

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 December 1982

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: GRANGE VINEYARD

A petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to list the Grange vineyard property in its entirety on the register of State heritage items was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOBILE FOOD VANS

A petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restrict the threat that mobile food vans represent to snack-bar businesses was presented by the Hon. J.D. Wright.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Public Service Board of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon.

D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

North Haven Trust—Report, 1981-82.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Consumer Affairs, Commissioner for—Report, 1981-82.

QUESTION TIME

COMPANY TAKE-OVERS

Mr OLSEN: My question is directed to the Premier. Now that the Labor Party is in Government is it going to put into effect the promises made in Opposition about company take-overs and will it act in the case of the Onkaparinga Textiles Limited take-over and, if not, why not? Last Friday, Onkaparinga Textiles Limited, an Adelaide based company and the largest wool and textile group of its type in Australia, received a \$4 100 000 take-over offer which seems certain to succeed.

While Leader of the Opposition, the Premier constantly attacked take-overs similar to that of Onkaparinga. In a speech at an Australian finance conference luncheon on 24 June this year, he said:

The drift of ownership and control out of South Australian hands to interstate and overseas interests will not be stopped if Governments stand aside from the market.

Again, in the Labor Party document, South Australia's Economic Future Stage 1, published on 27 May 1982, the

regular take-over of South Australian companies was attacked, and the Premier was quoted as saying:

Labor does not find it acceptable that more and more vital economic decisions affecting the lives of South Australians are made outside the State.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is true, as the Leader mentions in his explanation that, under the previous Government particularly, South Australia became something of a branch office State. During that period, beginning with the disastrous decision to do nothing with the Bank of Adelaide, we saw the increasing take-over and shifting of control of some of our household names and major institutions. It was deplorable that no contingencies and no plans were formulated to do something about it. We can divide this broadly into two sections. There are those bodies or companies that are vital in terms of investment and financially to the State. The Bank of Adelaide comes squarely into that category. There are those that are commercial businesses in the market place. Again, while it is regrettable that control of those organisations shifts interstate, nonetheless market forces which operate can make it quite impossible for action to be taken in terms of direct Government intervention. Between those, there are shades. For instance, the Elders take-over was one that was talked about.

However, I certainly got what the Leader says in the reference to the darkened board rooms. We have plans to ensure that investment resources are mobilised in South Australia to prevent that sort of take-over occurring. Some can occur in the market place; in other words, there are instances where direct statutory intervention would not be justified, as I am sure members of the Opposition will agree. In fact, on their principles, statutory intervention is not justified in any circumstances. We reject that totally. Circumstances exist where action is necessary. In Government we boldly and resolutely said so in the case of Executor Trustee, for one. We have done it, and sometimes against the opposition and attitudes of honourable members now in Opposition.

But, in other cases, if we are to mobilise financial investment resources in this State, we will ensure that the major stake holding of those companies is protected from this sort of take-over in the public interest. This can be done through organisations such as the South Australian enterprise fund, which we are going to move to set up. It can be done through the way in which our major financial institutions can actively invest in South Australian enterprise; for instance, the State Government Insurance Commission, which was criticised roundly and prevented by those opposite when in Government from investing in companies in South Australia in order to keep them here. That again was a deplorable example of how the previous Government sat back and let that happen.

With the establishment and mobilisation of those investment funds which we have outlined in the election campaign, we will have the capacity to ensure that South Australian enterprises remain, to a much greater extent, in South Australian hands. In fact, more importantly, we will achieve over the period the ability to get some of the enterprises back here. Through our propositions, such as establishing a major head office of a financial institution, we will ensure that South Australia's capacity in this area is heightened. I am having discussions in those areas currently. That is the position in which we find ourselves. We have plans of action. It is a pity that we have lost three years—three years in which much has happened in this State which should not have happened. We have a lot of lost ground to recover.

In the case of the Onkaparinga take-over, it is regrettable that it has occurred. As the Leader points out, it is a *fait accompli*. It is the second attempt at a take-over. However, the important thing is that the take-over is in place. It is a

fait accompli. I challenge the Leader to provide evidence to the contrary. It is important to ensure that Onkaparinga remains operating here and that in whatever plans of rationalisation may arise from the take-over that there will be a viable, active employment based operation in South Australia and that there is a long-term commitment to this State. I have already held discussions with some of the principals in the take-over move to get just those assurances, and they have been given.

STONY POINT

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Premier join with me in having dialogue with Santos over the question of that company's accepting meaningful responsibility in making sure that local contractors and local labour are given top priority on contractual or employment opportunities being made available on the Stony Point project? I inform the Premier that I have already written to Santos concerning the latest unaccepted hourly-rate contract to a local steel fabricating firm by Santos itself. I point out further that the local fabricating firm missing out on that contract was Eyre Constructions, a firm that will close its gates on Friday (that is, tomorrow), retrenching 19 workers. I would contend that if Santos had been prepared to discuss the hourly-rate contract on this occasion, there is no doubt that Eyre Constructions would still have been in business, and I believe that the Premier should raise that aspect with Santos.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the member for Whyalla for his question, which highlights a very important aspect of this area of development in South Australia. The point has been made quite often by me and others that so-called resources booms and developments in the minerals and energy field will not have tangible benefits to the community to the extent that one expects unless we are also involved in providing the infra-structure support and taking part in the contracts in terms of the establishment and production of those projects. That requires a sensitivity by the principal contractors or operators of projects to the needs of the local community to share in that development, and that is something that we should be concerned about.

In the Cooper Basin indenture specific reference is made to where possible using South Australian based services and supplies in terms of developing the project. This is something that I have talked about at length, both in Opposition and since becoming Premier, with companies such as Santos, and I believe that we should remain ever vigilant on this, because unfortunately the terms of those contracts are not and probably cannot be watertight; it can only be more an expression of intention than something enforceable. One reason for this is that often in terms of a project, lead times are such that local suppliers cannot gear up to respond to the contractor or tender called, and that is one example of a problem that may not be overcome, but the longer the planning time, the longer the lead time, obviously the more easily this can be done.

I have had some figures taken out in relation to Stony Point and I am sure that they are reasonably encouraging, in that, of some \$136 000 000 spent during 1982, about \$71 000 000 (or 52 per cent) worth was let to South Australian contractors, so we are getting a bit over half of the action, which is certainly at least part of the way there; but one would hope, of course, that we could have got more.

Incidentally, the balance includes two very large contracts, the suggestion being that in both those cases, that of storage tanks and the wharf, much of that work could not have been sourced, particularly in the time scale allowed, through South Australia. In terms of employment, at Stony Point only there is close to 700, of whom about 68 per cent to 70

per cent have been recruited from South Australia, and the bulk of those South Australian recruits are from Whyalla itself. So obviously, there is some concern on the part of those companies, but I am suggesting, and I agree with the honourable member, that greater pressure should be put on them.

The contract that the company mentioned by the honourable member missed out on was won, I understand, by an Adelaide-based company, which I am assured is recruiting 100 per cent Whyalla-based labour through the local C.E.S. office. Therefore, that is not one of those gross cases where a local company is missing out because a contract has been let to an overseas supplier, for instance. I reiterate that we are very concerned about the matter, and I certainly will take up the matter yet again with the companies, as I think it should be something to be kept at the forefront concerning any contracts that they are letting and any development of such projects.

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce preference to unionists in the Public Service and, if so, when and why? I understand that a decision has been made by the Government to introduce preference to unionists and members of the Public Service Association and that a circular to this effect is to be sent out. As members would know, the P.S.A. has become blatantly political, particularly in the last 12 months, and it waged a strong campaign supporting the Australian Labor Party before the last State election, so much so that as a result of some of the resolutions passed at the conference of the Public Service Association condemning uranium mining, for instance, I know that a number of people resigned in one of the departments for which I was responsible. I also understand that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is definitely starting to transgress and to debate the matter. Until now I have allowed reasonable tolerance.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am seeking to give some facts which would indicate that some pressures are being applied to the Government (which may be the reason—I hope that the Premier will elucidate the situation) to institute this instruction. It has been suggested that this is part of the pay-off by the Government for that blatant political support.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the evidence suggests that members of the A.L.P. are the crooks. Members will recall the sort of circular that went out during the life of the previous Labor Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has now transgressed and I will not accept any further transgressions. By the same token, the situation is not being helped by interjections from the Government benches, and I will not tolerate them, either.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am seeking to point out that if the Government does proceed with this action it will be doing something that it has done in the past, and I refer to a circular that went out to heads of schools indicating that they could employ people as teaching aides only if such people were prepared to join the appropriate union. I am simply saying that there is a precedent for this sort of action by Labor Governments.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It has been the policy of the Labor Party throughout most of its existence that there should be a preference applying to unionists in employment. The philosophy behind that (which I know the honourable member would have great difficulty grappling with) is the

same philosophy that established the conciliation and arbitration system. In Australia, a system of industrial relations was devised so that organisations representing employers and unions had right of access to an independent tribunal, whereby, using that tribunal as the umpire, the terms and conditions of their employment and awards could be established. It is absolutely fundamental to that scheme (and this has been recounted in a number of judgments of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission at the Federal level since the 1920s, and echoed in many other tribunals) that those representative organisations should be fully representative and that there should be an institutional recognition of them to promote their standing before the courts.

Part of that process is to quite clearly suggest that if those organisations are providing the benefits of representation, and if that is a matter of public policy, then certain preference can legitimately accrue to persons belonging to those organisations. That has been our policy for many years, and it is a policy that is endorsed by the very system itself. Members will find that many employers and employer organisations adopt the same policy. In the time that this Party has been in Government, both in the 1920s and in the periods 1965-68, and 1970-79, a preference to the unionists provision existed in the Public Service. When we returned to Government recently, we moved immediately to reinstitute that preference to unionists by industrial instruction as had applied in the period to 1979.

HENLEY UNEMPLOYED GROUP

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether his department can give consideration in the next Budget to restoring the levels of grant to the Henley Unemployed Group? This organisation has provided to unemployed people in Henley Beach both a place where they can learn work skills and a source of information. Unemployment in the electorate of Henley Beach has now reached the average of the whole of the metropolitan area. The year 1983 does not look as though employment will be readily available for the large number of school leavers in that electorate. It is my understanding that the Department of Community Welfare is seeking to broaden the charter of this organisation to make it a community organisation that will include people of all ages. Because of the reduction in the community welfare grants, this organisation has been severely restricted in the service it can offer to the unemployed people of Henley Beach.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for Henley Beach for raising this issue. His interest in the unemployed in his district is already well known. Indeed, his concern has already been expressed within his electorate for organisations of unemployed people. The Henley Unemployed Group is an organisation funded through the community welfare grants scheme. I point out to the House that I approved the recommendations from that advisory committee soon after taking office. These recommendations were prepared under the guidelines which were laid down by the previous Government almost 12 months ago, and a great deal of work had gone into those recommendations. Indeed, there was considerable concern in the community that that decision was made without delay and, indeed, I remember some representations from the member for Hanson in that regard.

I recognise that it is important that groups be advised of their funding allocations as soon as possible so that staff can be settled in their positions and programmes established for the ensuing 12 months. However, I find myself in the same position as the member for Henley Beach with an organisation in my own electorate which is working among

unemployed people and which also received a reduction in its grant this year. I had the unenviable task of talking to an annual general meeting of that organisation and trying to come to grips with this most difficult situation. That is compounded, as the honourable member has informed the House, by the rapidly increasing number of unemployed in our community. However, I will be reviewing the work of the Community Welfare Grants Committee early in the new year. When that review is under way I will be seeking the comments of community groups on this process, and I will be looking forward to hearing from the Henley Unemployed Group at that time.

BARMERA CHOKE

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Water Resources say what is the present situation in relation to the clearing of the Barmera choke, and will the Minister explain to the House the benefits to be derived by South Australia as a result of this important work being undertaken?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am aware of the matter raised by the member for Chaffey. As the former Minister, he would realise that this matter includes problems in relation to the flow from the Hume dam and the Dartmouth reservoir. The choke mentioned by the honourable member is situated in New South Wales and Victoria. This problem is a matter for the River Murray Commission and probably the Commonwealth Government. I do not have further details at present, but if I can obtain any additional information I will provide it for the honourable member.

TRANMERE VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Transport examine existing traffic controls on Glynburn Road adjacent to the Tranmere Village shopping centre as to their adequacy, having particular regard to whether the existing traffic controls adversely affect small businesses operating in the centre? The present restricted and difficult access for motor vehicles using the shopping village discourages potential shoppers. It has been put to me that a break in the traffic island would enable north-bound traffic to enter the car park directly from Glynburn Road. At the moment, north-bound traffic must virtually execute a right turn into Hallett Avenue and arrive at the rear of the shopping centre. This has the further consequence that north-bound traffic cannot leave the front car park without using Hallett Avenue. Anyone who has turned right from Hallett Avenue into Glynburn Road would know how dangerous that manoeuvre is for vehicular traffic. The overall effect of the present traffic controls deters people from using the shopping centre, to the detriment of small businesses.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I appreciate the concern expressed by the member for Hartley. I have not had an opportunity to look at the problem but I assure him that I will arrange an inspection of the area as soon as possible.

ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

Mr MATHWIN: Has the Chief Secretary used his influence to encourage the Minister of Health to make a decision to allow and support a request from a Mrs Hunte to have her husband's baby by artificial insemination? At present her husband is detained in Her Majesty's prison. An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 28 November, under the heading 'Keneally defers "gaol baby" decision', states:

A Taperoo woman, 40 . . . is waiting for the Government to allow her to have her jailed husband's baby by artificial insemination . . .

But after Labor's election win Mrs Hunte said she believed the new Government's go-ahead was a foregone conclusion because the Labor Party had given her a guarantee of help. After Mr Olsen's rejection of Mrs Hunte's request, Mr Keneally, then in Opposition said he would be very sympathetic to the woman's request, and take reasonable steps to meet her wishes. Mr Keneally was also quoted in the *Sunday Mail* as saying: 'I see no difficulty in allowing this insemination to take place.'

Because of the Chief Secretary's obvious expertise in this matter, I ask him whether he has used his influence with the Minister and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thought that the first part of the honourable member's question was serious, warranting a serious reply. However, the rather flippant comment at the end of the question detracts from the serious issue raised by the honourable member. In Opposition, I was approached by the *Sunday Mail* and asked whether I would allow the insemination process to take place. I pointed out that, as shadow Chief Secretary, I could only comment on that aspect of the subject that would come under my jurisdiction if I was the Minister.

That aspect concerns whether or not I would be able to allow, by administrative process, the donation of the sperm from the husband to the woman. I told him that that, to me, did not seem to be a difficult administrative process at all, and I was surprised that the Chief Secretary was finding it so. I said that I was sympathetic to the needs of the woman and her husband, who was a prisoner in Yatala, and that in government I would, as the Chief Secretary, make the process available to the couple. I then pointed out to the reporter, although unfortunately it was not reported in the press, that I was not the Minister of Health, so I was not able to make any comment or decisions on the moral, ethical or medical reasons why such an insemination should or should not take place.

Unfortunately, whilst the press reported the first part of my answer, it did not report the second part. I think if all members would consider carefully what I have just said they would know that any shadow Minister or Minister of the Government would say just that; there are areas of responsibility that are confined within a shadow portfolio and it would be foolish indeed for Ministers or shadow Ministers to go beyond that. The availability of administrative action within the Department of Correctional Services still remains open to the woman in question and if she wishes to avail herself of it then we will be happy, so long as the Department of Health and the Minister of Health believe that the circumstances warrant such action.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I see the former Minister of Health making some comment on this. This is a serious question which this Government is treating seriously. I will take up the matter with the Minister of Health for the honourable member. I do have some concern though, as I am sure he does, that a matter of such privacy to the couple concerned should be a matter of such public interest in South Australia and should be the subject of questions within this House. Surely this matter ought to be able to be resolved in the best possible way which means that their personal involvement in this ought not to be the subject of wide community interest. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that it is a matter of community interest, and for that reason I will refer the question to my colleague in another place and see that the honourable member gets a full report in due course.

TAPEROO PLAYGROUP

Mr PETERSON: Can the Minister of Education say whether a decision has been made regarding the funding of the playgroup operating at the Taperoo Primary School? This playgroup, which caters for 110 children (and many more will be available to attend the group next year) was recently informed that funding might be cut. The result of a cut in funds for this group would go far deeper than simply denying children access to the group because no alternative playgroups that could cater for the children are available in the area. It is a disadvantaged area with many single parents, but there is a high level of parental involvement. This was reflected in a meeting that was called about a month ago at which 70 families were represented. The support for this playgroup has been expressed by many prominent community groups which recognise the value of it. On 3 December the Minister met a delegation from the playgroup and undertook to give an answer within a short time.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I am in a position to be able to advise the honourable member and the House of the situation with the playgroup at the Taperoo Primary School. I received a deputation and considered earnestly the submission put that not only should the position be maintained but, indeed, that it should be a full-time position. I have had discussions with the Education Department and the Kindergarten Union as to, first, whether or not a position could be provided and, secondly, how it could be funded and provided for. The result of that is that we are not able to accept, at this stage, the submission for a full-time position for the playgroup, but we believe that a half-time position can be continued. I repeat that it is continuing. The manner in which it will be done as a result of discussions that have taken place is that, for administrative purposes, that half-time position will be attached to the Yongala Kindergarten but will operate from the Taperoo Primary School and will work in liaison with the staff at the Taperoo Primary School. It will be within the Education Department facility and will be a good example of co-operation between the Kindergarten Union and the Education Department.

The problem came about because of the withdrawal of priority projects funding for this position. When that withdrawal took place there was not the disappearance of the need in that community. That need is acknowledged. We believe that there is a real justification for this playgroup position to be made available. Accordingly, I have requested that those arrangements take place from the start of 1983.

WAGE FREEZE

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Will the Premier advise what conditions would apply in any arrangements for a wage pause in South Australia? Would a wage catch-up position be applied at the end of the six-month period? The Government today intervened in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission as a first step in an attempt to impose a six-month wage pause in South Australia. It is reported today that, if a pause is achieved, the Government will take action to freeze until June 1983 fees and charges not already announced. However, the Premier was quoted yesterday as saying that the wage pause would be conditional. The Premier said in the same interview that he had a fair idea what he wanted but did not specify the precise details of his pause plan or the conditions that would allow the pause to be implemented.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Some of those details (in fact, I would say the bulk of them) were reported in this morning's *Advertiser* and were contained in a press statement that I

issued yesterday evening. The press statement was the subject of discussion between myself and the organisations of employers and the Trades and Labor Council in terms of the submission we are making today. I think that the member will find his questions answered there in fairly precise terms.

To deal with one aspect to which he referred in his question on the matter of a catch-up at the end of it, I agree that that is a fundamental and important question that has been raised in this area. It has been treated far too flippantly and lightly by those who have advocated the 12-month wage freeze, such as the Commonwealth Government. The South Australian Government's position is that, just as the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission will take us into a wage pause if it agrees to the proposition put before it today, so the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission should take it out and apply its principles of wage fixation and look at the submissions made by the parties at the end of the period of the pause. That means that the South Australian Government is not saying that there should be an automatic catch-up, because one just does not know the circumstances that will apply at that stage. Nor are we saying, as the Commonwealth Government would have us do, that there shall be no catch-up and no way in which the real value of wages can be restored. That is a matter for the commission to decide, just as it is basically a matter for the commission to decide whether or not we have a national wage pause.

FLAGSTAFF HILL ROADWORKS

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Transport inform me, for the benefit of my constituents, whether a time table has been set in motion for the commencement of Reservoir and Flagstaff Hill Roads roadworks? As the Government made the commitment during the election and the terms were that this Government would commence the project in the term of this Parliament, my constituents would like to know whether any reports are available.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The member for Brighton is aware that the Government indicated that it would, within its first term of office, commence the reconstruction of Reservoir Drive with a view to providing an upgraded Flagstaff Road, Reservoir Drive, Manning Road as an arterial alternative to South Road. I can inform the member for Brighton that the Government has given this matter a very high priority. It is proposed to fund these works under the Federal Government's Bicentennial Road Project, which the Highways Department is currently finalising. I can say also that it is planned to provide some money during this financial year for some of the preliminary work that will be required, and it is hoped that all of that work will be completed and finalised during the 1984-85 financial year.

O'BAHN BUSWAY

Mr OSWALD: How does the Minister of Transport reconcile his remarks reported in the *Advertiser* of 20 November 1982, when he first officially rode on the O'Bahn bus, that the new Government would stick to its promise of honouring all contracts entered into by the previous Government for the busway with those of the Premier who, during a speech at Glenelg on the following day, that is on 21 November, when opening the new tram line on Jetty Road said in front of me, the member for Glenelg, and members of the city council, that the O'Bahn route was in an advanced state of planning and was probably a *fait accompli*; but later in his speech he referred to 'replacing the O'Bahn track with light rail.'

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Construction on the busway commenced in February 1982 and is proceeding on a programme of works providing for commissioning of the system in mid-1986. I reminded the House yesterday of the policy that was given by the Government that it would take no action to jeopardise the commencement date of the busway and that we would also honour the contracts that had been let. As I reported to the House yesterday in answer to a question on the O'Bahn busway, the Government is reviewing the whole financial structure of that system, and when that is finalised I will be able to report further on it.

TEACHING POSITIONS

Ms LENEHAN: Following the recent announcement that the Government will retain 231 teaching positions, will the Minister of Education advise the House how these positions will be allocated for the 1983 school year? As the southern region is the fastest growing area in Adelaide, the subsequent pressures placed on many schools through overcrowding and large class sizes are of grave concern to my constituents. In particular, the Reynella South Primary School, which has an enrolment of 700 students for 1983, has and is experiencing both the problems of overcrowding and large class sizes.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for her question, because in fact it addresses a very important topic that faced the Government early on its election to office. We were concerned that we faced the prospect of presiding over the previous Government's plans to dispense with 231 teaching positions and, should those positions have been dispensed with, it would have resulted in larger class sizes in the first term of 1983 than existed in the last term of 1982, and naturally that was a matter of some considerable concern.

It was with that in mind that the Cabinet took that decision on those positions, taking that as the first instalment of the 940 positions to be retained which was mentioned as part of the Labor Party policy before the last election. Obviously, these have been allocated to schools right around the State. Members would appreciate that, as there are 700 schools in this State, 231 does not divide into 700 in whole units. Officers of my department have done a very good job looking at needs throughout the State and trying to examine how that staff could be allocated, as well as consulting with me on how the Government would like to see those positions used according to the various needs in education.

The following break-down roughly applies: 157 of the positions were allocated to primary schools, with 137 of those being used for basic class size problems and with the remaining 20 being used for negotiable elements within the various primary schools around the State. I point out that 30 of them were used to cope with the problem of secondary enrolments, the problem being that secondary enrolments have increased somewhat more than anticipated. We again face the prospect of increased class sizes, and so an allocation was made to the secondary school area.

Another 20 were used for those with special education needs for integration into ordinary schools. A further 20 were used for addressing the special needs of Aboriginal children who are students in schools not classed as Aboriginal schools, and four positions were used in advisory services. In fact, those positions must be allocated throughout the State. We have had a great many submissions made to the department about how they should be used. The department has very sensitively tried to deal with all those submissions. Of course, it is natural that, given the number of needs that

exist in the education system, regrettably not all of them have been able to be met either in full or in part.

Finally, I refer to the needs of schools in growth areas. The honourable member is quite correct in identifying the very special needs in schools in fast-growing areas, especially in an age of enrolment decline, because it seems that quite often the entire psychology of thinking is about how one copes with declining enrolments, and as a consequence one tends to forget about the schools that are very much growing, such as that mentioned by the honourable member, the Reynella East school. That is a school faced with a critical problem due to very large growth in numbers. Indeed, I have asked officers of my department to do some work on the general matter of preparing an approach to growth in a time of enrolment decline to pick up the very special problems of schools such as the Reynella East Primary School.

WATER ALLOWANCE

Mr MEIER: Will the Minister of Water Resources give the market gardeners of the Virginia and Two Wells area an additional allowance of water this financial year to compensate for the extra water used during the dry winter? The growers in that area have used a lot of additional underground water for irrigation and have had additional pumping costs because of the recent dry period. They now have to make decisions about planting in the coming January-February period. Not only do they face the problem of excess water rates but also, as the Minister would be aware, in many cases they have to pump the water into a storage dam, and from there they have to pump it on to the fields. Thus, two separate usages of electricity are involved in pumping, together with the cost of excess water. It is a situation which is likely to result in a probable loss to the grower even before he commences the coming season's planting. On the last occasion when a dry spell occurred, about four years ago, a 10 per cent increase in the water allowance was given.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes, I am aware of the problem that exists in the Virginia area involving market gardens. I assure the honourable member that I will give the matter my attention and advise him accordingly.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Housing outline any action the Government has taken to boost the building industry?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is with much pleasure that I can tell my colleague, the member for Peake, exactly what this Government has been doing to boost the building industry. Since coming to office, this Government has been keen to give some immediate support to our sagging building industry. We are concerned to ensure that the building industry remain a vital part of our economy, directly providing jobs and a stimulus to jobs in other industries. I have been pleased to announce the agreement in principle of 36 development proposals, involving nearly \$18 000 000, from 24 building companies to construct 363 houses and pensioner flats of their own design in the metropolitan area and in 12 country towns. I stress that this Government acknowledges the importance of the building industry in country areas. These projects will start in the new year and will provide some new jobs in this period of rising unemployment. It will benefit many in the community in need of housing and also sustain employment of over 1 000 jobs. About 330 jobs in the building industry and about 760 jobs

in other industries are expected to be generated by this development.

ONKAPARINGA WOOLLEN MILLS

Mr RODDA: Will the Premier say whether the management of Macquarie Worsted has given him an undertaking that the head office of Onkaparinga Woollen Mills will remain in Adelaide, and did he receive an assurance that the conditions would be met under which the Onkaparinga Woollen Mills received considerable financial assistance from the State Government as of last year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In my answer to the Leader, I mentioned the fact that I had had brief discussions with one of the principals of the take-over group involved with Macquarie Worsted, in the light of this announced Onkaparinga take-over. Those discussions were held last Monday, and I was informed that the take-over was, in effect, in place. That is why I use the term *fait accompli* in relation to it earlier.

In answer to the honourable member's question, I can only say that at this stage we have not really got down to the nitty-gritty of determining just precisely what guarantees there are for a continued Onkaparinga factory and presence in South Australia. All I can base this on is the conversation that I had in which it was said that, as part of the overall rationalisation of this industry (and let us remember that Onkaparinga, in turn, has taken countervailing action against take-overs in previous years), it was clear that an efficient and productive operation was being carried out in South Australia, and that would continue. That is about as far as we have got at this stage. I can certainly assure the honourable member of my concern and the desire of the Government to do as much as possible to ensure the presence of what is a well established and proven profitable industry in South Australia.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MAYES: Will the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health, report on the progress of the allocation of the 120 public and pensioner beds announced prior to 6 November by the Labor Party when in Opposition, these beds to be allocated to community hospitals? In September 1981 the Federal Government deleted section 34 from the Commonwealth Health Act. In so doing, it removed some 120 beds from the availability of pensioners and aged people in community hospitals throughout South Australia. That decision was brought about overnight without any fair warning or proper notice to those community hospitals affected. It almost had, and in many cases it did have, disastrous effects upon the aged and elderly in our community, and in addition it directly affected many hospitals and their bed numbers. One hospital was Ashford Hospital, which had a quarter of its occupiable beds removed overnight.

Despite deputations to the former Minister of Health, no help was forthcoming from the then State Government. With the support of the staff (who at great sacrifice accepted shorter hours for lower pay), and the overwhelming support of the hospital executive, the board and management, that valuable hospital was saved from disaster. It took until late this year, prior to the election, for a Labor Opposition to announce that in Government it would introduce 120 pensioner and public beds. Those beds will be of great convenience to the community of South Australia, particularly the aged and elderly and those hospitals that expect to receive a share of those beds announced by the then Opposition. In particular, Ashford hospital is expected to receive a share

of those beds, which will be of great benefit to the Mitcham, Unley, West Torrens and Marion councils, and of special benefit to the elderly in those communities.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the member for Unley for his question. His concern for aged and elderly citizens is well known in this House and throughout South Australia because of his many statements in their support over recent years. The honourable member is correct when he points out the apparent lack of concern shown by the previous Government in this area. I am happy to refer this matter to my colleague in another place, the Minister of Health, and to request an urgent report so that the issues addressed by the honourable member can be answered.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr BECKER: Can the Deputy Premier inform the House when the Government proposes to introduce legislation to provide minimum redundancy conditions for all employees under State awards? I understand that Labor policy includes the following:

Where redundancies are unavoidable, or subject to company take-over or reconstruction, the following minimum conditions should apply:

- (a) minimum periods of six months notice should be given to employees to be retrenched;
- (b) severance pay for retrenched workers should be based on a minimum of four weeks pay in respect of each year of employment, provided that in no case should a person get an amount in severance pay exceeding that which he/she would have received if he/she had remained in the employment of that employer until normal retirement age;
- (c) an extra week's pay for each year of employment should be provided for each person over 35 years of age;
- (d) compensation should be provided by employers to employees for capital loss in homes where such employees have to take work in other localities;
- (e) employers should pay for lost time, fares and removal expenses where retrenched employees have to take work in other localities;
- (f) where required, assistance should be provided by the employer to employees to obtain alternative employment;
- (g) severance pay should include a lump sum equal to an amount calculated by taking the difference between the level of the unemployment benefit and 120 per cent of the poverty line over the average period of unemployment.

Two weeks ago I noticed in a Sydney newspaper that it was anticipated that 200 firms would close before Christmas. The Minister would know that in years gone by there has always been a syndrome of dismissing employees just before Christmas and then offering re-employment in late January or early February. Does the Government propose to proceed with this policy and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is a very important one. The honourable member is probably aware, because he has looked closely at our policy (in fact, he has a copy with him), that the spearhead of the Labor Party's proposed legislation at the last election was the establishment of the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee, which will consist of a minimum of two employer and two employee groups, myself and departmental officers. I use the word 'minimum', because it may be argued that more participants are required and the number may be increased to three or four, but I am not sure at the moment.

On Friday of this week for the first time in a long time I will be in a position to call a meeting of IRAC. Members of that committee, particularly from employer groups, have already received their notices of the meeting and have telephoned me personally to thank me for reconvening that committee. Some strong criticisms have been made of the

previous Minister for not having utilised that committee sufficiently. Those criticisms have come from the employer groups as well as from the employee groups.

It is my ambition to establish that committee as a statutory authority and to really make it work. I am not naive enough to believe that it is certain to work, but I believe that the consultative process which I am trying to establish will be of tremendous benefit in drafting legislation. It will give that committee and the parties involved in industrial relations an opportunity to sit down and talk about the legislation and argue the point and reach conclusions on whether or not the legislation is good at a particular time. As I have said, I am not naive enough to believe that this will be 100 per cent satisfactory; it may not work 100 per cent, but at least it is an attempt to get away from what was happening during the last term of Government when the Minister of Industrial Affairs introduced legislation without any consultation at all. In fact, no-one knew about the last piece of legislation brought into this House by the Minister of Industrial Affairs except those people who drafted the Bill for him in private. No employer or employee organisation was consulted about that legislation. I believe that that is a severe blot on the last Government and the way in which it approached the industrial scene. In fact, the President of the Industrial Court, who ought to have been consulted about the matter, heard about it on the radio. So much for the consultative processes of the last Government—it was a dictatorial process.

I am confident in my own way that the legislative processes will commence early in the new year. The first thing I have to do is to establish IRAC by Statute. That Bill has already been prepared and I had hoped to bring it to this House before this sitting was completed. I am unable to do that because the consultative process must start with that; that is the beginning of it. I have sent to my committee copies of the Bill which they will analyse and discuss. I will also be talking with employer and employee organisations at 3 p.m. tomorrow about the processes which I am anxious to set up.

I think the actual legislative programme will commence some time in April next year. That will be the first occasion on which I think the honourable member will see the legislation. However, whatever legislation is brought in will go through the consultative process which I believe is important. I am receiving thanks from all groups within the community, particularly after the last period in which the Government pushed through legislation on industrial matters when there was no consultation; it was dictatorship.

PRE-CHRISTMAS SPENDING

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether, with Christmas approaching and people making purchases on credit, the Department for Community Welfare has any advice to shoppers based on the experience of his department's budget advisers, as often the number of people seeking budget advice increases just after Christmas?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question, which is timely. Whilst it is pleasing to see that the retail stores are receiving good custom at this time of the year and that flows on to the general community, it is appropriate that some warning should be given to the public about pre-Christmas spending. It is the experience of the Department for Community Welfare that in February and March of each year the number of persons seeking not only direct financial assistance but advice from the budget advisers in that department increases. A well established budget advisory service is conducted by the department.

There are two problems associated with the use of credit accounts, which is one of the prime sources of concern as experienced by the department. First, it results from heavier pre-Christmas spending than many consumers can actually afford, and it is easy to lose track of just how much has been charged to accounts in the pre-Christmas rush of shopping. It is important that consumers look carefully at the statements as they are received and work out just what they have spent compared with what they had budgeted to spend. On this point I suggest that people using credit accounts for their pre-Christmas shopping should keep a record of just how much they are spending.

Secondly, it is only natural that parents would want their children and those close to them to have an enjoyable Christmas, and the way in which that enjoyment can be transferred is not always through the buying of expensive gifts for them. It is easy to be caught up in Christmas spending, and it is important that parents perhaps pay particular attention to the amount of money that their children are spending so that they spend only what they can afford.

I would point out that the departmental budget advisers have found credit personnel in the major retail trading stores extremely helpful when trying to make arrangements on behalf of clients who are experiencing some difficulty. As a general suggestion, I urge anyone whose account for some reason has got out of hand to explain the trouble in the first instance with the credit personnel in the trading organisation concerned.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE'S OFFICE

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Yesterday in this place the Deputy Leader found it necessary to make a personal explanation about matters that had been raised in another place. After perusing the Notice Paper for today for that other place, I, too, wish to make a personal explanation about certain outrageous implications in its contents. For example, the Minister of Agriculture has been asked a question, by arrangement, I understand through his own colleague, about the state of repair of the office of the Minister of Agriculture immediately after the last State election and the estimated cost of repairing or replacing all items that were severely damaged. In an explanation of this kind I do not need to go into great detail to demonstrate the sort of outrageous implications contained in that question by any Minister, let alone a Minister of Agriculture, as has occurred.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. It is quite in order for the honourable member to give a personal explanation to clear his name. It is not in order to deal with the proceedings of another place or to get involved in the procedures that might be adopted there. I would like the honourable member to come to the matter which has affronted him and on which he wishes to clear his name and reputation, so that I can rule on relevancy and other things. I ask him to come to that straight away.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: In my view, when I left the office of the Minister of Agriculture in the previous Government it was in an immaculate condition; indeed, consistent with its condition when I took over the premises. Of course, after three years of vigorous use some items are worn, but in my view the tidiness and cleanliness of that office were beyond question. After having had this paper drawn to my attention, I have been told that certain items

in the Minister's office have been replaced by the new Minister. He has insisted that a new toilet seat be fitted, for example.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! A number of people are waiting to be warned and then named. I will give the honourable member for Alexandra his last chance to indicate the precise matter on which he has been affronted and on which he wishes to clear himself. If he does not do that I shall withdraw leave.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I seek on this occasion to at least clear myself of any blame for any damage that may have occurred in that department, especially in the bathroom and particularly in regard to the toilet seat. Whether the new Minister did not like the one that was installed or whether—

The SPEAKER: Order! I withdraw leave.

SELECT COMMITTEES ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

Mr HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the Select Committees on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Councils of Balaklava, Owen and Port Wakefield and on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Council of Meadows have power to invite specially qualified persons, whom they may desire, to attend any of their meetings in an advisory capacity.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Order!

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the member for Light not use the term 'Order' but rather 'point of order'.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I seek to speak to the motion. A long habit will gradually die. I support the motion which the Minister has moved. I think it highlights that, because of the technicalities involved with so many select committees coming before the House, the distinct possibility exists that Standing Orders in due course should be altered to allow this form of assistance to be available to select committees as a matter of course. I believe that it is a totally responsible course of action in view of the information that the select committees will be seeking. That longer-term advantage of altering the Standing Orders in due course should at least be considered by the Government and by the House when opportunity allows.

Motion carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ELDER SMITH GOLDSBROUGH MORT LIMITED

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I make the statement in my capacity as Minister representing the Attorney-General in another place. In the Parliament on 9 December 1982 the Attorney-General made a Ministerial statement indicating that he was considering the Government's position regarding the tabling of the report by the special investigator Mr John von Doussa, Q.C., into the activities of Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited and Petroleum Distributors Pty Ltd. Mr von Doussa was appointed by the Attorney-General's predecessor, the Hon. K. T. Griffin, to inquire into the complete circumstances surrounding dealings in the shares of Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited. Mr von Doussa's appointment was made under the provisions of the Securities Industry Act, 1979-1980. To date, this inquiry has cost approximately \$200 000.

At the time of the appointment, requests for information by both the Corporate Affairs Commission and the Stock Exchange of Adelaide Ltd had been ignored, and the Corporate Affairs Commission had not been able to obtain information relating to matters that were relevant to the dealings in the shares of Elder Smith. The thrust of the recently introduced take-over legislation is to ensure that the share market and investors are kept properly informed of all relevant information and that shareholders have equal opportunities to participate in share trading in publicly listed companies. On the face of it, neither of these principles had been complied with.

The Attorney-General indicated that he was concerned to ensure that no action was taken to table the report or a part of the report in the Parliament, until such time as full and proper consideration had been given to matters relating to the possible prejudice of any person mentioned in that report and who may subsequently be the subject of legal proceedings. The Attorney-General indicated that he would be seeking legal advice in relation to the issues raised in the interim report in so far as they related to possible offences and that he would also direct the Corporate Affairs Commission to make appropriate inquiries regarding any commercial negotiations and/or arrangements that may be currently 'on foot' and that could be prejudiced and/or disadvantaged by any action taken by the Government in the tabling of the report. These inquiries have been made.

The Attorney-General also indicated that as a matter of principle, where a special investigation is conducted and it is appropriate to do so, the issues dealt with by such an inquiry should be made public. He sought the advice of the Solicitor-General, Mr M.F. Gray, Q.C., as to whether the publication of the report would be prejudicial to the administration of justice and his advice is that it would not be.

The Corporate Affairs Commission is continuing with its inquiries relating to the issues raised by this report and it would not be proper for any further comment to be made by me in relation to these matters. The findings of this inquiry have a relevance for investors and those persons concerned with and having responsibilities for the management of publicly listed companies. The report highlights the uncertainty the share market suffers where companies and individuals, who have the ultimate entitlement to shares, are prepared to hide behind nominees. At the time the inspector was appointed there were calls for the unmasking of persons and companies who were buying shares in Elders purportedly in order to defeat a take-over attempt from interstate. These were the so-called 'white knights'.

Whilst persons seeking to protect an old established South Australian company might be honourably motivated, this is not a justification for permitting confusion and uncertainty to reign in the share market and does not warrant the vesting by boards of company directors, in individual directors, of unbridled discretion to commit companies' assets. The report has found that, in the heat of the struggle, certain individuals may have lost sight of their obligations to their companies and shareholders. Directors of public companies must act in the best interests of their own companies and must consider carefully whether committing their company's assets to the take-over defence of another unrelated company satisfies their duty.

Securities markets are public markets. To promote commercial certainty and maintain investor confidence, information about publicly listed companies' affairs should be available to all. The market must be kept fully informed so that all shareholders can make their decisions about accepting an offer, refusing it, or selling their shares in the market based on up-to-date information. Shareholders should be given an equal opportunity to participate in trading in securities. This Government is committed to the principle of

disclosure of financial and other information that may affect the market price of the securities of listed companies. The Securities Industry Code makes provision for the regulation of the securities industry and also contains certain disclosure requirements.

The report has disclosed irregularities in the operations of some persons within the securities industry and the Attorney-General will be forwarding a copy of the report to the National Companies and Securities Commission and will be requesting the South Australian Corporate Affairs Commission to continue with its inquiries. The report refers to matters arising under the Commonwealth Foreign Takeovers Act and Commonwealth Broadcasting and Television Act, and copies of the report will be made available to the Foreign Investment Review Board and the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal for them to examine.

The report presents a comprehensive review of the matters relating to the entire circumstances surrounding the transfer of shares in Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort at the relevant time, and I am now making the first interim report and appendices available in the public interest. Mr von Doussa has presented the report as an interim report based upon the information made available to him in the course of the inquiry. It may well be that, as a result of the publication of this report, further information will be made available, and it is possible that there may be a need for the inspector to undertake a further inquiry. I table the first interim report of the Inspector, Mr John von Doussa, Q.C., into the dealings and securities of Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited and Petroleum Distributors Pty Ltd from 1 January 1981 to 25 May 1981 and the appendices attached to that first interim report.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 15 March 1983.

In doing so, I think it is only reasonable—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I wish I could get through without interjections. I am being distracted by members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I want to tell them something and they will not let me.

An honourable member: I am waiting.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will not tell them if they are going to keep interjecting. I will keep it on this side of the Parliament. I think that it is only fair to give members some idea of the proposed sittings. As I said, the House will be returning on 15 March. It is our intention to sit for a fortnight, have a fortnight off, and sit for another fortnight. For most of April we will be sitting. This gives members some indication of the proposals. They are subject to change, of course, because one does not know what commitments may occur of which we are unaware at the moment. I am merely giving members the opportunity of making their arrangements for that period.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition intends to oppose this motion. Whilst I can understand the Government's enthusiasm to get out of this place as quickly as it can, some matters critical to this Parliament and to the people of this State are not yet resolved. The most pressing, of course, is the need for the Government to establish a workable and efficient policy and programme in relation to a wage pause in South Australia by the end of this year. If South Australia does

not put into place a wage pause at least as effective as those in the other States, and that contemplated by the Federal Government, then we will be seriously disadvantaged in industry and all who depend on industry and commerce and the economic viability will be placed in very serious jeopardy.

The Premier announced last night that the Government would intervene in the current Commonwealth Arbitration Commission wage hearing, and the Opposition supports this move as far as it goes. Of course, we will not know the result of that before the end of today, but as the Opposition indicated yesterday by seeking to introduce legislation which would allow a worthwhile wage pause scheme in South Australia, legislative action should be taken by this Parliament, and March next year will be far too late. The Opposition is prepared to facilitate necessary legislation next week, if the Government agrees to introduce it. It will be too late if the Government seeks to bring the House back on 15 March next year.

By then the unions will have won additional wage increases, and firms struggling to survive in the current very difficult economic climate will be forced to lay off further staff. There will be an escalation in redundancies, and in some cases, of course, business will have to close down completely. Prices will continue to rise. A wage pause implemented by the Parliament now, in concert with the other States and the Commonwealth, will give these firms vital breathing space and improved profitability in commercial performance. A worthwhile pause would also save some Government spending on wages over the next six-month period, and certainly in a full year this would have a positive impact on the State's overall Budget position. Moreover, the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal will have met in the meantime, as it is required to do; it has just been appointed by the Government. Any chance of restraint there will have gone.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: That is very important.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is very important indeed, because if there is to be a meaningful wage pause in South Australia then, of course, the Government, and members of Parliament, as leaders of the State, should be taking a lead. Of course, by 15 March that will be all signed, sealed and delivered. That gives the lie to any real intention to give any leadership in a wage pause.

A properly established wage pause now will also set an example for the rest of the community, one which the Government would not want set. It would make unions recognise that there is a need for responsibility and sacrifice. It will encourage companies to hold down prices, and it will create a sense of community involvement in Australia's overall economic recovery. Instead, the Premier is prepared to shut down the operation of Parliament for perhaps two months—and now we know precisely until 15 March—and let this State fall out of step with the rest of Australia, where real moves are being made to implement some restraint on wages and salaries.

The taxpayers of this State have already been warned by the Premier that they can expect some tax rises if the application before the Arbitration Commission falls through. In clear contradiction of the unequivocal undertaking that the Premier gave during the election that there would be no increase in taxes in the next three years, he mentions petrol tax and motor registration tax as two revenue earning areas which the Government already has in its sights.

An honourable member: And public transport.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: And public transport charges. The Premier has already indicated that a wage pause would put an automatic moratorium on tax rises which he promised would not occur. For these reasons alone I urge the Premier and Deputy Premier to rethink this

motion for adjournment. These past two weeks have not been happy for the Premier or for his Government. He has struggled with the unions to try and reach some form of consensus on a wage pause. We knew from the start that that was doomed, because the unions made their attitude very clear.

The Premier has been forced to go back on an unequivocal promise on pay-roll tax exemptions. He has found that his over-generous and rash election promises have left him with a serious budgetary problem. He has found that his promises on electricity concessions were not acceptable to some sections of the community. Some of his Ministers have found that the pressures of office, particularly in the Parliament, are more than they can cope with. This is particularly the case on the question of uranium and Murray River water supply.

In moving this motion the Deputy Premier is preventing the Opposition from continuing to question the Government's poor first month performance. These few days of Parliament have clearly indicated that the Labor Government is in serious disarray and is not prepared to face up to major issues or set the standard of leadership which the South Australian people deserve. I oppose this motion and the Opposition opposes the motion and, if the Government intends to press on with it, I foreshadow that I will move the following amendment:

After 'rising' insert, 'until 2 p.m. on Monday 20 December 1982.'

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition whether he proposes to move the amendment.

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

To delete all words after 'rising' and insert, '2 p.m. on Monday 20 December 1982.'

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has again created history in this House. It must be the only occasion when a resumption date has been announced and we have heard a prepared speech read out in this House. I do not think that it is very becoming of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to waffle on for 10 minutes about matters which the Premier made very clear in his statement last night.

I want to place on record the State's approval of the way in which the Premier has handled the wage pause situation over the last two weeks. One has only to talk to employers and unions alone and we have had the privilege of attending meetings that members opposite have not attended. We met with them last night and there was great accord across both sides.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is quite clear that the proposals that were put to the employers and unions last night were accepted with great accord. The case is proceeding in Melbourne today. The Premier is on record as saying that the Government will consider the results of that court case and its determination, so that is quite clear.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That's all right about the Government: what about the Parliament?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: If the Parliament is required to come back earlier, it is only a matter of notifying the Speaker and getting his authority for that. We have every channel open to us to return to the House if necessary. I stress that the Opposition's amendment is simply a sham and a weak attempt to make some political capital out of the date of the resumption of Parliament, and such an attitude is getting to a pretty low state in this House. In the 11 years that I have been in this place I have never heard such a debate, nor heard such a speech as that made by the Deputy Leader when he read a prepared speech today.

The Government rejects the amendment. The Government has determined the resumption date. I set out to inform

members on both sides of the proposed sitting dates. However, I can see no evidence of acceptance of that courtesy that I was extending to members. All we heard was this great folly from the Deputy Leader when he read a prepared speech which some of his staff must have written for him either late last night or early this morning. The Government opposes the amendment.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, and Wilson.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lençhan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten and Wright (teller).

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 6, line 15 (clause 16)—After 'the regulations' insert 'and such a direction shall not be given, in any event, to either of the following authorities—

(a) The Savings Bank of South Australia;

or

(b) the State Bank of South Australia.'

No. 2. Page 7, lines 1 to 7 (clause 18)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 3. Page 7, line 8 (clause 18)—Leave out 'or (c)'.

No. 4. Page 7, lines 13 to 16 (clause 18)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 5. Page 7, line 21 (clause 18)—Leave out 'or (c)'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Basically there are two matters in the Bill which are the subject of these amendments. The first relates to the question of directions that shall be given to authorities under the Government Financing Authority provisions. This matter was discussed when the Bill was before the House in another Parliament, and considerable discussion ensued on just how far such directions should go.

There is a school of thought, and I think that it has been expressed on both sides of the House at different times, that one must take great care in terms of the directions that can be given. In order to partly overcome this, a provision was inserted which provided that those authorities subject to such directions had to be prescribed by regulation. Therefore, Parliament held the ultimate power. The Bill has been returned to this House with an amendment excluding two specific authorities, namely, the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia, and the Government is prepared to accept that amendment. Both of those banks are, essentially, financial institutions and, of course, the Government Financing Authority Bill creates the South Australian Government Financing Authority which in itself is aimed at investments, loan raising, and so on. This is covered by both these banks.

Secondly, in relation to the second part, which is really covered by amendments 2 to 5, concern has been expressed about the fact that directions could be given to convert

what was originally a grant into a loan. There is nothing sinister about this proposal; it is simply a power that ensures that the restructuring of financing authorities is conducted in the most equitable way. It could also clearly identify subsidies under the programme performance principles. It is for these reasons that this provision was contained in the previous Government's Bill, and that is why it has been retained. However, the Government has decided that it is prepared to accept this amendment, because it does not strike at the base of the authority. If the power proves to be necessary in the future, it can be submitted to Parliament as such.

BUDGET REVIEW

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That my statement and the report entitled Budget Review tabled by me on 14 December be noted.

I move:

That the time to be allotted for this motion shall be until 5 p.m.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is the second part of what the Premier just put, that is, the allotment of the time. Honourable members are not voting on the substantive motion but simply as to the allotment of time.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In moving the substantive motion, I do not intend to make an extended speech because much of what I will say is contained in the statement that I tabled. I stress that the review that I tabled last Tuesday was not a political document. It was prepared by the Under Treasurer as an information document as much as anything, and an up-to-date analysis of the state of the Budget. Obviously the statement that I made was the Government's response to the position disclosed by that statement, and there is no question that the situation revealed in the Under Treasurer's document is extremely grave. I have not tried to hide the fact that it has left my Government with some very difficult decisions to make, decisions which would not have been necessary if the finances had been properly managed and if the position had been as was stated so definitely and positively by the then Treasurer—and I have got a number of his statements on the record.

I stress that in no way will my Government accept the responsibility for the situation that we now face; it is a situation we have inherited. It is a situation that has clearly developed over the past three years during the life of the former Government, which came to office with the accounts in surplus. It was always my intention that the statement I have tabled should be debated. I think it is vital that the House and the people of South Australia fully understand what has been happening over the past three years.

I think the most important aspect of this debate is the fact that it will give members of the former Government an opportunity to explain why this was allowed to happen, and to explain why, over the past three years, it constantly denied that any problem was building up. I would have been particularly keen to hear from the former Treasurer because obviously he has made most of the statements and introduced the Budgets on which this financial situation is founded. Unfortunately, it appears that he will not participate in the debate, and I think that is regrettable. Nonetheless, it is not only his responsibility under our system of government, because Cabinet has overall and joint responsibility for the finances of the State. I believe that the House is owed an explanation by each and every member of the Cabinet who took part in those Budget decisions, particularly from the Deputy Leader and the member for Davenport

who were members of the so-called Budget Review Committee.

As to the future, I hope that the Opposition will join the Government in attempting to overcome these problems, because the State is facing large financial problems. If we tackle this problem with the consensus which I believe has been the key note to the Government's attitude in the short time we have been in office then in time we will be able to restore South Australia's financial position and ensure that the State is well placed to use its resources to take full advantage of any economic upturn that might occur over that period.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The statement presented to this House on Tuesday by the Premier was riddled with misrepresentation, exaggeration and glib comment. It has further highlighted this Government's inexperience, indecision and complete inability to come to terms with the responsibilities of office. The statement was a dishonest document presented by a dithering Premier. It had only one purpose—to set the scene for tax increases. A statement issued last night by the Premier has betrayed that purpose. In his long awaited announcement about the implementation of a wage pause, the Premier also said:

The freeze will include increases in motor registration and petrol taxes which were proposed to take place during this period. In other words, the Premier has publicly confirmed that he is proposing tax increases and that unless there is a wage freeze, taxes will be increased during the next six months.

It can also be assumed from the Premier's statement that he has already decided to increase taxes next financial year, at the latest. The timing of those increases is, however, irrelevant to the central issue in this debate. That issue is the Premier's credibility, because before the election he said repeatedly and consistently that he would not increase the rate of existing taxes or introduce new taxes during his first term of office. The Premier's credibility in that respect is now in ruins. His strategy is in disarray. His response to this dilemma has been entirely predictable. He now wants to be seen as the pauper Premier so that he can toll the taxes. To do so, he has seized on a document presented to him only the day before it was tabled. By the admission of its author, the document contains rough figuring. It is based on possibilities, assumptions, projections, forecasts and variables between \$30 000 000 and \$55 000 000—a 50 per cent tolerance factor. It is the sort of document which Governments regularly receive on the progress of Budget estimates, and I will say more about that in a moment.

But what the Premier has done with this document is to release it publicly in an attempt to evade the responsibility for breaking a fundamental election promise. He has tried to abdicate that responsibility to a senior and well respected public servant, the Under Treasurer (Mr Barnes). It is the role of Treasury to recommend means to Government to managing State finances. But it is the role of Government to make decisions based on that advice and to accept the responsibility, publicly, for those decisions. In this case, it appears that the Premier wants that responsibility transferred to the Under Treasurer. But he did not stop there.

The Premier has attempted to portray that advice in its worst possible light to further justify his need, indeed his desperation, to raise taxes, so that the Labor Party's supporters can be rewarded for their support during the election campaign. The Under Treasurer's document contains five pages of estimates and assumptions, yet the Premier has used it to allege that the former Government's Budget was 'incomplete and dishonest'—a Budget, I remind the House, for which information running to hundreds of pages was supplied to this House during the Budget debate and the sittings of the Estimates Committees.

The Premier's statements contained other words of deception. He alleged that the former Government had seriously miscalculated the timing of the impact of movements in wages and salaries. For a start, that statement is not supported by the Under Treasurer's document. He stated, entirely dispassionately, that salary and wage awards given this year have operated from earlier dates than were expected when the Budget was framed (the words of the Under Treasurer). That Budget was framed on the basis of advice available at the time and in consultation with Treasury officers and all Government departments. Those officers were in no better position than was the Government to gauge with complete accuracy the full impact of wage and salary increases.

What the Budget did provide was a round-sum allowance of \$80 000 000 for wage and salary increases this year—a third more than the amount spent for this purpose in the preceding year. Surely that is prudent planning. Even though the Premier did not raise this matter during the Budget debate (and I wonder why), I can only assume that he believes the former Government should have handed an open cheque to public servants for even higher increases.

There is another example in his statement of the Premier's wisdom with hindsight. He has referred to the impact of the drought, and suggested that the Budget should have provided more for drought relief. It was as though the Premier believed that the former Government could define the seasons to the last drop of rain. In fact, the full impact of the drought had not become apparent until well after the Budget was presented to this House, and even someone with an elementary knowledge of the land, which the Premier obviously lacks, would know that sowings in late July or August could still produce substantial crops. The Premier's hypocrisy on this matter is compounded by the views expressed by his own Minister of Agriculture in August. In the *News* of 9 August, at the time the Budget was being finalised, the Hon. Mr Chatterton said:

It is much too early for the Government to be talking about a drought.

That was the Premier's own Minister of Agriculture. Here, then, is another example of the Government's blatant double standards.

Even the Under Treasurer on 12 October qualifies drought needs on 'improvement of seasonal conditions'—seven weeks after Budget date. In an attempt to give the Labor Party some respectability in financial management, the Premier said, in a very glib way, that the former Government had inherited an accumulated surplus from the Corcoran Government, so that it was reasonable to suggest that the deterioration in State finances began after the 1979 election. I remind the House that the Budget result for the 1978-79 financial year was a small surplus only because of under-expenditure of \$12 400 000 on the revenue account, due mainly to a change from quarterly to half-yearly wage indexation adjustments, so that only the December 1978 decision had any major impact on that Budget (conveniently overlooked by the Treasurer).

I also remind the House of the very significant financial liabilities which the former Government inherited from the decade of Labor Government—Monarto, the Land Commission, the Frozen Food Factory, the Riverland cannery, mismanagement of the Health Commission, and so on. The debts were huge. The Tonkin Government reduced the State's liability for these projects, the liabilities all taxpayers must bear—the legacies of misguided socialist government.

Let us consider some examples. In the former Government's Budget for last financial year, \$13 500 000 was provided to redeem commercial bills and towards receivership losses as a result of commitments made by the former Government for the Riverland cannery. The same Budget provided a payment of \$25 000 000 to the Commonwealth

with respect to the former Land Commission. The Monarto project cost a further \$3 100 000 last financial year to redeem semi-government borrowings as they fell due, on top of the \$5 100 000 paid earlier by the former Government in full settlement of outstanding obligations to the Commonwealth.

Commitments such as these, as well as the need to restore efficiency and eliminate waste in the public sector to reduce the burden on taxpayers, required the former Government to exercise very strict control over all State finances. The Budget Review Committee expected all departments to justify every line of expenditure in the preparation of the Budget papers. During the year, senior departmental officers regularly appeared before the committee to review the progress of Budget estimates. Where spending was running above estimates, explanations and remedial action were sought. As the Deputy Leader pointed out to the Premier, he would do well to establish a Budget review committee of his own to monitor and keep close tabs on departmental expenditure.

The former Government did not resile from the need to continually monitor and review expenditure and, where necessary, effect savings or eliminate waste and inefficiency by reductions in manpower levels in Government departments. That strategy was being continued at the time the former Government left office. It was emphasised in the former Premier's last Budget speech, when he said:

Through the Budget Review Committee, we shall once again monitor and review expenditure and manpower trends during 1982-83. We will ensure that agency expenditures are kept within the limits set by this Budget, unless exceptional circumstances arise or there is an unavoidable and unforeseen requirement.

As part of that review, the Treasury presented to the former Government a document dated 12 October, the day before the election was called, which set out Treasury's assessment of the Budget position at the end of the first quarter of this financial year. Whilst I am not permitted to table that document, I make it available.

This document formed the basis for statements and commitments made by the former Government during the election. It was the basis for a statement that I made last week projecting that the former Government would have faced a deficit of just over \$13 000 000 at the end of this financial year. Honourable members will see that this document gave no reason for the former Government to suspect that the Budget could blow out to a deficit of \$30 000 000 this financial year, let alone \$55 000 000.

I make the following points about the document. It raises concern about Health Commission receipts. The former Government was at all times frank about its policy that State charges must be kept under review to ensure that they matched the cost of providing services. In Opposition, the Labor Party expressed a different view, yet one of its first decisions on coming to office was to significantly increase hospital charges. In my public statement on this decision, I did not deny that the former Government would have faced this possibility early next year, as this document that I make available indicates, but I did emphasise the hypocrisy of the Labor Party in criticising increased Government charges while in Opposition, then moving immediately to increase charges after the election.

Before dealing with the document's references to wage increases, I point out that it contains a misprint. The round-sum allowance in the Budget was \$80 000 000, not \$74 000 000 as printed. Members will be well aware that in public statements on the impact of wage increases in the public sector, the former Government had indicated it would take a strong line with any further claims during this financial year. At the time of the election, there was every indication that wage restraint would limit the need for significant additional calls on the round-sum allowance.

The document shows that, by early October, the 1982-83 cost of wage increases in the public sector was \$69 000 000. This figure has now increased, according to the Under Treasurer's document, by more than \$16 000 000 in the last eight weeks. There is no explanation in the document about why this has occurred. I would be interested to hear the Treasurer's comments as to why that \$16 000 000 has occurred in eight weeks. I assume that some of the present Government's actions, including a commitment to a 38-hour week and the employment of more public servants, are contributing factors.

At the time of the last election, the former Government was not in possession of information to suggest, nor does this document suggest, that the call on the round-sum allowance would accelerate so quickly and to such an extent. However, what the Under Treasurer's assessment does emphasise is the need for wage restraint in the public sector and, if ever the Premier needed a reason for agreeing to the implementation of a wage pause for 12 months, it is this trend in public sector wage and salary increases. Wages and salaries account for more than 60 per cent of spending from the Revenue Account. That must be contained.

The document of the Under Treasurer makes reference to other increases in spending not notified to the former Government. Payments are above Budget in a number of departments to the extent of \$9 000 000. We are not told which departments have overspent or for what reason, and perhaps the Treasurer would like to explain where that \$9 000 000 was spent and which Minister authorised the departments to overspend to the extent of \$9 000 000. As I have indicated, the former Government's Budget Review Committee was continually monitoring these trends to ensure that the Estimates did not blow out, and insisted on remedial action by Ministers if that situation did arise. There are six months in which to take remedial action against those departments.

The cost of drought relief is estimated at \$9 000 000. I understand that the latest figures from the Department of Agriculture show that just over \$3 000 000 has been allocated for frost and drought relief so far this financial year, so this estimate may be excessive. There are other factors which do not seem to be addressed in this document, including increased natural gas royalties and the royalties which will soon flow from the production of crude oil in the Cooper Basin.

Last week, I released calculations indicating that the former Government's Budget position would have been manageable, based on advice available to us at the time we left office. Our modest election commitments could have been accommodated. We said that it was an election and not an auction, and we stuck to that during the campaign. It is clear from the document I have made available that the former Government was not aware of all of the changes in Budget Estimates now advised to the present Government.

Other Treasury information made available to the former Government just before the election put estimates of future deficits at a much lower level than those now indicated. However, it is also clear, from some of the changes in estimates within a matter of eight weeks, that Budget Estimates must be kept under constant review and, in this respect, I bring the Premier back to his predecessor's statement in presenting his Budget, and to the comments which begin the document that I have made available about the difficulty in drawing firm conclusions, and the need for continuing detailed review. Indeed, the Treasurer acknowledged, when releasing the most recent monthly figures issued by the Treasury, the need to take figures on not a monthly basis but an overall basis.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And the need to watch blow-outs because of irresponsible promises, which is what has happened in health.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, I will be interested to know which departments blew out by the \$9 000 000, because I can recall the now Minister of Health saying that in anticipation of relaxation by this Government hospitals across the State spent money excessively in the first few weeks. Indeed, he said in the last week of the campaign, they knew they were going to win so they started to spend. Is that where the \$9 000 000 has gone? Is that financial management? Is that clear direction from the top? Obviously it is not.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Who was in government?

Mr OLSEN: The Premier was at the time the expenditure took place; I have just said that.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: In the last week and in subsequent weeks it took place. The Minister of Health said to a group of which I was a member that in fact during the last week of the campaign some of those people started to spend money and in the subsequent three weeks when Labor was in Government it was allowed to blow out. That is clearly on record.

The Minister of Education has said how he will fund some of his promises. He said, 'We will just add it to the deficit.' This is the Treasurer who brings to this Parliament a document from the Under Treasurer and tries to pin financial mismanagement on the former Government: fair go! I also point out to the Premier that the advice he has now received is by no means unprecedented. He could ask former Premier Dunstan about that. I refer, for example, to a document dated 9 December 1974, forwarded to Mr Dunstan by the then Under Treasurer. I quote from a section of that document:

Work is now under way to introduce major State taxation measures to make good the loss of the expected supplementary grant but, even so, it is possible that the 1974-75 deficit could reach \$30 000 000.

Here, the Under Treasurer was referring to a deficit on the Revenue Account which, if adjusted for inflation to put it in today's money, amounted to more than \$78 000 000 about \$20 000 000 in excess of the highest possible accumulated deficit the Under Treasurer is now forecasting for this financial year. To deal with that projected deficit, the then Premier Dunstan introduced petroleum and tobacco franchise taxes after the Budget was passed for that financial year. The Premier now faces similar options, but he is trapped by his own rhetoric before and during the election campaign.

I have looked through the Premier's contributions to the last three Budget debates in this House. Each took a similar theme, attacking the former Government for financial mismanagement. He criticised the transfer of Loan funds to supplement the Revenue Account. He criticised reductions in the size of the public sector. He criticised increases in State charges. What the Premier's equation for financial management added up to was either huge increases in taxes or huge deficits. There is no other equation.

In fact, the A.L.P. platform recognises that the only option facing socialist governments is higher taxes. It states:

A Labor Government will regulate its financial position by raising taxes rather than cutting public expenditure programmes. But what did the Premier say when he was called upon to balance his equation in the months leading up to and during the election campaign? His position, constantly, was that he would not increase State taxes and that he had information which assured him that this would not be necessary to fund Labor's election promises.

The former Government constantly warned that the South Australian Budget position was tight and that it would not allow for extravagant promises of the type made by the

Labor Party without significant increases in State taxation. The Premier ignored these warnings; ignored them for convenience, obviously. The former Government said during the election campaign that implementation of just some of Labor's promises would increase Government spending by well over \$100 000 000 per year. Detailed estimates were provided, based on advice from the same Government departments which will now have to implement Labor's promises.

In refuting these costings the Premier said (and I quote from the *Advertiser* of 4 November):

We believe our programmes can be costed without a tax rise.

He went on to say in the *Advertiser* interview, when referring to information on which this commitment was based (and he is having trouble with *Advertiser* interviews, particularly page 5 this week):

We've got the Auditor-General's Reports, the programme and performance budgeting information, the Premier's own speeches on the economy.

A week after coming to office, his response was the same.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is the honeymoon period. In the *News* of 17 November he was quoted as saying:

There is no reason I can see why our strategy can't be encompassed even if there are some problems with the Budget.

The former Government never attempted to hide the fact that it was facing continuing problems with the Budget, especially in the present difficult economic climate. But now, the Premier's problems have become 'extremely grave', according to his statement on Tuesday.

The Hon. H. Allison: Honeymoon and Beverley both wiped out!

Mr OLSEN: Yes, as his strategy has developed, it has become clear that he has been following exactly the same course as his colleague in Victoria, Mr Cain. Before the Victorian State election in April this year, Mr Cain said that he would not increase State taxes. In words very similar to those subsequently used by the Premier in this place, Mr Cain was quoted in the *Age* on 27 March as saying:

We don't see any necessity to raise State taxes in any area.

Within a fortnight of his election, however, Mr Cain had changed his position, alleging that he had been misled about State finances. He used this argument to increase State taxation by 32 per cent in his first Budget, in September. In Opposition, the Labor Party traditionally attempts to hide the fact that its socialist policies can be implemented only at significant additional cost to each and every taxpayer.

The Premier's statements now are bankrupt in credibility and morality. If he continues on his present course, he will bankrupt the State. All he said in Opposition pointed to the need for higher State taxes to implement Labor policies. He was aware that the difficult economic climate would continue to have an impact on Budget estimates. He was well aware that State finances were extremely tight. He was aware that the former Government intended to keep the Budget under continuous review.

We would have continued to seek savings in the public sector. We had already reduced the size of the public sector by more than 4 000 people, which has saved South Australians well over \$100 000 000 in taxes. More remains to be done. We would have immediately implemented a 12-month wage pause, easing the Budget situation by more than \$40 000 000. We would have continued to encourage economic activity in the private sector and in the development of our mineral resources in particular, which in turn would have generated additional Government revenues.

I believe that, at this stage, the Treasury estimates presented to the House have taken a conservative view of the royalties to flow from the Cooper Basin by 1985. Perhaps

the Treasurer would like to address that matter. The former Government was advised just before the election that they would amount to \$50 000 000 annually within two or three years. At the last election, the former Government made only very modest promises, because it knew that nothing more could be afforded. We did not attempt to buy government, as the Labor Party did.

Now, all South Australians will have to pay the price, unless the Premier is prepared to concede that he was reckless in Opposition and must become responsible in Government. Becoming responsible in Government will require him to heed the advice that he has also received from the Under Treasurer (which is contained in the document tabled) to implement further savings in expenditure in areas such as education, and to maintain a strong stand against wage rises in the public sector. The Under Treasurer's document refers to the implementation of only four Labor election promises, yet the cost will be \$7 000 000 for the rest of this financial year.

There are many more promises which Labor made. In particular, the Public Service Union officials who campaigned so strongly for Labor have been promised more public servants on the pay-roll. This commitment must be immediately reviewed. It may also be necessary for the Premier to review the long-term capital works programme, determine priorities and perhaps defer the completion schedules for some projects.

However, this position could be alleviated by the calling of a special Loan Council meeting early next year to make available additional borrowing approvals to State Government statutory authorities for construction projects. Certainly there needs to be a call for that, and the Opposition supports that in correspondence to the Prime Minister. Factors such as the continuing economic difficulties, the drought and high interest rates are putting serious pressures on the Budget and make Budget forecasts increasingly difficult and susceptible to change over short periods. These are factors which continue to pose difficulties for businesses and individuals as well as Governments and, in these circumstances, the option to raise taxes must be resisted.

If the Premier is not prepared to face these stark options realistically and responsibly, South Australians could well be paying much more in State taxation in the very near future and at a time when they can least afford it. The Premier's colleagues in New South Wales and Victoria have taken the soft option of higher taxes, and I put before the House, for its consideration, the sort of impact this option could have on South Australians if the Premier proceeds to implement all of his election promises.

As the former Government said during the election campaign, to fund the deficit which the Premier says he is now facing, without further restraint in Government expenditure, would require perhaps a bank transactions tax to bring in \$30 000 000, the 1 per cent pay-roll tax surcharge, now in force in the other Labor States, to bring in some \$40 000 000, and an increase in the present levy on petrol and diesel sales to bring in another \$50 000 000. The people and the industries of New South Wales and Victoria will confirm that Labor Governments taking the soft option must impose this sort of burden—a burden which would cost an extra \$9.50 per week per family in South Australia. We cannot allow that to happen, and it should not be allowed to happen. Financial responsibility and constraint will avoid that happening.

In the 1970s, South Australia tried Labor's recipe of bigger government and higher taxes, and it failed our economy, our industries and all South Australians. The Premier said during the election campaign that his recipe was different. In particular, he would not increase taxes for three years. It was a clear, unequivocal and often repeated promise.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And already broken!

Mr OLSEN: Yes, already broken—weekly. I believe the statement he introduced into the House on Tuesday had the sole purpose of justifying the breaking of that promise. He has used Treasury estimates in an attempt to convince people that it is inevitable that the Budget will be in huge deficit at the end of the financial year so that taxes have to be increased.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The Labor Party's Christmas present to South Australia.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, a costly Christmas present which South Australians can ill afford. This is not the case. It is too early to be drawing firm conclusions. Much can be done to remedy the situation. The former Government would have done so. Its record in office of firm control over State finances confirms that. The responsibility is now the Premier's. He has no mandate to increase existing rates of taxation or introduce new taxes. He must not do so.

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): I had rather hoped, although I guess it was naive of me (the outside world has affected me, and I still believe that people are basically honest), that the Opposition would use this time to explain the situation that has arisen and why it did arise. We got only a whitewash from the Leader of the Opposition. If that is the best advice he can get from his research staff, and if that is the best speech they can write for him, it is time he changed his staff. We tended to get the rather lame excuse that the Liberal Government inherited debts. That is not the test of government. The test of government is how well it handles those debts. Of course, every Government of any persuasion comes into office inheriting debts. There is no exception to that situation. I was surprised that the Leader did not mention the Labor Government in Australia in 1972 to 1975. It seems to be one of those perennials brought up every time someone wants to throw dirt at the Labor Party. I will give him credit for that. He is probably the first speaker on the front bench not to have mentioned that for some time.

The point I make is that what they did with the debt was to compound it, and to increase it, and it is just not good enough to look at the debt that it left behind and the mess that we have inherited now. To that has to be added \$140 000 000 that the former Government took away from the building industry of South Australia, wrecking that industry in the process. When one starts looking at the amount of debts that we have, one has to look at that also. It is interesting that the Leader's message, such as it was, obviously has not been accepted in South Australia so far. If one looks at page 6 of today's *News*, at the Frank Jackson column, it is very clear from that. I quote:

There is no way the Labor Government can be blamed, except in small part, for the projections of a huge deficit this financial year, based on his calculations.

'His' is referring to the Under Treasurer.

An honourable member: What happened to the money from the railways?

Mr KLUNDER: It was used to help people, and that is what Governments are about. I continue the quote:

The Under Treasurer suggests the contribution of Labor election promises to a potential \$97 000 000 blow-out this financial year is \$7 000 000 . . . A figure Mr Barnes detailed that is definitely not hypothetical, and which points to at least a major misjudgment by the previous Liberal Administration, was the fate of \$80 000 000 set aside to cover wage increases in the Public Service for the whole of 1982-83. That money is not only gone, but overspent by \$5 000 000 four months into the Budget—a major blunder by the previous Government.

He was being exceedingly kind to the Liberal Government. It was not a major blunder; it was an utter disaster. To be able to misjudge that sort of amount of money from 12

months down to four months, and spend it and spend more, is just incredible.

When one looks at some of these things one realises that, when the previous Liberal Government came into office, it had a working surplus. We certainly do not have one to start with in this financial situation. The funny thing is that the Leader managed to blame us for things like rises in hospital costs since we have been in office, and that comes from a Government that increased the cost of a hospital bed from \$40 a night to \$105 a night, more than a 250 per cent increase, and yet it has the unmitigated gall to try and blame us for raising some of those costs.

The health saga that the Leader managed to bring up was in fact even more incredible. To indicate that hospitals were starting to spend during the term of the previous Liberal Government and then to blame us for that expenditure is beyond belief. All he is merely indicating is that he had no control over his own hospital department at that time. The Leader then set about using the Liberal Party costing of the Labor Party promises, and if one ever talks about setting up straw men and knocking them down again, that was it. It is quite clear, and it has been clear for some time, that during the previous Government's term of office, the Government of the day refused an independent costing of both the Labor and Liberal Party promises—hardly the claim of a Government that thought it was doing the right thing.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You have to use the Under Treasurer properly.

Mr KLUNDER: If the Deputy Leader really thinks that the Under Treasurer would allow himself to be used improperly, then he is reflecting on a very honourable gentleman. The Leader claims that his Government made only moderate promises for this election, and the real question, of course, is why did it make only moderate promises. Was it in fact that they knew what an incredible mess they already had and they just were not prepared to make a bigger mess out of what they had?

An honourable member: But you were, weren't you?

Mr KLUNDER: The point, of course, is that I certainly was not aware of the incredible mess that was left behind. It became apparent only in the first three or four weeks when we found that more and more had been spent by the previous Government, that it had overspent by an incredible amount. If the honourable member does not believe me, he should look at that \$80 000 000 that was made available and was used up in the first four months. It is possible to actually go back and look at the Budget of the Liberal Government and look at the kind of things that it actually did to get some sort of idea as to the mess that it got this State into.

It is interesting to look at the public works situation. The Dunstan Government in, I think, 1977 or 1978 actually made a transfer from public works to recurrent spending of \$5 400 000 and it announced beforehand that it had actually planned it. I was in this House at that time and I remember members of the Opposition going apoplectic with rage, that this sort of terrible misspending should be allowed. I now refer to the 1980-81 Budget. I regret not being here at that time, but I would have liked to be able to point out to the Government—

An honourable member: We all know you are here.

Mr KLUNDER: I am here now and that is one of the reasons that the Opposition is now sitting back on those benches. In 1980-81 the Tonkin Government transferred \$37 300 000 from public works to recurrent expenditure, and in 1981-82 it transferred \$61 800 000. Again, I regret not being here to point out the inconsistencies to the then Premier. In the last year of its office the Liberal Government was to provide for another \$42 000 000 of capital funds to be so allocated.

But I am here now, and I have no hesitation at all, and I derive a great deal of enjoyment from pointing out to the former Government, now the Opposition, that it allocated over \$140 000 000 away from public works and in the process wrecked the building industry of this State, an industry which is one of the major employers in this State. Interestingly enough, it is possible to quote from the then Premier. In 1981, speaking to the Appropriation Bill, he stated:

We cannot afford to continue to finance our recurrent operations from capital funds indefinitely. To continue to do so for a long period would be detrimental to the economy, particularly to the building and construction industry and to employment.

He got full marks for analysis, nil marks for implementation. He messed it up.

It is possible to look at the Budget figures of the Tonkin Government and see why we had some of the messes we now have. In 1978-79, the last year of the Labor Government, \$232 200 000 was paid on public works; in 1981-82 the Liberal Government allocated \$180 900 000 to public works; in 1982-83, \$229 000 000 was allocated by the Liberal Government for public works. That is not strictly true. The actual figure was \$236 000 000. I have taken \$7 000 000 away from the Liberal Government Budget figures for public works, and the reason I do that is quite simple: it has nothing to do with public works.

That \$7 000 000 was a book-keeping transfer for Government cars. It was switched on paper to make the public works figure look \$7 000 000 better than it was. It was a deliberate, miserable untruth perpetrated in Budget papers by the Government of the day. It is possible to look at the taxation record of the Government. It was certainly his intention to make it look as though no taxation rises would take place in the Budget figures. In fact, in the Budget papers themselves he states that the Government has avoided any rise in taxation rates.

All one has to do is look through that Budget to realise that taxation would rise above \$500 000 000 in this State for the first time in its history, that the percentage rise in taxation would be of the order of 11½ per cent, the biggest taxation rise since 1976-77. It does not take a lot of effort to find out why. The then Premier very carefully made his taxation increases public during the year, but did not do so in the Budget, so that he could then fudge his Budget figures and the entire intent of what he was saying and so that he could state that the Government had avoided any rise in taxation rates. It was a dishonest situation brought about by the previous Government because it thought that after the election, if it was lucky enough to win, it would be able to do something about the matter, or at least it would have three years to ride the ensuing storm.

In speaking to the drought situation it was interesting to hear the Leader saying that when the Budget was introduced in August there was no real knowledge of how bad the drought was and that that was the reason why money was not allocated at that time; however, he simply had not done his homework. In a minute of 30 September 1982 the former Minister of Agriculture stated:

I think it might be likened to a drought situation where we do not put any estimate on our requirements. There is no way in the world that we could predict when a drought will start or finish, so we do not provide a line to cover drought assistance.

Again, the fudging of words and intent, and the rubberising of a Budget. I do not intend to take up too much more time because I understand that other members want to contribute to the debate. However, it is rather disgusting that the Leader of the Opposition has given no explanation whatever about the fact that the State is now in the worst situation it has been in since the depression and that he seeks to put the blame for this situation on all sorts of things, none of them, however, dealing with the Liberal

Party mismanagement during the past three years. There is no doubt that that mismanagement took place and there is no doubt in my mind that that situation is now clearly understood by electors, and that the Liberal Party must bear the blame for it. I reiterate Frank Jackson's statements in the *News*, namely, 'There is no way the Labor Government can be blamed.'

Mr Baker: You should read the earlier part.

Mr KLUNDER: Yes, and I could also read the latter part. The tenor of that article is quite clear, namely, that the Liberal Party must accept its share of the blame, although I have not heard a single word about that from the Opposition benches. It will be interesting to see whether the next speaker opposite is in fact prepared to make some sort of statement concerning where the Liberal Party went wrong, but I doubt very much whether that will occur: we will probably continue to hear statements to the effect that it is the fault of previous Labor Governments. The previous Federal Labor Government will probably not come in for its share of blame, although I am not sure about that. However, because I have mentioned the Federal Labor Government it will probably be more difficult to talk about that. I imagine that members opposite might be crossing out slabs of material from the notes they have prepared! In regard to the Leader's reference to Mr Barnes's statement that there was a deficit on recurrent expenditure of about \$72 000 000, there could be two reasons for that: either in four months the Government accidentally overspent that amount or it deliberately fudged the figures.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The last speaker successfully managed to empty the House. I am not surprised, because it was probably one of the most boring contributions to debate that I have heard for a long time. If the honourable member thinks that his advent back to this House has done anything for any member other than himself, he has something to learn. All we have learned is that Frank Jackson is his financial guru and that he awaits every word that drops from his pen and that Frank Jackson has a mate. The honourable member was not here when the Labor Party enunciated, *ad nauseum*, its policy and its financial strategy. I have outlined it previously, but I will do so again.

In regard to the basic tenets of the Labor Party's approach to financial management in South Australia, first, it planned to increase Government spending—it made no bones about that; it planned to put more people on the Government pay-roll and to give them shorter hours and better conditions. The Labor Party indicated that it did not intend to increase taxes and that it was going to balance the Budget. I have referred in this House to those basic tenets of the Labor Party on numerous occasions, and the response I got from the Labor Party Opposition then was their behaving like buffoons, as members of the Labor Party always do when a few home truths are given to them. When in Opposition the Labor Party churned out these policy details to delude the public: they indicated not only that more people would be put on the public pay-roll and be given shorter hours but that they would balance the Budget and would not increase taxes. That is precisely the policy that the Labor Party went to the election on.

The Government at that time gave a warning that the Labor Party was talking financial nonsense. However, the Labor Party now feigns surprise at finding that the Budget position is difficult. It certainly does not come as any surprise to the Liberal Party. The Labor Opposition was warned on numerous occasions that it was talking nonsense. Every time we had an economic debate in this House, the Government warned members of the Opposition that they were behaving like schoolchildren, that they could not balance a household

budget, let alone a State Budget. However, the Labor Government now finds to be true what it was told before the election, namely, that the equation will not balance. I believe that Labor Party members knew very well that it would not balance; I believe that they went to the election deceiving the public, that the now Premier deliberately deceived the public. He knew what his colleague Mr Cain had done in Victoria and that he had deceived the public.

The Labor Party said that it would retain all teachers, despite the fact that there were declining school enrolments, and that it would reinstate the 4 per cent of ancillary staff. Prior to the election the Labor Party said that it would return to the 1979 Public Service levels, but it eventually welshed on that and indicated that it would retain the 1981 levels. Members of the Labor Party criticised the former Government for making economies to successfully balance the Budget: the only way to do that was to trim government, but the Liberal Party was criticised for that. The now Premier said quite unequivocally that there was no way that a Labor Government would raise taxes, because the Labor Party knew precisely the position concerning the finances of the State. He said:

We have no plans to increase State taxes. The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties, will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.

The now Premier thought that he might get three years in office, although he ought to get 10 years in gaol. He further stated:

We believe that our programme can be costed without a tax rise.

During the election campaign when he was quizzed fairly closely the former Leader of the Opposition said that he had precise information from the Budget papers, that he knew what the State could get from Canberra and that the projects had been costed. After the election, as the new Premier, he stated:

I can see no reason why our strategy cannot be encompassed even if there are some problems.

He had then started to back-pedal, indicating that they were on the slide but that they were sneaking up on it.

I believe that he is deliberately deceiving the public. He had been warned, and we reiterated this in Government, that the financial position was tough. We said that the Under Treasurer had told us that the Treasury was faced with the most difficult task it had ever been faced with since the present officers had been there. The Labor Party was warned before the election campaign, and it was warned during the campaign, but did members opposite divert from their basic economic strategy to put more people on the pay-roll and swell up the Government sector despite declining enrolments and not raise taxes? No. These are the financial gurus: these are the geniuses—the financial wizards who can make that equation balance.

We know that it was absolute nonsense, and I must say that I am surprised that members opposite were able to delude a number of people, even though the election victory was fairly close. They harped this doom and gloom and South Australia's poor position in relation to the rest of Australia, even though South Australia was doing better. They deceived the public with this phoney economic garbage, and they scraped in. Now they are seeking to criticise what proved to be a responsible, honest Government, the Tonkin Government. Some of the information in the Under Treasurer's statement was made public—and I do not know about the propriety of that, quite frankly—and in that advice there has obviously been some deterioration, because that is not the advice that came to the previous Government. We knew that the position was difficult, and we made no bones about it.

Let us take the items enumerated in that statement by the Under Treasurer on which the Premier hangs his hat. There is the question of the \$9 000 000 overspending by departments. Nobody told us. We were told about the latest advice that came from the Under Treasurer, and the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to make that available. We were told that there looked like being some overspending in Government departments by \$9 000 000. That was never enumerated to us. It certainly was not in the lead-up to the Budget. The Budget was prepared honestly. It was the best estimates based on the Treasury figures and predictions and the information gleaned by senior Ministers of the Government in the Budget Review Committee. Every department was probed closely. There was no information to the committee or the Government that there would be \$9 000 000 overspent. In fact, if there had been, we would have had the heads of those departments in and put them through their paces.

The present Government has not got the wit to do that because I do not think that they have the people in their line-up who would have the nous to do it. The Government talks about \$4 000 000 as the cost of removing the Labor Party's tax on gas. The great Labor Party, the saviours of the little people! The Labor Party came to Government and was going to tax the tall poppies—'We are not going to hurt the little people.' What do they do? They tax gas and electricity. They put 5 per cent on the turnover of the Electricity Trust (a new tax; 4 per cent to start with, and then they raised it) and taxed gas. Our Government removed it, because there was an offset.

The \$4 000 000 is not accurate and the Premier, if he had the wit to go into it, would know that there was an offset in terms of the increase in royalties. If the gas price to the producers goes up, the State gets a bigger take in royalties, because the State gets a 10 per cent royalty. It could have been more, I suspect, if we had had better financial managers to negotiate the original agreements. We were locked into that 10 per cent up to 1987 by the previous Government. There is an offset, and there is some snide comment in the Premier's statement about the information I gave to the public. The information I gave to the public was perfectly accurate. The costing I gave was perfectly accurate—the cost of removing the Labor Party's tax on gas (their help to the little people), because we made our calculations on the increased royalties that we would get in connection with that. Then the Government whinges. It also whinges that we made no allowance for drought.

The fact is that there was no advice from Treasury in relation to the effects of the drought or the pumping of water when the Budget was framed, because we were not well into the summer; we were not even into spring at that stage. We did get advice subsequent to the Budget, and the figure that came up in the original advice from Treasury was that it could cost \$10 000 000 all up. The Treasury said that this was tentative and that it could be 'saved' (that was the word used by Treasury). It could be \$10 000 000, and that was subsequent to the Budget.

The Treasury advice was that for both pumping and drought relief it could total, say, \$10 000 000, and that was well after the Budget came in. What did Mr Chatterton say? He said that the then Minister of Agriculture was scare-mongering and that we have no drought. Mr Chatterton would go down like a dose of salts with the farmers. He said that if there was a drought the farmers ought to sell because they do not know how to manage their properties. That appeared in a feature article in the *Advertiser*. He will be popular!

Those are the three matters that the Premier seized on to try to suggest that the previous Government was dishonest. That is garbage—absolute garbage! The \$9 000 000 was not

apparent at the time the Budget was framed, and if it had been the Budget Review Committee would have got into top gear. Secondly, there was an offset for the \$4 000 000 in relation to relief from the Labor Party's tax on the big people—the Gas Company, the gas users (every house that uses gas)—in terms of increased royalties. There was no contemplation of what the drought could mean or what the pumping costs would be when the Budget was framed. Anybody who accuses the previous Government of dishonesty, as far as I am concerned, can go to hell, because one thing the Tonkin Government can be proud of is the fact that it was straight. We did not go to an election campaign and deliberately deceive the public. Members opposite used to laugh at us when we raised that subject in this House. More people on the pay-roll—give them shorter working hours. What is one of the main reasons for having to raise charges in hospitals? One of the first things the Labor Government did was accelerate a 38-hour week—a hand-out. We were honest with the teachers. I do not believe the teachers won a lot of support among themselves with their campaign. They scared some parents.

Mr Klunder: You are not complaining about the 1979 campaign, are you?

The Hon E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We honoured promises made in the 1979 election, and we put more resources into the areas that we said we would.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government bought the teachers' vote, and the teachers paid them off by scaring the parents in relation to the education of their children. The teachers came to me, and I explained to them that if we put more resources into their area we would have to take it from somewhere else. I said that one thing that the Liberal Government would see to was that there was an equitable distribution of resources according to our judgment of what is fair to the community.

We told the now Premier that he would have to raise taxes, and that is what he is going to have to do. We knew it before the election campaign, with the financial garbage he was churning out, and we knew it during the campaign. And he knew it, what is more, because he knew the way his comrade Cain had behaved in Victoria; he would not raise taxes, he would spend more money and put more resources into the public sector. Anybody who took time out to examine it knew that it has to be garbage. With all the gloom and doom that we had going on, they were going to solve the problem; they were going to create jobs and channel funds into South Australia.

If ever financial irresponsibility was demonstrated during the three years that the Liberals were in Government, it was by the Labor Opposition, and now it continues. What is Labor's track record since the election? The day after, the Premier started to back-pedal. Things were going to be rosy, but the day after the election things looked as though they might be tough. What has been the Premier's position in relation to these taxes? Three weeks ago, there would be no increase in taxes. Earlier this week, the Premier would not rule it out. Last night they are in contemplation, but the Government will not go on with an increase in taxes if it manages to get this freeze underway. How is that for double talk and duplicity? At election time there would be no taxes, but after three or four weeks, 'We are thinking about it,' and they well know that they have no option at all.

They successfully deceived some members of the South Australian public. We never made a secret of the fact that the State's financial position was difficult. He said quite confidently (and I have his exact words) that he had precise economic information and that his Government could fund its promises. He knew what money was coming from Can-

berra. We told the public that we had difficulties in relation to our basic funding from Canberra. If the Premier and the last Government speaker had not read from Frank Jackson (particularly for his financial information), but had read the official documents before the House, they would have known about the basic problems in terms of the Grants Commission report.

Former Premier Tonkin and I went to Canberra and fought the Grants Commission report. If the Commonwealth had accepted the Grants Commission report *in toto*, South Australia would have been in a worse position—and we made that clear to the public. I refer to the Premier's Financial Statement, which states:

The Grants Commission, following an extensive process of submissions, hearings and examination, reported to the Commonwealth Government in June 1981. Its report was considered at the Premiers' Conference in June 1981 at which concern was expressed by the three less populous States [and we are one] at the magnitude of the changes in the distribution of the grants which adoption of the commission's assessments would entail. In South Australia's case, the implementation of the commission's recommendations would have led to a reduction of \$77 000 000 in its tax sharing grant for 1981-82.

We told the Labor Party that, but it knew how much money it would be getting from Canberra and it could fund its promises. If the Premier had read the Financial Statement he would have read that the Commonwealth had decided to phase it in over three years.

The Grants Commission report was based on the fact that Premier Dunstan did not have the wit to sign, seal and deliver the railways agreement. Premier Dunstan did not get it signed, so it was not binding in law. The Grants Commission had a look around and decided that it would take this money away from South Australia. The Liberal Government inherited that situation and had to fight it. The effect of the Grants Commission report was to put pressure on the South Australian Budget—and we said so. We made no bones about that. If the Premier had read the previous Premier's Financial Statement he would have known that what I am saying is true. The Financial Statement states:

For South Australia, the effects of this approach are estimated as follows on the basis of certain assumptions about future growth in total Commonwealth tax collections, the C.P.I. and State populations:

Estimated 'Loss' Compared with Previous Relativities

	If Grants Commission Recommend- ations Had Been Adopted in Full (\$ million)	Actual Arrangements as Decided by the Commonwealth (\$ million)
1982-83	-52	-11
1983-84	-59	-22
1984-85	-66	-37
	-177	-70

That put pressure on the South Australian Budget and we said so. We knew that it would be tough. That is why Treasury officials told us that we had the most difficult contract they had ever seen since they had been in the Treasury. We made that clear, also. If we were going to keep a tab on taxes in South Australia we had no option but to reduce Government spending and reduce the size of the Government sector.

With the declining school population, in these very stringent economic times, it was not unreasonable to reduce the size of the teaching force. The Premier and the Minister of Education gleefully ignore that the Grants Commission looks at the way in which States spend their funds. South Australia

spends more on health and education per head than any other State. That was the Dunstan promise.

Mr Gregory: What's wrong with that?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not wrong.

Mr Gregory: You want to cut people down.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite should listen to the point I am making. When the Grants Commission disburses its funds it looks at the needs of the States, and one of the criteria is the way in which Governments disburse their funds. If these areas are heavily funded, or funded to a higher extent than any other State in Australia, the commission takes that into consideration. That factor is used in an attempt to even-up things around Australia, and it was used to reduce South Australia's funding. If one takes a long-term view it does not pay to get too far out of step with the Australian scene.

I am sure that we would all like to live in Utopia and that we would all love to go to heaven one day. However, we live in the real world. We live in a federation and we must live with the Grants Commission. One of the tragedies for South Australia and the other two less populous States is the fact that the Grants Commission implemented a relativities system. If ever there was an attempt to put all of Australia's population on the eastern seaboard it was that. However, there was nothing we could do about it; we had to live with it. I warn the Government that, if it follows the path of the Dunstan Government in the Utopian years when this State was supposed to have been put on the map, it is looking for trouble, particularly at this time of financial stringency.

The policies enunciated by the Premier in the recent election campaign are just what this State does not need. If ever there was a recipe for disaster that is it. It ill behoves the Premier to stand up and try to shrug off his problems on the former Administration. We recognised that times were tough, we took tough decisions, and we did tough things.

An honourable member: And you messed it up.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We did not mess it up. We would have been in a damn sight worse mess if the policies that the A.L.P. is now espousing had been implemented over the past three years.

Mr Gregory: That's nonsense.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not nonsense.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I suppose I should have cause for complaint, rising with only a few minutes to reply. If I believed that the contributions from the last two speakers opposite had great substance I would have been fairly concerned. However, I do not believe that they addressed themselves to the problem in a direct way at all. We are still waiting in this House, and we will probably have to wait until Domesday, to receive a true explanation of the financial management of the last Government and why we find ourselves in an overall economic recession with a State Treasury that is simply not geared to cope with it.

It is certainly true that, during the period my Party spent in Opposition, we criticised certain features of the Tonkin Government Budgets: the way that something like \$140 000 000 was taken from capital works funds to prop up recurrent expenditure, the reckless way in which revenue was allowed to run down, and the reckless way in which money was expended in so many areas. We always had a lot to say about that. We were very much aware that to achieve government in this State we had to do it on the basis of a realistic platform and realistic promises. One of the underlying fallacies of the attacks of the Leader of the Opposition is that he simply ignores the underlying substance contained in the Under Treasurer's statement. One of the

bases of that is founded on a total fallacy. Why would any Government want to raise taxes, particularly if it promised that it would not do so? Why would anyone want to break election promises?

It is as though there was some intention on our part to do that. That is absolute and palpable nonsense. We know it is vital for Governments to attempt to deliver to the people the programmes that it promises. That is certainly my intention. Those are decisions that have to be made by my Government and they will be made. In looking at what we could promise during the election we had regard to the masses of information referred to. Indeed, there was a lot, and I have acknowledged that. The problem is that it tended to conceal more than it revealed. In fact, we were faced with bland and clear cut statements about financial management. Even if those statements were half true they would have allowed our programme to be put into effect. I refer to one clear example as late as 2 September this year when, just before he announced the election, the former Premier said in this place:

The Government's control of the budgetary situation, our management of the State's economic position, has been so good that there is no need whatever to consider taxation increases in South Australia.

They are clear, unequivocal, certain statements. That statement was accompanied during the election campaign by a series of promises, promises which on their own admission would have cost about \$13 000 000 and probably would have cost more. Taking all that into account, I would suggest that the substance of this debate has not been addressed in this House by the Opposition. It has failed, as it did in Government, to live up to its financial responsibilities.

The SPEAKER: Order! The time allowed for this debate has now expired.

Motion carried.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EXECUTORS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1978 an amendment was made to the Executors Company's Act limiting the number of votes that could be exercised by any individual shareholder or group of associated shareholders to a maximum of 1.67 per cent of the total number of A and B class shares issued by the company. Subsequently the company amended its articles of association to impose a corresponding limitation on the number of such shares that could be held by a shareholder or over which he could exercise control. In 1980 the principal Act was further amended to give statutory force to this limitation on the size of shareholdings. Under the provisions of this later amendment, if a shareholder fails to comply with the requirements of a notice issued by the company under section 31 (requiring him to divest himself of any shares in excess of the statutory maximum), the shares of that shareholder are forfeited to the Crown. Such shares are to be sold by the Corporate Affairs Commission and the proceeds paid to the shareholder after deduction of the costs of forfeiture and sale.

A group of companies associated with Mr Ron Brierley appears to have been in persistent breach of the provisions limiting the maximum shareholding in the company. The company has accordingly acted under section 31 of the principal Act to require divestiture of shares in excess of the prescribed maximum. Unfortunately, some doubt exists as to the validity of the notices issued by the company. This doubt arises because it is not entirely clear that the companies to which the notices were directed are all members of a single group of associated companies. An important provision of the Bill—proposed new section 29a—will, in effect, compel Mr Brierley to litigate this issue so that the matter may be determined finally and conclusively by the courts.

The Bill also deals with another stratagem that has been adopted with the apparent intention of circumventing the limitation upon maximum shareholdings. The principal Act presently provides that the directors may, before registering a transfer of shares, administer interrogatories to the proposed transferee in order to ascertain whether the transfer is consistent with the limitations imposed by the Act. These interrogatories have been generally ignored by companies associated with Mr Brierley. This means that the transfers are not registered, but the non-registration of the transfers has not deterred the acquisition of further shares. The apparent purpose is to build up such a large volume of unregistered transfers that ultimately they will have to be registered in order to maintain some reasonable correspondence between the company's share register and the actual position in regard to ownership of the company's shares. The Bill attempts to deal with this problem by providing that all 'defaulting shareholders', that is, shareholders who have failed to answer questions put to them by the directors, together constitute a group of associated shareholders. This will enable the company to proceed directly against this group with a view to divesting them of their shareholdings.

The Bill also provides for automatic cancellation of share certificates in respect of forfeited shares. This provision is inserted out of an abundance of caution and partly because the matter has been raised by Mr Brierley himself in his published statements on the matter. However, it should be noted that in an analogous situation—the forfeiture of shares in a no-liability company upon non-payment of a call—forfeiture of shares takes place without surrender of share certificates and without express statutory provision for their cancellation. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes an amendment to section 25 of the principal Act by inserting a new paragraph (c). New paragraph (c) provides that all defaulting shareholders together constitute a group of associated shareholders. New subsection (2) defines 'defaulting shareholder' as a shareholder who has failed to furnish a declaration required under sections 27 or 28 and is therefore in default under either of those sections.

Clause 3 enacts new section 29a. New section 29a is as follows: subsection (1) provides that a declaration by the directors that specified shareholders constitute a group of associated shareholders or that a specified person who is not the registered shareholder has a relevant interest in shares shall be accepted as conclusive proof of the matters to which the declaration relates in legal proceedings or proceedings of the company. Subsection (2) deals with service of a declaration under the new section. Subsection (3) applies the provisions of subsection (1) to a declaration made before

the commencement of the new Act as if the new section had been in force when the declaration was made. Under subsection (4) a shareholder to whom a declaration under the new section relates may apply to the Supreme Court for an order excluding him from the operation of the declaration. The Supreme Court may make such an order if it is satisfied that proper grounds for the declaration did not exist in so far as it related to that shareholder. Under subsection (5), such an order of the Supreme Court does not affect the validity of the declaration in relation to other shareholders. Subsection (6) provides that an application under subsection (4) must be made within 45 days of service of the declaration on the applicant or within 45 days of the commencement of the new Act, whichever is later. The period of limitation is not to be extended. Under subsection (7) the company and the Corporate Affairs Commission are to be the respondents to an application to the Supreme Court. Subsection (8) excludes any challenge to a declaration under the new section except as provided in subsection (4), and subsection (9) excludes from the application of the new section an examination under section 29.

Clause 4 amends section 31 of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection (2a). The new subsection deals with procedural matters in the event of a forfeiture of shares under the section. Under paragraph (a) the company is required to register the Corporate Affairs Commission as the shareholder of the forfeited shares. Paragraph (b) provides that any certificate previously issued in relation to the forfeited shares is deemed to have been cancelled from the date of forfeiture. The company is required to issue new certificates in the name of the Corporate Affairs Commission. Paragraph (c) provides that the commission holds the shares, until sold in accordance with the section, solely for and on behalf of the Crown.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is essentially to tidy up some loose ends discovered in the practical application of a series of wide-ranging amendments to the Executors Company's Act in 1980. Those amendments were an expansion of the principle established in 1978 by legislation that the maximum holding of any shareholder or group of associated shareholders in the Executors Company should be limited to 1.67 per cent, so we are not debating the principle of limitation of shareholders in the company.

I understand that there have been some practical difficulties in ensuring that the spirit of the 1978 and 1980 legislation is honoured by all shareholders and, because of the unique nature of the Executors Company, I have no quarrel with the principle. The Executors Company holds a wide range of assets, cash shares in other companies, real estate and other property for a wide range of beneficiaries. Those trust funds must be protected. There is certainly no guarantee that any shareholder with a large percentage of shares would act in the best interests of the beneficiaries with respect to the management of those funds. For those reasons, those controls are necessary and we support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Groups of associated shareholders.'

Mr LEWIS: Mr Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member wish to speak to clause 2?

Mr LEWIS: If I can find the Bill. I have complained about this before, Mr Chairman. I think it is disgusting.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I represent an electorate in this place and I am entitled to a copy of the legislation before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I want to know whether the honourable member wishes to speak to the clause?

Mr LEWIS: I simply ask that a copy of the Bill be placed on my Bill file.

Mr BECKER: Do I understand that Brierley and his associated companies can be linked with various companies which have breached this Act in that he has not divested himself of that shareholding in the Executor Trustee and Agency Company? I can remember some years ago that moves were made to prevent Brierley from obtaining a substantial interest in the Executor Trustee and Agency Company with a view, I believe, to taking it over.

It was also feared that if Brierley took over the company he would proceed with asset stripping, a practice for which he is well known. It always amazes me how the directors of well-known South Australian companies have allowed the situation to occur where the company is under-capitalised, writing down the assets and not revaluing them. For years they have denied the shareholders the opportunity to benefit on the capital value of the assets. It is therefore only fair and reasonable that the smart operator such as Brierley, Holmes a Court or Bond can step in, get control, and strip the company.

The Adelaide company directors have a lot to answer for to the shareholders in this State. It is a shame that we have not had greater accountability of our publicly listed companies. The information I seek from the Minister is as to the whole purpose of the legislation as far as Mr Brierley's activities are concerned.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I think the information that the honourable member seeks was given in the second reading explanation which I read to the House a few moments ago. The problem is tackled in the principal Act and the amendments to which his Leader referred a few moments ago in his acceptance of the measure. These small amendments to the principal Act attend to some anomalies that have been invented by companies seeking to do precisely that to which the honourable member alluded in his comments.

Mr BECKER: That being so, whilst it is a worthwhile move to protect and preserve the companies in South Australia and, in particular, the executive companies operating presently, what it does not do and what concerns me is that somehow we should be giving the message, loud and clear, to the directors of these companies that we would like to see greater accountability to the shareholders so that they benefit from any revaluation of assets and so that operators such as Brierley do not come in and acquire an interest. I do not think we will stop him from doing it, because it will be hard to prove that a person is not organising 20 or 30 shareholders to give him the balance of voting power. No matter what we do in legislation, if somebody wants to gain control of a company, that person can arrange for a large number of shareholders if necessary to avoid any close scrutiny by the directors in an endeavour to know what is going on, so that certain persons can be elected to the board.

I believe that in the whole wash-up of the situation the shareholders of these companies are not getting a fair go. That has been proved on many occasions with the companies we have lost in South Australia through take-over bids by interstate operators. The conservative approach to management, conservative valuation of assets, the establishment of large reserves used back in the business and the keeping down of dividends have shown that the shareholders (and in the main South Australians) have missed out badly in what they are entitled to. As we know, the Government (whichever Government it is) is held accountable for the spending of public moneys. Yet, there seems to be no authority which can hold directors of companies responsible to shareholders in the manner in which the taxpayers of

South Australia are in relation to their tax. We should look at this matter in the future. I want to be assured that in future the Government will look at this angle as well.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Whilst the comments of the member for Hanson are interesting, they are not pertinent to clause 2 (the measure before us). The matters to which the member referred are important, and I refer him to the von Doussa Report which I tabled earlier today. It is worthwhile Christmas reading because that touches precisely on the points he is making: namely, the rights of shareholders. Indeed, that is why the authorities intervened in investigating that matter to protect the rights of shareholders and, in so doing, the confidence of the public in the share market. The point is well made and taken on board.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 and 4) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): By leave, I extend Christmas greetings to all on the last sitting day for the year. It has been an extremely interesting year—even an extraordinary year—for all. In politics an election year is always an eventful and stressful year but, when the election is accompanied by a change of Government, that stress is compounded enormously. Throughout the year Parliament has sat constantly. Of course the last session that we have been going through has been brought about as a result of the election. That election campaign itself had all members and former members actively working in their electorates. So, the Christmas break comes as an extremely welcome relief.

I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on the way you have handled the office in the few days you have been in the Chair. Although you, Mr Speaker, are not bothering to listen to my congratulations, I am sure that when you read them in *Hansard* you will be gratified by them. I believe your auspicious start bodes well. I thank the former Speaker, the member for Light, for the way in which he conducted the House for the bulk of the year in which the former Government was in office.

Let me extend my thanks to the Clerks, officers, the Messengers, the library and research staff, the caretakers, the *Hansard* reporting staff, the refreshment and diningroom staff, the press (with whom we have a love/hate relationship), and all those working in this place. Over the past three years I have had occasion to work here every working day (and some more) and certainly appreciate the atmosphere and dedication of all those who work in the place. I am sure that, without exception, all are in need of a good rest over Christmas. I hope that everyone will return refreshed. I bid you, Sir, and all those who work in the place all the best for Christmas and the new year.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): By leave, Sir, I am delighted to support the Premier in offering thanks to the staff of Parliament House and reciprocating the good wishes that he has extended to members of the Opposition, and on behalf of the Opposition might I extend to each member of the Government and their families every best wish for Christmas and 1983. I also extend the season's greetings to the member for Flinders and the member for Semaphore who have chosen but a lonely course in this Parliament. Nevertheless, we certainly extend to them and to their families the compliments of the season.

I join with the Premier in congratulating you again, Mr Speaker, on your recent appointment as Speaker. Although we have sat for only a very short period you have indicated

that you will carry out your duties with fairness and impartiality and I think they are two attributes that someone in the Chair certainly needs; you have displayed those over these sitting days.

Many changes have taken place in this Chamber in recent months—too many, perhaps, for some, yet it is a credit to all those concerned that Parliament has continued to run smoothly and efficiently. The Premier has expressed thanks to officers of the Parliament, and the Opposition sincerely and genuinely supports those views. The list of those who can take the credit for the efficiency of this Parliament is long, but I think it is appropriate to mention the Clerks, Parliamentary Counsel, messengers, attendants, police officers, *Hansard*, secretarial and Library staff, catering, house-keeping, maintenance staff, caretakers, and of course the ladies on the Parliament House switchboard. These people have all served Parliament with dedication and courtesy which is appreciated I am sure, by each and every one of us.

I would also like to thank members of the electorate office staff of all members, our own secretaries and staff and, in this election year, members of the Electoral Department for their assistance right across the board to all who sought advice. To all these people may I, on behalf of the Opposition, extend wishes for a very happy Christmas in the hope that 1983, despite predictions, brings happiness and prosperity to a whole range of people.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I would like to add my Christmas greetings to those of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. We are at the end of 1982 and it is one of those years that will go down in history; as has been said, there have been many changes. I would like to add the season's greetings to the long list of people mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, and also to the media, although its representatives do not happen to be in the gallery at the present time. I believe that they might be around in another room. Nevertheless, I think that the media has played an important part in the year's activities and have the season's greetings extended to them. To every member of this Chamber, to the families, and to you, Mr Speaker, I would like to extend the season's greetings and compliments.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Being the fourth speaker, I do not think that anyone has been missed in the list to be wished a merry Christmas and I would like to support strongly—

An honourable member: Let's hope the last.

Mr PETERSON: Perhaps last in order for speaking, but never last. No-one seems to have been missed, and I would like to pass on my best wishes to all those people. As was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, it is a lonely path that some of us tread in this place and, without the support of all who work here, it would be much lonelier and much harder. I would like to comment on the changes that have been made in the place over the last 12 months. I wish the best to those who were unfortunate in losing their positions in this Parliament. Some of them might find Christmas a little different this year, and I hope that it is better for them in the new year.

An honourable member: The room is a bit poky upstairs.

Mr PETERSON: My room is the same. I have a very good room, with a courtyard, chair and tables; I am all right. I would like to welcome the new members, congratulate them on their election to this place, and hope that all goes well for them. In commenting on the previous Government and its Ministers, I would like to thank them for their help. I must say that the new Ministers already have shown a

willingness to give me assistance, so Semaphore may not suffer, as has been threatened.

An honourable member: Tell us about the seaweed at Taperoo.

Mr PETERSON: It is a problem, but the position is on the way to recovery and I know that the new Government will continue that project. One group of people is always forgotten, and I extend my good wishes to them; the families and the wives and children of the members and staff.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And the husbands.

Mr PETERSON: I stand corrected; and the husbands.

Mr Mathwin: Girlfriends and boyfriends.

Mr PETERSON: I am not sure that the families have boyfriends or girlfriends. These people put up with a lot. I know that my family sometimes has a rough time, with the hours that we put in and perhaps shortness of temper when we get home. I give them my condolences and best wishes for the festive season. We will be able to spend some time with them. I hope that all who work in this House have a merry Christmas, and that the new year is good for all. It may look a bit dim from the Opposition side of the Chamber, but someone has to sit there. I must admit that the view is a little different from my new seat. I wish everyone well for the festive season and hope the new year will provide the opportunity to achieve what members wish in their political lives.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): It is uncommon for me to speak at this stage, but I want to support the comments made about Christmas to the staff and everyone who works within or is associated with the building and, of course, their families, as mentioned by the member for Semaphore. There are staff members in this building who are hidden faces; theirs are the voices one hears around the corridors trying to find us when telephone calls come in. One of our switchboard ladies, Margaret, has been with us for a long while, and I am led to believe that she is retiring within the next week. I think that she has served this Parliament longer than has any member in this Chamber. Over the years we have known the girls on the switchboard by their voice; very seldom do we see them in person. It is important to remember the amount of chasing around and inconvenience that they have sometimes in finding us. I would like to add a special Christmas wish to Margaret, not only for Christmas but for the future. I hope that she has a healthy and happy retirement after nearly 20 years service to the members, staff and officers who work within the Parliament. When one sees Margaret, one realises that she came here as a very young girl. I know that all members will support me in thanking her for the service she has given to each and every one of us, as well as the many people who have left the place through retirement or defeat.

The SPEAKER: I would like to offer to all members and their families a merry Christmas and a happy and healthy new year. To the staff of the House of Assembly and indeed the whole Parliament, my thanks indeed. I offer my very special thanks to the table officers who helped my initiation into this job, which has a few hidden traps. I also thank my predecessor who was very kind during the two weeks interregnum, as it were, for his advice. I make special reference, as did the member for Fisher, to Margaret Hunt, who has been the telephonist here since the early 1960s and who is due to retire on 24 December. I offer her every good wish.

A number of people have made a comment about the new style uniform that we wear here, but at least we are not like Westminster. I am told that a group of tourists was going through there when a door opened in the corridor somewhere and they saw the Lord Chief Justice of England, with his gorgeous robes of red, ermine and gold and his

buckled shoes. Just as the door opened as the party was going past, he saw a friend across the corridor and said 'Neil', whereupon the whole party dropped to their knees.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 28 (clause 2)—Leave out 'the' first occurring.

No. 2. Page 1, line 30 (clause 2)—After 'Incorporated' insert 'or any other foot race meeting conducted by that body and approved by the Minister'.

No. 3. Page 1, line 32 (clause 2)—Leave out 'of the' and insert 'of a'.

No. 4. Page 2, line 3 (clause 2)—Leave out 'of the' and insert 'of a'.

No. 5. Page 2, line 5 (clause 2)—Leave out 'and the' and insert 'and a'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

These minor amendments provide the opportunity for the Minister to approve to extend legal betting on foot racing events. I want to make it absolutely clear that, if this amendment is carried, it is not my intention to extend the provisions relating to foot racing further than their application to the Bay Sheffield. I believe that the South Australian Athletic League would be perfectly happy and satisfied to accept that situation. I support the Legislative Council's amendments and recommend that other members of the Committee do likewise.

Mr EVANS: I oppose the amendments in the strongest terms. I am disgusted that the Minister now says that he will accept these amendments from another place following his standing in this House and saying that the provisions would apply to the event at Glenelg but that there would be no consideration of other foot races in this State, which were mentioned during the second reading debate. At no time did the Minister indicate that there would be other considerations, or that he considered it was necessary. However, support for the amendment has been given in another place and the amendment has now been returned to this Chamber. Whether that was organised in the other place or not, I do not know, although I know who moved it. However, the effect of the amendment is that if the Athletic League wants to conduct a professional foot race anywhere else in the State, all it needs to do is to get the permission of the Minister of the day. The matter will not be covered by regulation and will not come back to this place to be debated. There could be many such races and they could be held every Saturday, and it would be purely up to the Minister of the day to give permission without this Parliament having a say.

The specific reason given for bringing in the original Bill a couple of days ago and for its being put before this House before the Address in Reply was completed, was to give the opportunity for the Bay Sheffield to have professional foot racing with gambling; that was the purpose for Parliament's considering the matter and putting it through quickly. Now we find that wherever the Athletic League wants to have a foot race with gambling provided, with the Minister's agreement, that can occur. If this matter was covered by regulation, that would give Parliament some chance to debate such matters. I would like the Minister to think deeply about what he is doing, in view of the commitment he gave to the House, after his saying that the Athletic League wanted this provision for the Bay Sheffield. However, now the Minister tells us that the Athletic League would be quite happy with the amendments—of course it would.

This situation has been achieved by getting the main piece of legislation through here first, and then slipping in the amendment in another place, the idea having been to get it in and then having someone move an amendment in the other place to be supported by the main bulk of the Labor Party, as was the case in this place with the so-called conscience vote. The amendment now virtually puts the sport in the same category as other sports involved in the gambling industry; it is another sport that is to be opened up to the gambling industry in total. I admit that the Government receives revenue from the gambling industry, as do individuals. Because money changes hands, someone must benefit.

The other point is that earlier in the week when the legislation was brought before the House and when I sought an assurance that the funds would go to the Sport and Recreation Fund to be available to all sport and recreation groups, I was told that there would be little money involved, that there would be only one race a year. I was also told that all the money would go to the Athletic League. However, suddenly the door opens, it will be open slather, and there will be a lot of money involved in that fund. It does not matter what the present Minister tells us he might do: he is a bird of passage; he is there but for a short term. Honourable members know that no Minister is there for all time, and that any guarantee that a Minister gives has no bearing on what another Minister might do. This provision means that with the stroke of a pen any professional foot race can have gambling. I challenge the Minister to stick to what he said and send the Bill back to the Upper House (it does not matter how late it is and it does not matter about our personal inconvenience) as being unacceptable.

From one carnival and one amount of money going into the Athletic League, the potential now is for the Minister and the Athletic League at whim to widen it immensely. What chance has the public had to comment on this? Absolutely none! The amendments would broaden the concept of the Act considerably. There are many people in the community who would accept these amendments and say that it was all right to have gambling at the one carnival in which the Athletic League is included, namely, the Bay Sheffield. But ask those people whether they accept giving the Minister the power to allow professional foot-racing anywhere in the State at the whim of the Athletic League, and I believe that we would get an amazing reaction from many of them. All the Minister has to do is sign a document approving gambling at, say, Bordertown, Murray Bridge, Victor Harbor, or wherever it may be in the State. This proposal is to be much broader based, and I hope that the Minister realises what is happening when he takes this action.

He should not just sit back, smile and say, 'It doesn't really matter because in my heart I do not think that the Athletic League will ask for many more events, and if it does I am likely to say "No".' The Minister is in office only at present. Once the Act is amended, it is there until those who oppose it eventually have the opportunity to change it. I ask the Minister to give the public an opportunity at least to make representations before this Act is changed. These amendments have had absolutely no publicity at all. The other amendments did have, and I assume that members of the community did not have any great objection to them because they saw them as being restricted to one venue. I ask the Minister to reject these amendments with the greatest amount of effort. I urge him to now change his mind, having said that he thought it did not matter. I hope he realises that there is more to it than he originally thought and that he will agree to throw out these amendments and leave the amendments as they were originally for the Bay Sheffield to operate. If these matters need further discussion at a

later time, let us have those discussions after 15 March. I oppose the amendments.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I accept the Minister's assurances that he would not license any other professional foot races for betting purposes in this State. As the member for Fisher has so well put the case—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He might be here today and gone tomorrow.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Indeed. The Minister may not be Minister of Recreation and Sport at a certain time when applications are made for betting on particular foot races. If the Minister accepts this amendment he will be failing his first legislative test in this House, because this amendment changes the Bill considerably from the one that we debated earlier. It is an entirely different measure from the original one and, of course, many of us on this side opposed the previous Bill, but it was passed by this House, and we accept that fact as the member for Fisher has said.

Now, in the dying minutes of this sitting of Parliament, we are faced with major amendments and the Minister is saying that he is accepting these amendments because he wants to get the measure through so that we can go home and so that fielders can be down at Glenelg for the Bay Sheffield on 28 December. We agree that if this measure has to go through and if betting is to be allowed at the Bay Sheffield these amendments should go through now because otherwise it will not be possible to achieve that. However, that is no reason to lie down and subject this House to the whims of another place when major amendments are being made to this measure.

Mr Evans: It's even more major than the original amendments.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Of course it is, and I implore the Minister not to fail his first test in this place with important legislation, but to stand up for his rights in this House and, if necessary, go to conference and we will stay here until it is through.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I oppose these amendments as vehemently as I am able because, in my judgment, this is a prostitution of the Parliamentary process and one of the worst kind. One of the basic strengths of democracy is that the public should have an opportunity in any Parliamentary system of finding out what is going on before the Parliament and then having some input into that process. One of the complaints about democracy is that sometimes it is a slow process. By the time members of the public can have a chance to say what they think about a matter quite a deal of time can lapse. One can think of the controversy over the construction of the dam in Tasmania, for instance, as a prime example of democracy at work. For the people who want to get on with the job it must be a confounded nuisance. That is the price you pay when involving the public in matters which they think are important and giving them a chance to say what they think. A lot of us think some members of the public are quite misguided in their attitudes, but that is not for us to tell people. It is our job to convince them that the way we are thinking is the correct way and that what we want to do is the proper way to do things.

In no way should we deprive people of their rights to know what is going on and what is going to affect them. As the member for Fisher said, these amendments substantially change the nature of the Bill. It is not worth a crumple for the Minister to give an undertaking that while he is Minister there will be no more. That is not worth a cracker. It is not what the Minister says that is the law, it is what is in black and white. The Minister is here today, but once this Bill passes he could be gone tomorrow and the situation could change completely. It would then be entirely in the

hands of the Minister, whoever he may be, to decide what would happen in relation to this industry.

This Bill could change the whole face of foot racing in this State. What started out as a fairly minor amendment in relation to one foot race in South Australia could result in the industry's being opened up. It could be the beginning of a new industry in South Australia. It is no good for the Minister to say that while he is Minister that will not happen, because it is what is contained in the Statutes that counts. Therefore, the Minister's undertaking is not worth a cracker. I believe it is a prostitution of the Parliamentary process to move a major amendment and expect it to be accepted in the dying hours of a session. I will be using all the time allotted to me in this debate to make that point.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: To waste time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will certainly not be wasting time; I will be using my time to see that democracy works in this place. It will not be to waste time, as did the junior Minister of Health who, in Opposition, often got up to waste time. The Opposition is trying to prove a point, that is, that the public does not have the faintest idea about this legislation. How many people in South Australia know that this measure is before Parliament? I challenge the Minister to tell us what information he has given the public about this measure. What chance do people have to know about major amendments like this? The press in its wisdom has not seen fit to take up this matter as an issue. When the Casino Bill was debated, it was reported in the press day in and day out for months. Obviously the press is engaged in more pressing matters.

If we let this measure go through, what chance will the public have to know that we have opened up a whole new industry of foot racing? None. It is quite improper to prostitute the Parliamentary process in this way. To pass this measure to suit the Minister's convenience would make a laughing stock of any notion of the public's being involved, as a result of a smart amendment moved by a member in another place. I find it strange. I am informed that this amendment was moved by a Liberal member. I do not know who that member was. Some Liberal members in the Upper House take pride in the fact that Parliament is supreme.

Mr Becker: Mr DeGaris.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If it was Mr DeGaris, then I point out that the Hon. Mr DeGaris has waxed loud about Parliament's being supreme. When the Planning Act was passed, too much was put in the regulations; Parliament had to be supreme. It had to come back to Parliament. That Bill had to be delayed for, I think, some weeks, quite a considerable time, so that Parliament could be supreme. However, we have a member of the Upper House moving an amendment that will make the Minister supreme. The Minister will have the ability to make radical changes in this area without Parliament having much say. I find it strangely inconsistent that some of my colleagues in another place are behaving in this way in relation to this amendment.

This amendment does not make Parliament supreme; it makes the Minister supreme. It is with some surprise that I find that this amendment was moved by a member of the Liberal Party. Some members in another place pride themselves about their independence and the fact that they belong to a House of Review. We always come back to the fact that Parliament is supreme, but in this case there has been a complete back flip.

Parliament is going to wash its hands of it and hand it over to the Minister. Once it is there in law, and this sort of thing has been quoted to us *ad nauseam*, that is the way it will be. It will be at the whim of the Minister. Even if I were in favour of betting on races, I would not accept the amendment in the present circumstances—even if I favoured

the Bill. It is quite improper for the Government to first suggest that the measure ought to take precedence over the Address in Reply but we let that through to humour it and to be co-operative. However, to open up the matter, as this amendment does, without the public having the faintest idea that it is going on is entirely improper, it is a prostitution of the democratic process and a prostitution of the Parliament. If the Minister had any wit of the way that this place ought to operate, he would know that. I would like to take the amendments one at a time so that we can have 15 minutes each on each amendment.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Hanson may want to get home to mum, but I believe that this matter is important. We can look at the way the Labor Party behaved with the Casino Bill. When the public had the chance in the electorate to say what it thought, the members all got cold feet. We know that when a Bill such as the Casino Bill is before the House, the minority groups (I assume) lodge petitions. Members of Parliament get terribly sensitive at election time. Members start to listen to minority groups. Governments can do all sorts of things at the beginning of a Parliamentary term. They can get away with it as the people have three years to forget it.

What happened with the Casino Bill in the last six months of the last Parliament? The Labor Party went to water and backed off. The minority groups (although they were the majority in my district) came forward with petitions and wrote to members who subsequently backed off. The Casino Bill went out. Despite the enormous amount of work that was put in by the then Minister to produce an excellent report, they all deserted him. They all backed off and got cold feet because the minority groups spoke up, but my point is that at least those groups had their chance to have a say. That is what democracy is all about. If we are going to deny people a say in this place then it is not worth its name as a democratic Parliament. The Government may think we are wasting time but we are not. A principle is at stake. The member for Fisher believes that a principle is at stake, just as I do.

It would suit me to go home now and watch television with my family. However, there is no way that I will walk out of this place and let it be prostituted by a pathetically weak Minister and a couple of misguided members of my own Party in another place. I ask that these amendments be taken *seriatim* because I think that, under Standing Orders, we can all speak for 15 minutes on each amendment. I want my 15 minutes on each to prove a point. I ask that we take the amendments one after the other because I intend, without being repetitive, to make one or two important points. All this nonsense about Parliament being supreme is completely out the window when we hand over to a Minister powers such as are enunciated in what appears to be a little Bill.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. I request that these amendments be taken individually.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order. I must call on the Minister.

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. It is now past 6 o'clock and I believe it is past the time when the House should adjourn for the dinner break.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is reporting the results of the Committee and is now in a position to call the Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: A further point of order, Mr Chairman. Is it competent for a motion to extend the sittings of the House beyond 6 p.m. to be moved when the clock clearly shows that it is already beyond 6 p.m.?

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair will have to seek advice.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the hour of six is past, I cannot accept the motion. The House stands adjourned until 7.30 p.m.

[Sitting suspended from 6.7 to 7.30 p.m.]

Amendment No. 1:

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is now dealing with the first of the Legislative Council's amendments.

Mr MATHWIN: May I say that I oppose this amendment. I would remind members—

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the Committee is now dealing with each amendment individually and the honourable member can now speak only to the first amendment.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. I thought that we had agreed earlier that we would consider amendments 1 to 5 together.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Before the adjournment the Deputy Leader of the Opposition sought to deal with the amendments individually. That request stands.

Mr MATHWIN: As I said earlier, I oppose this amendment. The Minister said when these amendments were brought before this place that they were minor amendments. I remind the Minister that they are not minor amendments at all. In fact, they are most important and very wide. This amendment seeks to leave out the word 'the' in the definition of the prescribed foot race meeting. It provides:

... the foot race meeting known as the 'Bay Sheffield Carnival' conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated.

The removal of the word 'the' is most important because it means that any race meeting now will come under the ambit of this particular legislation. Let me remind the Minister of what he said to the House. I have known the Minister for some time and I pay him respect in regard to his word being his bond. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated:

I expressed very strongly that I was in favour of betting on the Bay Sheffield.

Later he said:

The history that has been given is absolutely correct. The events are certainly a very important part of the Commemoration Day celebrations at Glenelg.

This is the Minister explaining what he meant and what he believed the Bill was. In relation to the amount of turnover tax or the amount of turnover that bookmakers will bring, and in relation to whether it be \$30 000 or \$40 000, the Minister said this:

On the 28th the turnover will be between \$30 000 and \$40 000 and betting will be on the Bay Sheffield event only.

That is what the Minister said. He further stated:

The betting will be on the Bay Sheffield event only, and I do not contemplate now, or at any further time, any cross-card betting.

This amendment will cause cross-card betting. The Minister said, without any equivocation at all, that that is what he meant. That is what he said, and that is what the Bill is all about. He went on to say this:

That is why I have now introduced this Bill, because I want it to come into effect on this coming Proclamation Day.

The Minister is bound by what he said. He said it was in relation to the Bay Sheffield on Proclamation Day, not as an open slather for all betting throughout South Australia. That is not what it was all about. As far as I am concerned, the Minister gave his word and I would presume that, as an honourable Minister and an honourable member of this

House, he would keep his word. The Minister went on to say this:

This measure is in the public interest and in the interest of the events on Commemoration Day.

Throughout the Minister's second reading explanation, throughout his answers to other members who asked questions and throughout the debate, all his answers were centred around Commemoration Day and the Bay Sheffield; that was it. That was the commitment given to this House and that is one of the reasons why I supported this Bill. I know the Minister as being an honourable man in giving his word, and that was his word in his second reading explanation and in his answers to the arguments put forward during the whole debate. Now the Minister has turned around completely. Indeed, he has grasped the situation and has seen that this situation has come about because of some action in another place about which we are not allowed to talk.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: One of your colleagues.

Mr MATHWIN: Whether they are my colleagues or not does not matter. The point remains that they did not commit themselves but the Minister committed himself in this House as to what was meant by this particular Bill. He committed himself to members on both sides of the House and, in so doing, he may have swayed a number of members to support the Bill.

He has now seen an opportunity, after saying in the House that he is dealing with a \$30 000 or \$40 000 turnover that there is a possibility that the Government can obtain more revenue. We know how the Government is situated in regard to revenue. We know that the Government would grasp at any straw, and this straw has come up on the very last day of the last sitting of this House this year. The Minister grasped it with all the strength he had, and he will cling to it because it means more finance for the Government, more money. I would be most disappointed with the Minister if he were to put that part of it before principle and before his word, before his bond and before his honesty to this Parliament. Later in his reply the Minister went on to say this:

This proposal is designed to assist the Proclamation Day celebrations and to some degree—

and I do not deny this—

the South Australian Athletic League.

The Minister said that it is here to assist the Proclamation Day and the Bay Sheffield. That is what this Bill is all about.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: I understand that the member for Florey was talking to himself, because he called himself a fool.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Florey is not mentioned in this amendment. I ask the honourable member to come back to the motion.

Mr MATHWIN: The Minister has described the Bill as follows:

The Bill provides the definition of a foot race, as in Part VI, which will include a foot race that forms part of the foot race meeting known as the Bay Sheffield carnival, which is conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated. Even though the Bill does not define a particular area, the carnival is well known and it is run at Colley Reserve every year as part of the Proclamation Day celebration.

The Minister's statement is there in black and white. My friend and colleague, the member for Hanson, interjected as follows:

The flexibility of the ground is involved.

The Minister then replied:

There is no flexibility. That is the area where the Bay Sheffield is conducted and it is defined. Clause 2 states that the race is to be run as the Bay Sheffield carnival, is to be conducted by the league, and that is the venue where the race is conducted.

There is no flexibility in that statement; that was a definite statement made by the Minister. However, the Minister now wishes to change this provision and take it out of this carefully defined area. I accept the Minister's statement that as far as he is concerned the provision will apply only to the Bay Sheffield. However, the Minister may have forgotten, in the excitement (and we know what happens in this place at a couple of minutes to six), that he is not really a permanent fixture in this place; Ministers come and go and who is to say that any particular Minister will not change his outlook. So, the Minister's commitment does not really mean a thing, because he will not always be a Minister in this place.

We must think about the future, not only the present. I believe that the Minister should re-think this situation. I am concerned about the situation that has developed. I supported the Bill, but I cannot support the amendments. I honestly believe that when the Minister introduced the Bill he did not think that this situation would eventuate. When he introduced the Bill, with his great oratory style, he was trying to persuade all members of the House to vote for it, because he knew that it would be a conscience vote. Obviously, he swayed all the members of the Labor Party, to a person, and the Minister even swayed me to vote with members opposite and to support what was an honest Bill. I do not believe for one moment that the Minister's intentions are dishonourable, that he can see dollar signs in his eyes or that he can hear the till ringing, even though the Government is in dire financial trouble. I do not believe that that is governing the Minister's conscience.

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

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Chairman. Once again I find to my complete disgust and dismay that, despite the levity of the idiots opposite who think this place is a rubber stamp for the majority they won at the last election, I do not have a copy of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is quite within his rights to take a point of order, but at this time he is quite out of order. The question of the amendments was put to the Committee long before the dinner break. Therefore, on this occasion, the point of order is not upheld.

Mr LEWIS: On a further point of order, Mr Chairman, what explanation can you give me for the fact that I do not have a copy of the amendments at my seat?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has the right, as does every other member of the Committee, to seek a copy of the proposed amendments through the proper channels.

Mr LEWIS: On a further point of order, Mr Chairman, what are the proper channels?

The CHAIRMAN: At this point in time, I rule that the point of order has been carried out.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I oppose the amendment, because it could change the fundamental nature of the Bill. It broadens the spirit of the Bill, that is, betting on the Bay Sheffield, to include betting on foot races State wide merely with the approval of the Minister. There are two issues involved, both of which were mentioned by the member for Fisher and the Deputy Leader. They are absolutely fundamental issues and as such I am surprised that the Minister did not recognise his error during the dinner adjournment and come to the conclusion that the best and most honourable way out of this difficulty would be to stand up in Chamber and honestly admit that he has made a mistake, because it is abundantly clear he has made a mistake. We will see in a few minutes whether the Minister will try to wriggle out of this difficult situation by using the other place to relieve him of his embarrassment. I would

suspect, from discussions we saw or presumed were taking place during the dinner adjournment, that that might be the case. Nevertheless, it would have been proper and right for the Minister to have come into this place immediately after the dinner adjournment and admit that it would be in the best interests of the proper operations of this Parliament, and in the interests of the people, if this matter were deferred so that it could have some kind of public airing, so that the community could express a view and Parliament could vote accordingly.

I am sure that all members when taking school children around Parliament would explain the reasons for the Standing Orders and the procedures which provide intervals between the first reading, second reading, and third reading of a Bill, it going to another place for consideration and, if necessary, coming back here. Whenever schoolchildren come into this place, most of us explain that those procedures have been enacted over the centuries in the interests and rights of the community and their right to know what is occurring. We explain the nature of this Chamber, the Committee system, that *Hansard* is there to record everything that is said, and that the press gallery is there to record not only what is said but to publish what the press believes is in the public interest. The Minister has accepted a fundamental change to this Bill which, by sheer weight of numbers, could be passed without anyone in the community knowing that this major change was going to occur. I point out that I am opposed to the whole concept of betting on human beings.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I have said, I voted against this Bill because I am opposed to the concept of betting on human beings. I believe that it is inherently wrong and I also believe that it detracts from human dignity. Nevertheless, this Chamber accepted that in a specific instance, namely, the Bay Sheffield, betting would be permitted. It was quite clear when the Bill was introduced that betting would be restricted to the Bay Sheffield. It is absolutely supine of the Minister to say that he accepts the amendment but he will never use it. The law is the law and it is there for a purpose. If he does not intend to use it, why on earth did he accept the concept in the first place? It is too stupid for words to say that it is okay and that he is going to accept it but he will never use it. He knows full well that once it is on the Statute Book it can be used by anyone. He also knows that there is strong community feeling in South Australia that would reflect the feeling on this side of the House that such a fundamental change should not take place without some form of public debate.

There has been absolutely none. In that regard, by virtue of the fact that it is considered essential in a Parliamentary democracy that people should know what is happening in this Chamber, I believe that in this regard the press fell down in its job, as there has been no publicity about the Bill itself. We are subjected to plenty of criticism when we fail to do our jobs correctly. In this case I believe the Opposition is fulfilling its job correctly. It is extremely important that this issue is aired in the media and the Government at least gets an opportunity to know what strength of feeling and what level of support exist in the community for the change.

The member for Fisher outlined in considerable and effective detail the changes that will result if this Bill becomes law. He alluded to the fact that anywhere in the State, at the wish of the Minister or with the approval of the Minister, betting can take place on foot racing. I would be surprised indeed if there was general support in the community for that. Apart from the views I hold, which I believe are shared by a significant proportion of the community, there is some-

thing inherently wrong in betting on human beings. There is also, in a purely practical sense, very much room for abuse when betting is permitted on human beings. The judgment which cannot be exercised by animals in terms of racing can be exercised by humans. The opportunity for abuse of the system is obvious and that is why it has never been permitted in this State before.

It is permitted only in a restricted sense in other States yet the Government is now proposing to accept an amendment which will change the whole concept. If the Minister had been sensible he would have recognised that. He would have recognised that the community has a right to know and he would certainly have come back to the House immediately after the dinner adjournment and said that he believed that the matter needed further consideration and that the amendment would have been withdrawn. He could have still gone ahead and had the support of this House for the Bill as it was introduced in its original form. He certainly would have lost no respect from anyone on this side of the House nor from anyone in the galleries or the community at large. However, by persisting he has simply given an indication to the House and the community that he is prepared to ride roughshod over the rights of the community in respect of knowing what laws are being introduced and passed if they result in quite basic changes in the concept of the Act. In that respect he has lost out all round.

Whatever the outcome of this debate, the Minister has lost out in a way he will regret. It is still not too late for him to say that, in view of the strength of feeling, in view of the fact that the community has not had an opportunity to consider the matter, and in view of the fact he could not have possibly had time to consult with interested community groups in the time available, he will withdraw the amendment so that it can be considered at greater length when Parliament resumes in March. The enormous length of time which the Government has decided will take place before we meet again would enable the matter to be aired as it should be.

Mr OSWALD: I oppose the amendment, as it changes the concept of the Bill. I am opposing the amendment, not because I want a monopoly for Glenelg but because I believe that issues such as this should be aired in the community.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr OSWALD: We have before the Committee a Bill that transgresses many moral issues. When we had the Casino Bill before the House we aired our views publicly and gave the community an opportunity to contribute. When we were considering betting shops in Port Pirie, that was aired and contribution allowed from the public. This issue in Glenelg has been around for some three or four years.

An honourable member: Ten years.

Mr OSWALD: Probably so, but it has been well canvassed and the public has had ample opportunity to contribute to it. We have now brought the Bill before the House and voted on the second reading. This amendment changes the whole concept of the Bill. It is no longer addressed to one race in Glenelg; it is addressed to a situation that can become State-wide. Last Tuesday evening I was out on a pair. Had I been here I would have supported the Bill and voted 'Yes', because I am quite happy having the race run at Glenelg in the form of the Bay Sheffield and I have no personal objections to betting taking place on it.

But to do this and bring forward amendments which totally change the concept is so dramatic, that it has to go back to the people of South Australia. People outside Glenelg have to be given an opportunity to contribute and say quite clearly to their local members whether they want to have foot races in their local community. I go back to my original statement when I said that I oppose the amendment, not because I want a monopoly for Glenelg, but to be perfectly

frank, if I am voting for a foot race at Glenelg, I would probably be a hypocrite to say that we cannot have one in Todd, Port Augusta or Port Pirie.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That is what you are saying.

Mr OSWALD: I am not saying that. I am saying quite clearly that we are approving it in Glenelg, but the concept of the Bill is such that no one else in the State is expecting it to be lumped in their back door. I am saying through you, Sir, to the Minister that this Bill should be well ventilated in public to let others have the opportunity of saying whether they do or do not want foot racing in their vicinity.

Mr Ashenden: Consultation.

Mr OSWALD: Consultation. We have a Government which claims to be a Government of consultation. The Premier says that he is a Premier of consensus. He has not gone out there and obtained a consensus from the public as to whether they want gambling on professional foot racing. We have a consensus in Glenelg and I am quite confident that if we did take a consensus at Glenelg and if it was possible, there would be no violent objections, but there has to be an opportunity for people and concerned groups elsewhere in the State to say that they do, or do not want it.

The right and proper course for the Government is to go back to the people in other areas of the State and find out what the consensus really is, because it is a moral issue. We are not voting on Party lines. Only on a moral issue can we go out there and find out. The Government has been quite remiss in trying to bulldoze through this type of legislation without asking the people what they want. I intend opposing this amendment, and I will take another decision at the third reading stage.

Mr BECKER: I oppose the amendment, because I take note of the statement made by His Excellency the Governor, at the opening of the Parliament. On 8 December, His Excellency said:

My Government, recognising the importance of physical fitness and sport, has created a Department of Recreation and Sport. At an early stage, amendments to the Racing Act will be brought before you to permit wagers to be made on the foot racing at the Bay Sheffield carnival, an event which forms an important part of our Proclamation Day celebrations.

Therefore, the people of South Australia knew that this legislation was going to come into the Parliament. Anyone with an ounce of common sense would realise that it would be done very early in the session, and that it would have to be passed through both Houses well before the Proclamation Day celebrations on 28 December.

It was very clear that the Government's intention was to allow betting on foot racing at the Bay Sheffield carnival. I have heard several speakers talk about the Bay Sheffield only. There will not be betting on the Bay Sheffield only. There will be betting on professional races on that day, the Bay Sheffield and I think one or two other professional events. However, I supported the original legislation, because it was the carnival, and we are not talking about the actual event; we are talking about the carnival.

This carnival has already attracted over 330 entrants. The Bay Sheffield itself has attracted over 70 entrants, including a top Scottish runner, who will be the only international competitor in the race. Thirty interstate athletes have nominated for the race as well. There are, of course, many other nominations for other events held on that day. I have been selfish in calling over a number of years for legalised betting on the Bay Sheffield carnival. I believe that the Government was acceding to the request that I had made many times to the department and previous Ministers to support, and give credibility to this important day in the history of South Australia. This will be the 96th or 97th occasion on which

the Bay Sheffield has been run in conjunction with the Commemoration Sports Day Carnival.

I have never ceased to be amazed at what happens in the other place and I often wonder about the logic applied there. It is vital to the Government that this legislation is passed to honour the promise made in His Excellency's Speech. Why somebody in the other place should move an amendment which changes the whole outlook on professional foot racing in South Australia, I do not know. I have always been a great believer in letting the little people have their say. If the Government had announced in the Speech that it would legalise betting on all professional foot racing events, because it covers both men and women—

An honourable member: How many professional foot-races are there in South Australia?

Mr BECKER: I was about to come to that, because there are several. The Athletic League conducts professional events on Sunday mornings, sometimes at Colley Reserve, and sometimes at Camden Oval, which is opposite Immanuel College and primary school. I do not think the residents there would be happy if professional foot running with betting on it occurred on Sunday mornings. This Bill would create a situation where the Minister could approve that happening. Furthermore, Colley Reserve is opposite several residential flats in a high-density to medium-density residential area. I do not think that the people there would be happy if there was legalised gambling and large crowds at Glenelg on Sunday mornings.

Professional foot racing does not attract large crowds at the moment, but the Bay Sheffield carnival attracts between 30 000 and 50 000 people. I believe that this amendment could start a series of amendments that would change the complexion of this issue.

I think it is a tragedy that someone has moved this amendment, especially in view of the fact that the Governor said in his Speech that there would be further amendments to the Racing Act. Did the Minister originally consider the proposals before the House before the Governor's Speech was prepared? If so, did he really consider legalising the open cheque that these proposals would give or was he always of the opinion that this would apply only to the Bay Sheffield carnival, because I think that is the crux of the whole issue? I think that there is sufficient pride in South Australia for people to recognise and honour our Foundation Day. We have proved that already. The Glenelg Council contributes about \$6 000 for that day, not just for this carnival because there are also swimming and sailing events and the Proclamation Day ceremony at the Old Gum Tree. The Co-operative Building Society is sponsoring this race to the extent of \$11 000. The winner will receive about \$8 000 so the race offers the second highest prize for a professional race available in Australia. I believe that that deserves recognition.

At this stage there is no indication as to what will happen to professional foot racing in South Australia if we open it right up. I realise that professional sport is coming to South Australia and Australia as a nation. That must create jobs for the future. There would be no difficulty in approaching Rothmans, Benson and Hedges or similar organisations to put up large sums of money for professional foot racing.

The amendment is too wide because it is left to the discretion of the Minister. I accept the integrity of the Minister when he says that it is not his intention to legalise any other foot racing events. If sponsors can be found with large sums of money, far greater than the amounts of money we have been talking about as far as the Glenelg carnival is concerned, there is nothing to stop a motion going before Cabinet to instruct the Minister to approve other events and nothing to stop any member bringing up a motion in the Parliament to instruct the Minister to legalise gambling

on professional foot racing in South Australia. Even though the Minister may not want to do it, he can be instructed to do so. Therefore, I believe that we must go back to the original concept of the legislation, which I supported in every stage. I opposed the amendment put forward by the member for Fisher because I strongly believed in leaving the legislation as it was. At this stage I believe in the original concept. Let us see how this carnival at Glenelg works for two or three years before we consider opening up the whole issue. We are duty bound to support the original statement made by the Governor when he opened Parliament on 8 December.

Mr BAKER: I was not violently opposed to the original proposition—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: But you are now.

Mr BAKER: Yes, I am now. We are going to come to the Minister; he shed light on this subject of which we were not aware of before. It is very rare that the Minister can shed any light on anything, but he has this time. When we were originally debating the Bill it was made clear to us that this was a one-off proposition, that this legislation would enhance the Glenelg carnival and the Bay Sheffield. When the member for Coles put up this proposition, the Minister of Local Government said that she had not done her homework. I can only assume from that that the Minister of Local Government knew, before the legislation was introduced, that this was the start—that it was not just to be confined to the Bay Sheffield and that there was every intention in the original proposal to take it all the way.

Of course, there has been concern expressed in this House about the amount of money that has been transacted between some bookmakers and the A.L.P. Members on this side of the House have refrained from linking the two. One can hardly fail to link the two when one looks at the wider proposition. The proposition seems to be that we, in fact, want to spread this measure across the board.

On a philosophical point, the Minister must look to himself and say, 'Do I want to help the Bay Sheffield?' As I said originally, I was not diametrically opposed to the proposition—I did not feel comfortable about it, but was not diametrically opposed to it because I thought that the Bay Sheffield had some merit and it attracted large crowds. It is a sporting event known throughout Australia. However, if one extends the proposition and says that that carnival, amongst all other carnivals that could be held, will be destroyed by the proliferation of foot racing events for profit, one then has the demise of the Bay Sheffield. It appears to me that either the Minister is being misled, that my colleagues in the other House have been misled, or the Minister has dollar signs for eyes.

Mr Mathwin: That is what he wants. He is after the money.

Mr BAKER: That seems to be perfectly obvious. The Minister has not been perfectly honest with us; if he was perfectly honest with us, he would now repudiate the proposition before him. I was thinking about the prescribed foot races, I thought about prescriptions and I thought that perhaps the members on the other benches needed a dose of salts, because it is obvious that they have been under pressure this week and they need to get something out of their livers. It is no good for the Minister to say, 'It is not my intention.' We have all had canvassed the proposition that either the Minister, the Cabinet or whatever may change. It is insufficient to say, 'It is not my intention.' It is never anyone's intention. I heard this similar proposition before the election: 'We are not going to raise taxes.' That was a promise: not just something indefinite like, 'It is not my intention.' Surely, the Minister can see that this proposition takes it far wider than he envisaged. I am giving him the benefit of the doubt.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It is not my amendment at all.

Mr BAKER: But the Minister has accepted the amendment. He grabbed it. It is insufficient to say, 'I did not really understand', when in two or three years time there is pressure by the South Australian Athletic League to extend these foot races to other events. 'Why not us?' Then we say, 'What has happened to the Bay Sheffield? Has it gone down in status? Who is the man who has brought it down?' I am sure that the Minister does not intend that the Bay Sheffield should be put at risk, but we all know that he will put it at risk. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I want to impress on the members of this Committee the point that the procedures which are being sought to be followed by the Government in pressing this measure are quite wrong. I believe that the Government is seeking to prostitute the proper function of Parliament, and that is that there should be time for the public—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: You are denying the right of the House of Review to have an opinion.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The point has been missed.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Deputy Leader would be heard a lot better if honourable members refrained from interjecting.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I persist in the point because it has obviously been missed. It is not a question of what the members of the House of Review think in their wisdom or lack of it. It is a question of what the public out there think of it, who will be affected by the laws that we pass in this Parliament. They have no knowledge whatever of what is before this House.

Mr Plunkett: You are wasting your time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had precious little time to talk to the public about this amendment because the first we sighted this amendment was at about 5.30 this afternoon. We have learned subsequently that it is a DeGaris amendment. I have also expressed my surprise that one who has been so vocal about the supremacy of this Parliament would move an amendment which hands over this power to a Minister. I am most surprised. The point seems to have been lost that it is completely undemocratic for an amendment as radical as this to pass through this House in the space, if the Government had its way, of about half an hour without the public having the faintest idea about what is going on. This Bill, if this amendment is carried, is a major change to social and gambling legislation in this State.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Rubbish!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister can say 'rubbish', but this is not rubbish. We set up lengthy select committees to inquire into casinos, and we went to all sorts of trouble to take reams of evidence in that regard, but here we are investing in a Minister the power to authorise gambling on any foot race that he might choose if it is run by this organisation.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Obviously you don't agree with the Racing Act.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If what the Minister says is true, we have not had time to consider the Racing Act. That is true. We have not had time to do anything.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It was introduced in 1976, and there were plenty of amendments then.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That proves the point. The amendments were brought in here cold and we have been asked to vote on them.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Rubbish!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not rubbish. The amendments came in here at 5.30 p.m. The import of the amendments is clear: we will invest in the Minister a power

that I do not believe he should have. That is the strongest point that should impel the Government to back off and reject these amendments. The Government knows that we had to accept the decision of the House. Some members voted against it but, when it is through the House, so be it. This amendment changes the Bill radically. It is a different ball game, and the Minister knows that. It provides more than the Minister said he wanted and more than the organisation wanted. The Minister accepted the amendments because he thought that that would be the most simple way to clear out and to get what he wanted for his friends at the Bay Sheffield. It is just not good enough.

The Minister knows that he is changing his original Bill. All he has to do is to have the grace to withdraw, and that will be the end of the shooting match. I believe that a lot of people in the community would be very annoyed. People have the right to hold a view. If this Bill passes into law today with the amendment and without their having the faintest idea what it is about (and I believe this most sincerely and quite genuinely), many people would be disturbed if they read tomorrow morning in the newspaper that the Bill has passed into law with this amendment in the space of one or two hours. The Minister only has to say, 'I want my original Bill,' instead of trying to accommodate people in another place who get bright ideas on the spur of the moment, without thinking through the whole ramifications of what they are about. That action is certainly quite contrary to the specific views that they have stated *ad nauseam* on several occasions.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: We are accepting the right of the Legislative Council to recommend amendments.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are accepting the right to disagree with those amendments. When amendments radically change a Bill, as in this case, and extend the provisions so widely, I believe that the Government, which has the numbers, should ensure that democracy works so that the public has a chance to comment. It is pretty shonky dealing if the Minister simply accepts this amendment at the drop of a hat when he knows (or he should know—he has been around for long enough) that a significant number of people in the community would like to express a view in this matter.

If this were the end of a Parliamentary term and if the Government were facing an election, members opposite would be far more sensitive to the views of minority groups in the community, even if only minority groups are opposed to this Bill. I know the views of significant sections of the community in relation to the Casino Bill, groups of which the former Opposition members were not aware and a number of groups of which the Government Party was not aware. There was widespread opposition to that Bill, particularly among women. Members opposite know that from contact in their districts. I do not believe that the Minister or the Government has the faintest idea what the general community reaction to this Bill and the amendment will be. All he knows is the reaction of the fellow he met six months ago. He promised, 'If we get into Government, I will fix it for you.' I do not believe that the Minister or the Government has the faintest idea of community reaction on this matter, particularly now that the issue has widened.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr Ashenden: What about the 40 000 reasons?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. The member for Todd mentioned 40 000 reasons why this Bill was introduced, and the member for Glenelg stated that there was a bribe. The clear meaning is that the member for Glenelg and the member for Todd are saying that this Bill was introduced because the Government has accepted a bribe of \$40 000.

As a member of the Government, I personally object to that, and I ask that you, Sir, require the members to withdraw that charge. As part of my point of order, I point out to you that it is totally unparliamentary. It is a reflection on members of Parliament on this side of the House, and the honourable members ought to be required to withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: I must say that the particular remark to which exception has been taken is unparliamentary. I point out further that it is the word that is unparliamentary. I can only at this time ask the member for Glenelg whether he is prepared to withdraw that word.

Mr MATHWIN: I said '40 000'. I did not say what. If the conscience of members on the other side of the House means that they were paid off \$40 000 as a bribe, then so be it. I just said '40 000 as a bribe'. It could be 40 000 tadpoles or goldfish.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: You should withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I simply ask the member for Glenelg whether he is prepared to withdraw the alleged offensive word. It takes little time to say 'Yes' or 'No'. I will ask the member for Glenelg again whether he is prepared to withdraw the remark which he made and to which the Chief Secretary has taken offence.

Mr MATHWIN: If the Chief Secretary objects to the fact that I said '40 000', then I will withdraw '40 000'.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I rise on a further point of order again. I draw to your attention, Sir, to the fact that my point of order was that the member for Glenelg said that it was a bribe. The member for Todd said that it was 40 000. It is the word 'bribe' to which I have taken exception, and I ask that you, Sir, rule that the member for Glenelg should withdraw it, because it is a direct reflection on members of this House. We know that under Standing Orders no member of Parliament is to reflect on other members in that way, and I ask that the member be made to withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: The word 'bribe' is the word to which offence has been taken, and I simply ask the member for Glenelg whether he is prepared to retract the word 'bribe'.

Mr MATHWIN: I do not wish to hold up the proceedings any longer. I am quite happy to withdraw the word 'bribe' and substitute the word 'donation'.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was making the point that the Minister has merely to insist on his original Bill which obviously was passed in both Houses and there would be no argument as far as the Opposition is concerned. The fact is that the Bill passed the House. It was in the form in which the Minister wanted it, but now we have an amendment that radically changes the whole game.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: We are offering to support it on this side.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. The Minister has merely to say that he will not accept the amendments and send it back to the Upper House. I do not think that the Upper House will defeat the original Bill, which is what the Minister wanted. But now for some reason the Minister wants to go further (I think it is stubbornness) than he wanted to go in this legislation. Cannot he accept that this is far wider and it is important? If the Upper House member who is alleged to have moved this amendment was consistent, at least he would have moved that it be done by regulation. At least one would have a sensible amendment, if there was to be an extension of this facility in relation to foot racing, if it was to be done by regulation. At least Parliament would have a say as to how far this was to be extended. If I recall correctly, we went through all this hoo-hah with the Planning Act. We could not hand these powers over to local government to be spelt out in a set of rules. It had to come back to Parliament. Parliament had to be supreme.

I would think that it would be far more acceptable if the Minister were to move an amendment along those lines, which would perhaps truncate proceedings considerably. My view is that it would be very dangerous to give the Minister the power as suggested in these amendments. If the power to be given to the Minister is not as great as is suggested by the amendments, we have had precious little time in which to find that out. If the Minister is prepared to alter the amendments to provide that future extensions will be made by way of regulation, that would help with some of the difficulties that the Opposition perceives. At least that would give the community an opportunity to have some input, because matters would have to come before Parliament. The plain fact of the matter is that we on this side of the House are not filibustering.

Mr Ferguson: Tell us what you call it?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member has not been here long enough. If he wants to know what filibustering is, he should wait until he is in Opposition and get the present Minister of Education to take him around a slaughterhouse at 3 o'clock in the morning—he will then know what filibustering is. The Opposition feels strongly about the principle involved in this matter. The community has had no chance at all to consider the matter. If the member for Henley Beach has no respect for his constituents, then I believe he will be a 'oncer', and that the place will once again be graced by Bob Randall as the member for Henley Beach. If any member snubs his nose at minority groups in an electorate such as Henley Beach he will learn the hard way and will be back doing whatever he did before he came to this place. That is what the Government, or the Minister, is trying to do to those people. Government members will snub their noses at people who have a contrary view to their own and have not had a chance to express it.

Mr Ferguson: Go your hardest.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is nothing like a cocky new member, although the laugh will be on the other side of his face in due course. The Opposition believes that it is quite improper for the Government (just to suit its own convenience and to enable members to get out of this place) to accept a radical amendment before anyone in the community has had a chance to find out what it is all about. Opposition members will continue to speak to these amendments and to hope that common sense will prevail.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: It is not going to; you know that.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If that is the case, the consequences will be on the heads of those in the Government. If the Government treats the public of this State with contempt, it deserves the treatment that it will get.

Mr LEWIS: When speaking to and trying to understand these amendments, we have merely to look at the Minister's second reading explanation. The Minister probably even conned his colleagues in the Party room—I would not mind betting that, although I do not bet very often. The Minister would not most certainly have indicated to Caucus what his real intentions were. What we should do is turn to page 34 of the Parliamentary debates and read what the honourable Minister said in his explanation, as follows:

South Australian foot racing will benefit financially under the proposals as it is intended that 1.4 per cent of the total amount bet on foot races at the carnival will be paid to the South Australian Athletic League.

Of course, he did not explain that there would not be any 1.4 per cent of the amount that is bet illegally, that he already acknowledges is bet illegally. It is unlikely that it will ever be bet legally. It is 1.4 per cent of the amount that is bet legally, which presumably, is implied. I do not know whether or not he has got the inspectors there to try and enforce this provision. The honourable Minister continues:

This payment will be on the same basis as for other payments based on betting turnover presently paid by the Betting Control Board to the South Australian horse racing, trotting, greyhound racing, and coursing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member that the amendment that we are dealing with simply leaves out a word in the original Act, and it deals with a foot race. It has nothing to do with betting turnovers, or trotting, or any other aspect of the racing industry.

Mr LEWIS: I submit in response to the advice that you have just given me that the word omitted, or proposed to be omitted, by this amendment is the word 'the'. For your benefit, Sir, presumably you know how to spell it, that is, 't-h-e'.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair does not intend to allow the honourable member to address it in that sort of framework.

Mr LEWIS: I meant no disrespect whatsoever. I merely intend that you should understand that my understanding is that this word 't-h-e' means 'a particular one' and only one. We are proposing to accept, according to the wisdom of the members of another place, an amendment to leave out that word and then trying to understand what they mean by deleting that word. I see that the Minister cleverly, with sophistry and cunning has used the devices of this Chamber to deceive us into believing that that is now permissible under the terms and explanation that he gave in response to the second reading today. Accordingly, I am quoting the Minister to illustrate the point I am trying to make.

The Hon. H. Allison: The Minister is travelling around in circles and will soon disappear into his own betting ring.

Mr LEWIS: 'Betting ring' is an appropriate adjective, or 'ring' of any kind. I do not know if ding dong is anything the Minister knows anything about. However, I will continue quoting so that I can illustrate the point for the benefit of the Committee. I well recognise that you, Mr Chairman, are part of that procedure and with full regard and due respect for the advice that you have given me, I feel I should continue to elaborate on that point. I continue by quoting what the Minister said, as follows:

The Government will, of course, proceed with its other proposals for the assistance of the racing industry at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Minister said that; he brought the racing industry into it in his second reading explanation. He continued:

I commend the Bill to honourable members and seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clause inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

At this point, let me explain that the word 'the' that we are proposing to delete, according to the amendments recommended to us by the other place, has special significance in the context of the preceding sentences which I have quoted, and those sentences which I now propose to quote.

Before doing so, let me explain to the committee that, unless I find some compelling reason in the future that will allow me to change the view I hold at the present time, I will never again give this Minister leave to incorporate any part of a second reading speech without his reading it. He said, in the most deceitful and despicable way (not verbally, but by having his remarks incorporated in *Hansard*) that clause 1 is formal, clause 2 amends section 85—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already pointed out to the honourable member that we are dealing with a specific amendment that has come to this place from another place. It has nothing to do with the line that the honourable member is pursuing at this point of time. If the honourable member is going to defy the Chair on that ruling, the Chair will have to act accordingly. I ask the honourable member to come back to the amendment.

Mr LEWIS: I submit that the Minister said, in his comments incorporated in *Hansard* without being read, that he will include a foot race that forms part of the foot race meeting known as the Bay Sheffield Carnival. He said that he 'will' include it. He said that he did not include anything about the word 'the' or the way the Bill is written and thereby hangs his out. He slips free because, in his second reading explanation, not given verbally to this Chamber as it was incorporated, he said that he would include that race. He meant all the time to extend it beyond that and his words incorporated by leave of this Chamber clearly indicate that. That is the point to which I have been coming. He said one thing when he spoke, but he intended another, as indicated by the words he was given leave to incorporate without having to speak them. We should have known that that was his intention. I will further demonstrate that that was always his intention.

I would not be surprised if he had concocted an arrangement with members in another place to allow him to do what he now proposes to do, that is, to accept their amendment. He said that it was a conscience vote and we accepted it as such. However, all members of his Party decided to support him, albeit on the spur of the moment (and I wonder at the truth of my last remark). In his explanation of the clauses he said that the principal Act, which sets out definitions of terms used in Part IV in relation to betting with bookmakers, provides:

... as used in Part IV, will include a foot race that forms part of the foot race meeting known as the 'Bay Sheffield Carnival' conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated.

Because his comments were inserted without his reading them, the Minister stated without directly telling the House:

This will mean in particular that the Betting Control Board will be able to issue permits under section 112, authorising licensed bookmakers to accept bets on foot races that form part of the Bay Sheffield Carnival.

I agree that that is what he intended but it will include further things. Now he finds that he can happily accept the word 'the' and laugh at other members in the Chamber because we gave him that leave in good faith. The Minister's second reading explanation states:

The present provision under section 114 for payment by bookmakers to the Betting Control Board of a percentage of debts made with them and for payment by the Betting Control Board to racing clubs of 1.4 per cent of those bets will also apply in relation to betting on foot races at the Bay Sheffield.

He does not say that that remark relates only to racing, trotting, pacing and dogs. Nowhere in that paragraph does the Minister say that it is limited to the extent to which he intended it to apply. I submit that it is utterly despicable; it is an abuse of what this Chamber has allowed Ministers previously. I challenge the Minister to answer me honestly and inform the Committee whether that was his intention when he sought leave to have the explanation of the clauses of the Bill incorporated in *Hansard*. What was his real intention? Did he write those remarks himself, or were they written for him by someone else? The explanation of the clauses states:

The present provision under section 114 for payment by bookmakers to the Betting Control Board of a percentage of bets made with them and for payment by the Betting Control Board to racing clubs of 1.4 per cent of those bets will also apply in relation to betting on foot races at the Bay Sheffield Carnival in the same way as it presently applies in relation to other races.

I ask the Minister what other races? The explanation also states, and this is very relevant because it further explains how the Minister now finds it possible to accept this amendment:

... reflecting the fact that, as in the case of coursing events, there will not be totalisator betting on foot races.

He quite deliberately uses the plural and not the singular. For that reason, I ask the Minister to clarify his remarks.

Did the Minister intend in his original second reading explanation that the proposal should only apply to the Bay Sheffield, or did he intend that it should apply surreptitiously and by deceit to other foot races?

If he intended the former, then I put it to you, Mr Chairman, and to other honourable members, that it is not appropriate for us to now accept this amendment for the same reasons expounded by the members for Mitcham, Coles, and Glenelg and other members who have already spoken. It is not appropriate for the Minister to say he is now prepared to widen the ambit of this measure without consultation with the broader community in South Australia. I oppose the measure for the same reasons given by the Premier yesterday and in days previously in his opposition to a wage freeze: there has been no consultation and no discussion in the broader community. There is no consensus.

Mr MEIER: As a new member in this House, I do not profess to be as eloquent as the member for Mallee, who certainly made some relevant points about this clause, which states:

'the prescribed foot race meeting' means the foot race meeting known as the 'Bay Sheffield Carnival' conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated:

If the proposed amendment were to be successful the clause would read:

'a prescribed foot race meeting' means the foot race meeting known as the 'Bay Sheffield Carnival' conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated:

I think that many of the points made by the member for Mallee require close thought and consideration. I oppose this amendment because, as a new member, I was under the impression that a change such as the one envisaged here (which would be caused by substituting the word 'a' for 'the'), would hold serious implications for the overall concept of the Bill. I know that we are talking presently about only one subclause. However, I find it incredible that this Parliament should take this matter so lightly as to introduce an amendment at 5.30 this evening, half an hour before we were due to recess for Christmas, expecting the Committee to make a decision before adjourning.

When I say 'we', I am looking at the Minister, because it would have been easy for him to have said that the original Bill must pass and that there would not be any amendments. I have said publicly that I was not in favour of the Bill to amend the Racing Act. However, that Bill was passed and I accept that fact. I felt that the Government had, in its wisdom, endeavoured to represent those sections of the community that it felt needed representation here. The member for Hanson gave a good explanation as to why he believes that betting should be allowed on the Bay Sheffield. Even though I did not agree with his argument I saw his point of view and after the clause was passed I thought that this Parliament, and the Minister, would adhere to the decision arrived at. However, we now have a change which, if one thinks about it, is almost revolutionary for this State. It is something that I believe the public probably knows nothing about.

Mr Mathwin: They would be shocked.

Mr MEIER: The honourable member for Glenelg might be right, they probably would be shocked. I have not heard any news broadcasts since 6 p.m. this evening and there has not been a newspaper printed since that time, so I do not think that the public knows about these proposed amendments. As a person who has worked on many committees for many years (committees that have not had to make decisions that have the effect on people that this amendment will have), I have always been led to believe that any new legislation, requirement or suggestion needs to be fully investigated.

Mr Mathwin: The public has the right to know what is going on.

Mr MEIER: I can only agree, once again, with the member for Glenelg—the public has the right to know what is going on. In my opinion to do that it is essential that the views of the public, in this case the electors of South Australia, have the chance to express their views to us, their representatives. For all I know members of the Government may have been on the telephone from 6 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. ringing their constituents, saying that 'a' is being substituted for 'the', and finding out the feeling of the electorate. But, I doubt whether members have telephoned their constituents. I certainly have had no chance to obtain an idea of the feeling in my electorate.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: What did your constituents say about the Planning Act Amendment Bill or the Alsatian Dogs Act Amendment Bill when you asked them about that?

Mr MEIER: The Chief Secretary would understand that I have not been a member of this House for a long period of time. I feel that the Bills that have come into this place to date have been such that they were either in the Governments espoused policy and I thought, therefore, that the Government had a mandate, even though the Opposition expressed concern about the pay-roll tax Bill. Otherwise, if it had not been announced earlier, I would ensure that I tested the feeling in my electorate.

Mr Mathwin: Did the Government have a mandate for the Bay Sheffield only?

Mr MEIER: I question that and do not think that is part of the debate. I am opposed to substituting the word 'a' for 'the'.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would like to ask questions of the Minister concerning this clause. As other members have pointed out, the word 'a', inserted instead of 'the', makes a fundamental change, a change about which the Committee has been told nothing. The House was told nothing, because this was not in the Minister's second reading explanation and it was not part of the intention. What other foot race meetings are held in South Australia by the South Australian Athletic League? Are those foot races held in locations which are circumscribed by boundaries? Is admission charged? Are there the same controls over those kinds of foot races as are exercised over the other racing codes?

This goes back to the question raised in connection with the Bay Sheffield. Unlike the Stawell Gift, the Bay Sheffield is held in an open area where families come to enjoy themselves, where children are present, and where casual passers-by could become involved with children and young people without being aware that they were in an area where betting was taking place.

This is likely to occur at other race meetings throughout the State in communities which, at this stage, have no knowledge of what is being proposed. I would like the Minister to outline to the Committee the details of all other foot race meetings that are conducted throughout the year by the South Australian Athletic League, the locations of those meetings, and whether or not those meetings take place in areas enclosed by boundaries. Can the Minister also say whether admission is charged and what kind of promotion is undertaken for those races?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I always wonder what excites the Liberal Party regarding any degree of social legislation. This matter has been blown out of all proportion. Let me assure all members that the intention of the legislation is to provide legal betting on the Bay Sheffield. As far as I am concerned the amendments do not mean a great deal at all. In answer to the member for Coles' question, the South Australian Amateur Athletic League has other meetings during the year. It has pre-Bay Sheffield events.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Whereabouts?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: At Camden Oval, but they are fairly limited in that regard. I do not think that the South Australian Athletic League, from my knowledge, is anxious to conduct any other legal betting in regard to anywhere at all except the Bay Sheffield at Colley Reserve on 27 and 28 December.

Mr Mathwin: The amendment says 'any other body'.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I note that it is the intention of the member for Fisher to move an amendment to the amendment of the Legislative Council. I am prepared to accept that amendment which leaves out 'approved by the Minister and prescribed by regulation'. However, if the Committee is familiar with the Racing Act at all, which from my observations it is not, the Racing Act provides in a great degree many reasons and many opportunities for the approval and discretion of the Minister in other things. The argument, as far as I am concerned, has been blown out of all proportion and is fairly invalid.

All I am seeking to do with the legislation is to provide the South Australian Athletic League with the opportunity to conduct betting on the Bay Sheffield on 27 and 28 December this year and in the future because, I believe, it has been around the place for the last 10 years. The Glenelg Commemoration Day and the Glenelg council want it. There has been no great community concern about it at all. I believe that it is in the interests of the community in general. There is no problem associated with the very things that the other side has been worried about. It will not bring ruination on the people; it is not poison in the hands of children.

The sort of emotions that have been demonstrated this evening amaze me. I never cease to be amazed that members on the other side of the House can get so uptight in regard to these matters. I assure them that, as far as we on this side are concerned, there is no ulterior motive. We are not trying to put anything over the community. We believe that the South Australian Athletic League should have the opportunity. It is in the interests of Proclamation Day, and I suggest that members opposite ought to take another look at the comments that were made by their Leader the other day that they should take off their Liberal-coloured glasses and get in touch with the community.

Mr EVANS: I appreciate the acceptance by the Minister of the amendment when we get to it. We are not to it yet, but I want to be sure that the Minister has not misunderstood what the debate has been about. I want him also to understand that we know what is in the Racing Act in relation to the Ministerial power. Those matters were debated through the normal channels in Parliament when there was plenty of notice and when the time for debate was considerable between the two Houses. So, there is a difference.

We were looking to ensure that we were not taking away from the community the opportunity to make representations on a major issue—which can be major, perhaps to a minority group, but also to a majority group. By going to regulation, at least we give people the opportunity to make representations not only to Parliamentarians as individuals and to political Parties, but to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and we give the opportunity for the community to be made aware, and maybe groups other than the Athletic League will be interested in it.

So I am pleased that the Minister has accepted the amendment. I will not ridicule anyone as to how it has come about. That was our goal, and I believe that is a sensible solution to leave the opportunity to the public to make representations in the future. I thank the Minister for that comment, and when the opportunity arises I will formally move the amendment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not believe that the matter was blown out of all proportion. It was stated previously that this action could be taken by regulation, and the indication was that that would not be accepted. Fortunately, commonsense has prevailed. The matter was not blown out of all proportion: important, basic principles were involved. First, the community must have a chance to know what is coming before Parliament, particularly when an amendment is moved that enlarges the compass of the original Bill enormously.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It may be the other way around, especially when those who espouse the principle of supremacy of Parliament are prepared to vest these powers in the Minister. No-one was talking about poison before children or about blowing things out of all proportion. We were talking about the principle that the public should have a chance to comment on legislation and that in a democracy minority groups have rights to express their views. The Government sought to deny those rights. I am very pleased that the Minister has accepted the suggestion that Parliament should at least consider this matter before it is extended.

Mr MATHWIN: I appreciate the fact that the Minister is having a second look at this situation, and that he has accepted a proposed amendment to the next clause. Nevertheless, I take some umbrage at the statements made by the Minister in relation to the Liberal Party's outlook.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: It is all right for the Chief Secretary to mumble in his beard. No-one can understand what he is trying to say. I think he is trying to put me off. The Minister, who is representing the Government, accused the Liberal Party in regard to its outlook on social legislation. Let me say that a number of Liberal Party members crossed the floor to vote with the Government in relation to the Bay Sheffield and Proclamation Day. A promise was made and a definition was given by the Minister at that time, and that is why some members on this side crossed the floor.

For the Minister to adopt amendments that alter the situation completely, whether they were inserted by Liberal, Labor, or Democrat members, is not right. If members in the other place are misled, that is their problem. It is not for the Government or this place to say, 'All right, that will do. This gives us another Act.' The amendment completely alters the whole situation. As has been explained by other members, the public of South Australia had no opportunity to voice an opinion on this matter.

The Minister talks about people becoming uptight in certain circumstances. He may say that he gives his word: I will take his word as a gentleman and as a Minister that he will keep his promise, but some people would not keep their word and promises have been broken from time to time. The Liberal members who crossed the floor believed that the Government was quite earnest in relation to the Bay Sheffield. We supported that aspect of the Bill: I still support that aspect. I appreciate that the Minister will accept further amendments to solve the problem.

Mr LEWIS: I understand that I am entitled to speak at least three times on this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! At this point of time, the number of times on which the honourable member has the right to speak is not at question. We are dealing with the first amendment. So far, with very great respect to honourable members, the Chair has allowed certain members a lot more latitude than they are entitled to. If the honourable member wishes to speak on this amendment, he can do so, but he must stick to the first amendment.

Mr LEWIS: I will accept that, Mr Chairman, and I will accept the same latitude that you gave both the Minister and the member for Fisher in canvassing future amendments.

I believe that this amendment is like botrytis rot that appears in the first instance on a piece of wholesome fruit as nothing more than a small spot and one can pinch it out, but before long, the spot has spread to encompass the entire fruit.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair originally pointed out to the honourable member that the amendment with which we are now dealing has a very small ambit, and I ask the honourable member to deal strictly with that ambit.

Mr LEWIS: I was asking you, Mr Chairman, to give me the same latitude that you gave to the Minister and the member for Fisher when they canvassed the future amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Does the honourable member wish to speak to amendment No. 1?

Mr LEWIS: I undertook that that is exactly what I would be speaking about. I gave the undertaking—you may decide—and I respect your judgment, Sir. In the course of my remarks, I wish to urge honourable members to oppose this proposition to amend this clause, for it merely gives, as indicated by the member for Fisher and the Minister, birth to an unholy deal that will be consummated by the acceptance of an amendment to a subsequent clause wherein the Fabian socialist principle occurs of attempting to take a yard and then only taking an inch.

I do not accept that it is legitimate for us as a House to accept that this amendment will in any way improve the law in this State, and the amendment is to leave out the word 'the'. I have not sought, nor am I using even as much latitude as was granted to the three preceding speakers in the way that they canvassed other matters. As much as I might like to, I will not. I will adhere to the strict effect of your ruling, Mr Chairman. By agreeing to the deletion of the word 'the', we agree in time, one by one, even to the time where we agree to the Forster Sheffield being an event upon which bookmakers can take wagers. We are agreeing that we can further erode what was formerly a professional foot racer's goal to win a prize. We create the circumstances in which he or she, as the professional athlete participating, will be subjected to temptation to throw the race by being offered a bribe by bookmakers, singularly or collectively, and I think that that is a sorry day for South Australia.

At present, any bets made on such races are placed illegally. The bookmaker and the punter know it. They do not boast about it and they try to obscure the fact that they do it. Honourable members know, as well as I do, that that happens, and we are now saying that those people can go about that business without their feeling in any way constrained, and they will extend the influence of their interest in a nefarious way by offering, as they do on such foot races upon which wagers are taken in other States and other places around the world, a bribe to the participants or to the people who train the participants or serve the participants in any way.

All one has to do is stick some dope in his toothpaste. I speak from personal experience. I have never been a foot racer, but that can and does happen. I do not think that this Parliament will do the community of South Australia any service whatever by allowing those races to be conducted in an atmosphere in which the public, the punter, the honest bookmaker and the participants in the race cannot be absolutely sure that there is a fair competition between the participants.

The informal discussions that I have had with members opposite clearly indicate to me that they acknowledge that fact. I would say to the promoters of foot races in general and the Bay Sheffield, in particular, that that will be an unfortunate consequence in regard to the integrity of those events. It will destroy what many people feel is an ideal and appropriate occasion for them to take their families. At least in some measure that will happen. With a change of

heart the Minister now accepts this amendment, when in the first instance he assured us that it was not his intention. He has withdrawn from that position as a result of negotiations that have taken place in the lobby.

I shall leave it to the members of this place and to the public to judge whether or not that is opportunistic hypocrisy or whether or not it is meretricious administration for the sake of the occasion. I know what I think. I am sorry for the Minister's integrity and reputation. I urge members of this place to vote against this amendment, because it will open up the prospect of professional foot racing in this State becoming corrupt as a result of the influence of bribes offered to people who have got more to lose than just the race.

Mr MEIER: I know that there are many members in this Chamber who are not too happy about being kept here this Thursday evening debating what I regard as a trivial matter and something that does not have to be before us. If we did not have to be here we could be at functions in our electorates where we could perhaps be speaking to people and ascertaining their thoughts on this matter. I am not speaking here to waste time, but rather to express my dissatisfaction with the way in which the Minister, at the drop of a nail, has decided that the amendments would be acceptable.

Mr Mathwin: What about the people who framed the amendments?

Mr MEIER: I do not think it is proper for me to comment on members in another place, because the matter is now before this House and we are responsible for what we do. I cannot understand why the Minister and the Government are not happy with what happened two days ago, when this Bill to amend the Racing Act passed the second reading stage. The legislation put forward by the Government was passed, and therefore one would assume that those who wanted it would be happy, although I point out that I am against it. I realise that there is a foreshadowed amendment, although I cannot see myself supporting that. Why is the Minister, in his wisdom, not satisfied with the Bill as it was originally introduced?

If we are not going to get any further, I certainly will take my right to speak for the full time at every opportunity simply to try to get what I would see as the right course of action occurring here. In this case, the right course of action is coming back to the original Bill and seeing that that gets through.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is that amendment No. 1 be agreed to. For the question say 'Aye' against 'No'. I think the Ayes have it.

Mr LEWIS: Divide! On a point of order, Mr Chairman, a division was called for and, if you did not hear the member for Goyder, then I place the call.

The CHAIRMAN: I take the point of order. The Chair did not hear the call for a division, but I will accept the point of order. Ring the bells.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Crafter, Ferguson, Gregory, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoppood, Keneally and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten and Wright.

Noes (16)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier (teller), Olsen, Oswald, Rodda and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Duncan and Groom. Noes—Messrs D.C. Brown and Wotton.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

Mr EVANS: I oppose the amendment as it is now before us and move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be amended by striking out 'approved by the Minister' and inserting 'prescribed by regulation'.

I trust that members will think about the position that we are now in and give it serious consideration before we continue the debate unnecessarily for the rest of the evening. We all know that this will now have to go back to another place to be debated. We know, too, that those who oppose the proposition in total can still vote against the amendment. I know that some will support the regulation, as it has been suggested the Minister will. I trust that most of his colleagues, if not all, will support it, as well as some members on this side. By this method we can achieve what we were trying to achieve earlier.

If, in the future, a Government brings in a regulation to allow betting at some professional foot race in South Australia other than the Bay Sheffield, and if it is conducted by the South Australian Athletic League, that regulation has to come before Parliament. It must be before the Parliament for 14 sitting days, during which time any member can take action to disallow it in either House. Any group or individual from the community can give evidence before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. That process is as democratic as we can get it. It is a process similar to amending the Act; in fact, it is slightly more in favour of the public, because it needs only one House to disallow it: members must understand that. It provides a greater opportunity in future for control through the democratic process. If we do not incorporate the regulation provisions, but include the alternative, it is just an act of any Minister in the future (without reflecting on the present Minister).

I believe that this is a reasonable compromise, which will put the matter back in the hands of the people. I hope members see it that way. Those who oppose in total the principle of any extension or possibility of extension can vote against it. Whether or not there is betting on foot racing in South Australia has been decided by this House. I respect the decision made by the House. It is not what I wanted—I opposed it, but I accept it because it is the democratic process. We are now debating whether we can improve on the amendment from the other place for those who want to put it back in the hands of the people rather than having Ministerial direction. I hope members understand that and see what happens in the other place.

The Hon. J. W. SLATER: I support the amendment moved by the member for Fisher to provide for prescription by regulation rather than Ministerial approval.

Amendment carried; motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

Mr MATHWIN: The amendment means that the clause will read as follows:

By inserting in the definition of 'race' after the passage 'coursing ground' the passage 'and a foot racing ground used of a holding of the prescribed foot race meeting'.

I wonder about that wording. Perhaps the Minister for Education can sort it out. It seems to be a rather ridiculous wording. I ask the Minister whether the wording is correct and whether that is correct English (or perhaps it is just

legal jargon to baffle the public). Has the Minister looked at the new wording, and is he quite satisfied, because it will go into the Statute Book. In order for it to be amended it has to be brought back to this place either by a private member, or by a perhaps reluctant Government. I presume that the Minister and his advisers (and he has many sitting around him) have decided that the wording is correct. I am surprised that the Minister has not taken my point.

This is an important point, because this clause will be going into the Statute Book. I asked the Minister whether the wording of the amendment is correct. If the Minister wishes to ponder that question I will talk for another 10 or 15 minutes to enable him to make a decision.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: The amendment that I have here states:

No. 4. Page 2—Line 3, clause 2, leave out 'of the' and insert 'of a'.

Has the Minister checked this matter, and is he satisfied with the existing situation? If the Minister is satisfied that this is correct, then I am quite happy about it. It is obvious that all Government members have looked at this clause and are happy about it. If they are happy about it, then I am happy about it, too.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If it makes the member for Glenelg happy, I am happy to tell him that I am happy to accept this particular amendment.

Mr MEIER: I oppose this subclause, because it states in part:

...after the passage 'coursing ground' the passage 'and a foot racing ground used for the holding of the prescribed foot race meeting';

This returns to the original intent of the amendments that betting can occur on any foot race. Here we see that it will happen on a particular ground. Even though an amendment has been moved and agreed to, where it is prescribed by regulation (and that seems to provide some safeguards), I still see no reason why members have to kowtow or compromise when the Minister's original Bill has already passed. If we stayed with the original Bill, as it was passed a couple of days ago, what the Government was seeking would have been granted. Consideration of this subclause and the clauses already passed opens more possibilities. It has been pointed out before that this is simply the beginning of legalising betting on many foot races. The wording of the Bill in the previous subsections makes it quite clear that it is referring to 'any other foot race meeting'.

When one thinks of other foot racing grounds, the Olympic Sports Field at Kensington comes to mind. I can envisage it becoming a carnival situation with bookmakers being allocated a certain area, people paying to go in (because these are closed facilities) and there will be a race track. Perhaps athletes will be kept in special areas from which they will be marched out, taken to the barriers with the red light flashing, and then off!

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I did not hear that comment. The Minister may think that this sounds like a fairytale but when the wording 'any other foot race meeting' is used, it opens the door for betting on other foot race meetings throughout South Australia. I wonder whether or not it will include foot race meetings such as the Adelaide to Bay run or the Gawler to Adelaide run. Possibly we will even see the Whyalla Gift return as a major race if people can see a chance of making money on it.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That would be a good thing—

Mr MEIER: The Chief Secretary mentioned that it would be a very good thing if the Whyalla Gift did come back. He would know that better than I and perhaps he has a point. I do not wish to argue about that. I apologise for referring to him in the wrong sense before.

Returning to the clause, in my opinion the public knows nothing about the new amendments. No previous warning or information has been given about them. It is virtually a secret society that we are enacting and suddenly tomorrow people will be confronted with the new legislation that has been passed. It disturbs me greatly that this matter has not been aired in public. This House needs to consider very carefully whether it is taking the right course of action in allowing this particular subclause to be passed.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr MEIER: What I am getting at is that no-one has had an opportunity to air the implications of the wider perspective suggested in the amendment.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: Again, I come back to the point that I do not know why the Minister and members of the Government are not happy with the original Bill to amend the Racing Act. I do not feel that it is necessary to have to compromise on the original Bill.

Mr LEWIS: I support everything that the member for Goyder has just said. The problem I have is that, whereas I was told that the amendment would read 'another', I am told that it means 'plural'. I have not been able to obtain the advice of people more competent than I in drafting legislation, because of the incompetence of the Government, and that is a reflection on the way the Government has managed the House over the past five days. It is not the first time that it has got everything back to front.

As a consequence, I now find myself compelled to simply accept what is here. However, I urge all members to vote against this amendment because I would prefer the amendment to read 'one other' foot race meeting a year, wherein it would have required consultation between the competing interests that wanted to have legalised betting and bookmakers in attendance at their meeting through the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated. The Minister called the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated the South Australian Amateur Athletic League Incorporated in his amateurish fashion.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I made a mistake.

Mr LEWIS: I accept that as long as the Minister acknowledges that it is a fundamental mistake. He should know what he is talking about when it is in the context of an organisation for which he is intending to amend an Act of Parliament. This is a fair illustration to the Parliament of the level of competence of the Government in the preparation and presentation of legislation for this place. I am disappointed that what I understood would enable me to restrict it to one other meeting, as a facility within the capacity of this House at this time, is now denied me. Therefore, I urge you, Mr Chairman, and all other members to oppose this proposition; otherwise we will find that meeting after meeting demands will be made to the house and to the Minister, for bookmakers to be present, with all the attendant, unfortunate consequences.

This amendment will give the Minister the power to allow that to occur. When we have voted on this measure Parliament will rise and will not sit again until March next year.

There could be six meetings convened by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated in the meantime, and all of them could have bookmakers in attendance. This Parliament would not have the opportunity to debate and disallow the regulation that would permit that to occur. You, Mr Chairman, and all other members would know that that is possible. By stealth and cunning the Minister, just like some of his colleagues, has attempted to slip this provision through under our noses. He says, in a way that is contrary to what he intended when he made his second reading explanation—God knows, he has changed his view on that enough times—

An honourable member: We could have gambling at the Mudgee courthouse.

Mr LEWIS: So be it. I will oppose this amendment and the next and call a division on both.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (32)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Adamson, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Bannon, Crafter, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Gregory, Gunn, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mathwin, Mayes, Olsen, Oswald, Payne, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, Wilson, and Wright.

Noes (5)—Messrs Allison, Goldsworthy, Lewis (teller), Meier, and Rodda.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Duncan and Groom. Noes—Messrs D.C. Brown and Wotton.

Majority of 27 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No 5:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be agreed to.

Mr LEWIS: I take the last vote as a test case for the measure of support and of the extent to which members are prepared to allow foot races on which bookmakers can operate to be conducted, even though the organisers could be granted permission to do so without Parliament sitting. Parliament would have absolutely no say in the process in that case. In view of the fact that some members consider Parliament to be an inappropriate place in which to debate the merits of each case, I will leave it to any other member to call a division. I will not delay the Committee any longer. I oppose the motion.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 10.4 to 10.16 p.m.]

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 15 March 1983 at 2 p.m.