and relies upon advice of his officers and especially the advice of the Teachers Classification Board, which is set up under the Education Act for this purpose.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS

168. Mr HEMMINGS (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many special schools are there in South Australia?

2. Approximately how many students travel to and from such schools by bus and how many bus routes are involved?

3. Who is responsible for the students while they are travelling to and from the schools?

4. How many of the school buses belong to the Education Department and how many are contracted from private companies?

5. What are drivers instructed to do with a sick child?

6. What is the driver's responsibility if his bus breaks down?

7. What kind of insurance cover exists for those travelling on these buses?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 17 special schools in South Australia for intellectually disabled pupils, including the Kent Town pre-school. Additionally there are speech and hearing centres (11, including a pre-school), and other particular special schools e.g. Townsend School for the Visually Impaired, and centres. To all these establishments, as well as regular schools, particular handicapped children may be transported.

The answers which follow apply to all such provisions rather than to special schools alone.

2. There are 458 handicapped pupils who travel on buses funded by the Education Department on 29 bus routes. There are also 377 children who travel by taxis on 75 routes.

3. Clause 1 (h) of the contracts made with operators with respect to the transport of handicapped children specifies as follows:

Exercise all reasonable care for the safety of the children whilst they are entering, travelling in, or alighting from the vehicles, and be responsible to the principal of the said school for the general behaviour of the children at such times.

4. All buses belong to private contractors.

5. The instructions given in the contract indicate that the driver is responsible 'for the general behaviour of the children'. Where specific enquiries have been made by contractors about sick children, they have been advised to stop the bus and hail assistance rather than leave the children.

6. The Contractor is responsible for the transport of children and it is the contractor who is required to get the children to school or home if his/her vehicle breaks down.

7. Third Party insurance is provided, as is required by law.

ELIZABETH SCHOOL TRANSPORT

171. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Education Department advised the local community of what transport arrangements would be—

(a) needed; and

(b) likely to apply.

in the event of each of the proposed options for restructuring high schools in the Elizabeth area being adopted and, if so, what advice was provided in each case, including information as to the financing of such arrangements?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows: In the public consultation process just concluded in Elizabeth, during the second school term of 1982, the local community was advised of transport arrangements related to the proposed options as follows:

Option 1—The junior/senior cluster of schools: No special transport arrangements are considered necessary, and public transport in the area is available. The siting of the proposed senior high school would be considered in the light of the best available public transport access.

Option 2—The sharing proposal: Only two of the Elizabeth secondary schools have so far opted for such a proposal. This was done as a school-based decision, and since both schools (Elizabeth West High School and Smithfield Plains High School) have their own school buses, and have made no requests for additional resources to operate their scheme, it is anticipated that the two schools will finance the arrangements out of their own resources.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

182. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What were the balances of the Education Department deposit account for manual pays as at 30 June in each of the past five years?

2. What interest receipts were earned by the account in each of those years?

3. What investment policy is pursued regarding the account?

4. What categories of pay are handled through the account?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Balances of the Education Department deposit account for manual pays were:

Year ended	Amount
	\$
30 June 1982	130 917
30 June 1981	149 152
30 June 1980	163 446

This account was opened in October 1979, hence only three years balances are available.

2. No interest receipts were earned by the account in any of the above years.

3. The Education Department does not pursue an investment policy for this account.

4. This account was established to meet urgent manual salary payments under the Education Department Management Information System (EDMIS). At present, teachers, temporary relieving assistants, hourly paid instructors, part-time ancillary staff and cleaners are categories of pay handled through the account.

SCHOLARSHIP AND PRIZES TRUST FUND

184. Mr LYNN ARNOLD (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. For what purposes is the Scholarship and Prizes Trust Fund held by the Education Department?

2. What were the payments and receipts of the fund in each of the past five years?

3. What are the sources of income for the fund?

4. How are the funds invested?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. This trust fund is held by the department for the purpose of administering bequests received specifically for the payment of scholarships and prizes. Interest from investments is accumulated in the fund and payments to the recipients of the scholarship or prize are made upon receiving advice from the appropriate committee.

2. Receipts and payments of the fund in each of the past five years were:

	Receipts	Payments
	\$	\$
1977-78	12 715.20	25 833.00
1978-79	30 401.32	9 843.09
1979-80	13 578.80	8 714.95
1980-81	18 741.33	28 599.55
1981-82	16 152.47	12 946.86
	\$91 589.12	\$85 937.45

3. Bequests are mainly invested with the Public Trustee (two exceptions being with Elder's Trustee and the Registry of Inscribed Stock). The interest on these investments is forwarded to the department and placed in the trust fund. The balance in the scholarships and prizes trust fund is taken into account by the Treasury Department when calculating the overall Government surplus to be invested. A weighted average rate of return on these investments is calculated over a six-month period and distributed accordingly each six months to the scholarships and prizes trust fund.

4. The Finance Officer, Treasury Department, has advised that these funds are taken into account when calculating the overall government surplus to be invested in government bonds, Treasury notes and convertible certificates of deposits, which are all Commonwealth Government guaranteed.