HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 29 March 1983

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

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following papers:

1. Index of the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly 1963-1982.
2. General Index to Bills before the Houses of Parliament 1975-1982.
3. Index to Papers laid before Parliament and petitions presented to both Houses 1975-1982.

Ordered that papers be printed.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 61, 63 to 67, 69 to 71, 74, 75, 79 to 81, 86, 87, 89, 146, and 148.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report, 1982.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by the South Australian Planning Commission on—

I. Proposed quarry and crushing plant at North Shields.
II. Proposed land acquisition for Ocean Boulevard.
III. Proposed land acquisition for Panalatinga Road.
IV. Proposed erection of two transportable classrooms at Strathalbyn High School.
V. Proposed erection of a 33 kV transmission line and a 33/11 kV substation near Kingscote.

By the Chief Secretary, on behalf of the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1980—Regulations—

I. Cream Prices
II. Milk Prices

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

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Racial Discrimination Act, 1976—Regulations—Aboriginal Teachers.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Local Government Act, 1934-1982—Regulations—Register Book of Burials.
II. Parks Community Centre Act, 1981—General Regulations.
III. District Council of Mount Barker—By-law No. 26—Fences, Hedges and Hoardings.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I advise that the Premier will take questions that would have been directed to the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say whether an agreement to redevelop the Adelaide railway station site will be finalised on or before Thursday? I ask this question in view of the imminence of the date (31 March) and the fact that this was the expiry date of an option granted by the former Government for the completion of an agreement. By way of further explanation, I point out that, on 17 September 1981, the former Government approved a draft State Transport Authority brief for the redevelopment of the Adelaide station and environs. This brief was subsequently issued to four consortia that had previously indicated interest in the project. As a result, one of the consortia accepted an invitation to submit a detailed redevelopment submission and this was received by the former Government on 26 February 1982. The consortia was then given a period of one year in which to secure financial backing and to develop the proposal to the stage at which a commitment to proceed could be given. The proposal contemplated a $160 000 000 first-stage development to include a bus station, a parking station, offices, a 400-room hotel, apartments, a convention centre to seat 3 000 people, retail areas and a restaurant. To indicate its support for the concept, the former Government gave certain commitments, including a 99-year lease, use of the area as a bus station, and the preparation of an appropriate indenture agreement. In the Australian Labor Party election policy speech on 25 October, the Premier said:

> I have already had discussions about the establishment of a major convention centre using the Adelaide railway station building and site. Labor will take every step to ensure that this project is realised.

On coming to office, the Premier would have found that, in fact, negotiations were at an advanced stage following initiatives of the former Government to establish a major development at this site. I hope, therefore, that he will be able to report further progress to the House.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the Leader for his question. The short answer is 'No: an agreement is not to be signed on or before Thursday in relation to this project.' However, in view of the Leader's explanation of his question, I will provide more information in reply. The history of this project goes back to 1974, when the first proposals to redevelop the Adelaide railway station air space were developed to an advanced stage in terms of concept plans. At that time, the State Transport Authority was submitting the suggestion of this project and the various elements involved in it, so that various consortia could submit whatever propositions they thought appropriate.

For various reasons the project was not taken much beyond that concept stage, but in recent years great interest has been shown in it and, as the Leader said, at the time of the previous Government the S.T.A. formally moved to call for submissions and certain propositions were to be considered by the S.T.A. and the Government. Finally, from that consideration emerged proposals that were to be developed. The essentials of any project such as this depend on the ability to raise investment finance for it and much money is involved as this project is ambitious, large, and an extremely exciting development in its potential.

As a precursor to attempting to raise finance and to obtain investor interest in this sort of project, there must be a detailed evaluation both as to the financial feasibility and the demand that the various facilities will engender, and the return on them as an investment. Unfortunately, despite several announcements made before the recent election about this matter, much of that detailed work had not been done. Indeed, it has been found necessary over the past few months to commission, both through the S.T.A. independently and the consortiums involved, several of those studies. Much

vital information was assumed to be available as part of this project that could attract investor attention, but, in fact, it had not been developed. I regret to say that this is probably one of the examples of the previous Premier's enthusiasm being over exaggerated and where an announcement was made prematurely about what was involved in it.

Be that as it may, the project has certainly been picked up enthusiastically and vigorously by my Government. It has investor interest, but I think I should say at this stage, and it is important for us to remember, that it involves major financial considerations, commercial negotiations, and discussions. Obviously, they will not be helped or advanced if there is all sorts of public speculation built around it. The other aspect concerns not raising prematurely public expectation about precisely what can or cannot happen. The project is known, the concept has been publicly discussed, and, as the member for Torrens has said, it is an interesting and exciting project. I assure members that negotiations are continuing, but the Government is not able to make announcements or detail the kind of commercial and financial discussions and negotiations that are taking place.

EYRE PENINSULA TOURISM

Mr MAX BROWN: Has the Minister of Tourism had discussions with departmental officers in respect to the brochure recently put out by his department concerning the tourist industry on Eyre Peninsula and, if so, can the Minister say what are the results of those discussions? The Minister would be aware that earlier this month brochures about Eyre Peninsula that were prepared and distributed by his department contained inaccurate information about certain areas. The department was severely criticised for incompetence, which needed investigating and rectifying, first, to ensure that such mistakes did not occur again, and secondly, to improve liaison between the department and local areas of tourism.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have discussed this matter with the officers of the Travel Centre. As the member for Whyalla pointed out, a mistake was made: I believe that it was an unforgivable mistake. Unfortunately, we were not able to implement the new system of checking all the brochure material with the local tourist association and the local community before it was distributed for public consumption. However, that system is now effective. I am sorry that the shadow Minister is not here because she would have enjoyed—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: She has the flu.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am sorry to hear that the shadow Minister is ill. My comments certainly will not be offensive to her in any way. I am sure that she would have been pleased to note that, whilst that material in the brochure was initially prepared in May and June of last year, it was approved during the term of my office as Minister of Tourism. Therefore, in a sense there is a joint responsibility involved. In fact, the mistake should never have been made. It is quite unforgivable, and I can assure the honourable member that the department and I apologise to Whyalla, Port Lincoln and the other areas that were misquoted. We are certain that it will not happen again.

We are looking at whether or not it is cost effective to take that brochure out of production and print others. When we have that information, I will provide it for the honourable member. I heard someone say, whilst I was listening to *AM* one morning, that this controversy over the brochure and the mistakes that were in it had given more promotion and publicity to the areas on the Eyre Peninsula than otherwise might have happened, so, what you lose on the merry-go-round you pick up on the swings. Overall, it may not have been a great disadvantage, but when we have decided whether or not the brochure will be withdrawn and reprinted I will let the honourable member have that information.

CASINO

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier, or have any of his Ministers, or any agent acting for the Government had discussions with any persons, company or consortium, or any other organisation interested in establishing a casino in South Australia? If so, do these discussions relate to including a casino as part of the redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station site? Who is involved in these discussions if they have occurred?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question of interest in a casino in South Australia has been very thoroughly canvassed in this House in the past. Certainly, a number of groups are interested in such a proposition. If the Bill that was before the previous Parliament had passed, there would have been a large number of bids for a casino, and, as I understand it, most of those groups have retained their interest in it; it makes sense for them to do so.

Mr Mathwin: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the specific development that was the subject of the Leader of the Opposition's question a moment ago, obviously any group involved in developing that site would be interested in having a casino as yet another aspect of that if indeed it was successful in gaining a licence.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: However, it has been made clear to any groups and to those carrying the brief for such a project that the question of a casino is not to be considered as part of their negotiation, or any possibility. The law at the moment does not allow a casino to be established in South Australia or a licence to be issued. Even if it did, any developer in any project in South Australia still would have to take his chances with all others who might be seeking such a licence.

I cannot say more than that but, if I take the thrust of the question by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, it was to see what impact a casino might or might not have on this development. I am simply saying to the honourable member that the only discussion that one could say had been held on that is to make it quite clear to those progressing such projects that they are to do so on the basis that there is not and will not necessarily be a casino.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BUS INCIDENT

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Transport call for a report on an incident that arose this morning on a State Transport Authority bus travelling from Flagstaff Hill to the city involving a problem with the driver and the passengers? I believe that the police were called and, as a consequence, the bus arrived 20 minutes late in the city, causing the majority of travellers to arrive late at their place of employment.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not aware of any details of the incident referred to, but I will be happy to call for a report on this matter and bring it down for the honourable member.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: When will the Chief Secretary release the latest Touche Ross Report relating to Yatala Labour Prison? The Chief Secretary told this House on 16 March that he would release the report 'to everyone in South Australia who has an interest in the report and who wishes to see what is in it.' However, I understand that the report was discussed by Cabinet yesterday and, as a result, Mr Swink has been asked to redraft at least some of it. If this is the case, it would seem to conflict with another statement that the Chief Secretary made to the House on 16 March, when he said:

When the honourable member has the opportunity to read the Touche Ross Report, he will understand that what we are doing fits in snugly with that report.

I also seek from the Chief Secretary an explanation of the apparent conflict between his earlier statement and the present situation in regard to that report.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The first point is that it is not another report by Touche Ross on the Yatala Labour Prison: it is the only report by Touche Ross on the Yatala Labour Prison. The report received from Mr Hugh Swink, of Touche Ross, was prior to A Division at Yatala having been burnt down. We have been trying to contact Mr Hugh Swink to see whether that fact will alter any of his recommendations. Until we have been able to contact him to see whether that is the case—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It is possible that he may want to add to or amend some of his recommendations. We are trying to contact him. I would expect, and certainly hope, that the report will be made public before the end of this week. There is no delay. However, the report that we have received from Mr Swink, of Touche Ross, was made when A Division was part of the Yatala compound. It currently is not, and that may have altered his recommendations. It is important for him to be given the opportunity to say whether or not that is so before we issue the report, which we expect will be at the weekend, at the latest.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: No-one from your office—

The SPEAKER: Order!

JOB FINDERS EMPLOYMENT AGENCY

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Labour inform the House of the result of his department's investigations into the activities of Job Finders Employment Agency, situated at 312 Pulteney Street in the city? On 8 December 1982 I asked a question in this House regarding the activities of the Job Finders Employment Agency and expressed my concern about them.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member was good enough to advise me a couple of weeks ago of his interest in the matter. It has been investigated, and I am pleased to report to the House and the State the exact position. In fact, the honourable member has written to me about the matter, as have a number of other members.

The honourable member is quite right to be concerned at the activities of such agencies. They do exploit hapless people who are without a job through no fault of their own and who are trying to find work. However, before going any further it is necessary to understand what the accepted function of an employment agency is. The reputable agencies are far more than simply a referral service to a list of job vacancies. The reputable firms are licensed under the Employees Registry Office Act and are obliged to comply with certain requirements under the Act. Their lists of job vacancies are compiled after personal contact with firms looking for extra personnel. They try to match the qualifications of the applicants to the jobs, set up appointments for interviews, and sometimes even conduct aptitude tests; in other words, they provide a comprehensive service for both the employer and the employee. For this service the employers pay a fee and, I might add, are quite happy to do so. So much for reliable firms. We come now to firms such as Job Finders.

The honourable member might be interested to know that, since he first asked his question, the attention of my department has been drawn to other firms which operate in a similar way. Job Finders charge unemployed people, not the employer (that is the great difference) $50 in return for a referral to a job vacancy. However, investigations by my department have shown that the job vacancies are simply those listed in daily newspapers or solicited by the firm after ringing round companies listed in the yellow pages of the telephone book.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I notice that the member for Hanson is agreeing with me. There is no real attempt to match skills or abilities to the vacancies. There is no attempt to set up appointments with prospective employers. In many cases by the time the unemployed people are referred to the vacancies they have already been filled, sometimes for days. This is evidence and fact. The operation is one of the most callous exploitations of unemployed people that I have ever seen. Part of the problem with agencies like Job Finders was that it was uncertain whether their activities were covered by the Employees Registry Office Act and therefore they were not bound by the regulations.

After the honourable member first voiced his concern in December, I asked my department to investigate this whole sordid affair. The department has now received a legal opinion from the Crown Law Office that Job Finders and agencies which operate in a similar manner do come under the Act and do have to adhere to the regulations.

Accordingly, my office has written to Job Finders and told them that they have until 5 p.m. on Thursday to apply for a licence as an agency. If they do not, legal action will be taken. Similar notices will also be sent to agencies operating on the same lines as Job Finders. The main effect of their registration will be that the odious practice of making only the unemployed person pay for the job referrals will be done away with immediately. Under the Act the agency cannot charge the employee any more than the employer. I realise that this is not the best solution. In other States the employer pays the entire bill for the employment service.

I repeat my statement, made in this House on 8 December last year, that the South Australian Act will be amended to bring us into line with the other States on this matter; it should have been amended in 1979 if it had not been for the hostile Liberal Legislative Council. I emphasise to the House that the reputable agencies are in full agreement with this proposed amendment, and in fact have promised me support in this area. I hope that we get some support from the Liberals on this occasion in the Upper House.

However, I assure the member for Florey that, until that Act is amended, the activities of employment agencies will be closely monitored to ensure that unemployed people are not exploited, and I urge any members of the public who are concerned about the activities of employment agencies to contact the Department of Labour for advice.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether the Government has amended the option date to the con-

sortia relative to the development of the Adelaide railway station area and, if so, what is that date?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This whole area of options on this project is one that has some sensitivity, both in terms of the commercial nature of the operation and the general progress of negotiations. Therefore, I am not prepared to say anything in the House in answer to the honourable member's question, but I am certainly willing to speak to him privately and provide him with the information he seeks.

KANGAROO POPULATION

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House what is the current kangaroo population within the boundaries of South Australia and whether his department has any idea—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAYES: I will ignore the comments from the other side. Does the Minister's department regard the kangaroo population in South Australia to be under any threat of extinction as a result of any destruction programmes that are being followed? As a consequence of the television programme *60 Minutes* and a number of radio programmes which have conducted talk-backs during last week, I have had inquiries at my office from people who have raised concern about the situation of the destruction programme being followed in South Australia in regard to the population of kangaroos. They have raised with me their concern as to what the population is and the likely outcome of current Government programmes.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As I recall, the estimated kangaroo population in South Australia is approximately 1 700 000, compared with a national population of a little more than 3 000 000. The honourable member will be aware that harvesting on permit is confined to that part of the State to the north of the agricultural lands and south of the dog fence. The previous Government had a policy of a quota of 400 000 in the last calendar year and it is estimated that the harvest taken was about 250 000. The present Government has reduced that by 25 per cent to 300 000, but we have said that that in fact has to be looked at on a six-monthly basis, that the quota for the first six months, from memory, should be 160 000, and that we would review it at the end of the six-month period.

We are also endeavouring to look at harvesting on a regionalised basis, because it is understood that the problem that property owners sometimes have with kangaroos may relate to a particular region and that these 'global' figures can be misleading. It is not my belief at present, nor from the advice given to me can I conclude, that the macropod population of South Australia is under any threat at present. There is evidence that the macropod population of the north has probably increased somewhat as a result of European occupation because of the setting up of watering points and that sort of thing. My basic concern must be for the total marsupial population of the north, and there is some evidence that an increase in the numbers of the larger macropods has put at risk the habitat of some of the smaller species which are indeed in some danger of extinction.

In looking at a harvesting programme, which is what we are basically trying to do, we are trying to ensure the preservation of the smaller species and those which are more at risk. However, we have certainly reduced the quota this year, and we are looking at it closely indeed. This is something which exercises the hearts and minds of people. A young man wrote to me recently claiming that if the kangaroo population of the State became extinct I solely would be responsible, and to make good his claim he obviously pricked his finger and dropped some blood on the letter to simply underline his concern. I share that young man's concern for the future of our native animals, but we do have to look at the broad spectrum of the fauna population and not simply at certain species.

One interesting aspect of the problem that has been put to me, probably arising out of the film that has been shown widely around Australia, is a prohibition on the harvesting of does with joeys. I am attracted to that proposition although, whether it is really practical in terms of harvesters being able to tell at a distance whether the animal in the sights has a joey or not, I am not too sure, but we are certainly looking at it.

ST JAMES PARK KINDERGARTEN

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister of Education state what action will be taken to alleviate overcrowding at the St James Park Kindergarten at Panorama? In 1981 the enrolment at St James Park Kindergarten fell and as a result the Government took away the afternoon session and reduced the kindergarten hours to the morning session. It was pointed out at that time that this may have been an aberration and that, if student numbers increased, the afternoon session would be restored. In 1982 enrolment numbers increased but staff numbers were not increased so that the kindergarten could recommence its afternoon session.

On being elected, I wrote to the Kindergarten Union and spoke to the Minister about this problem but I was told that funds were not available. Again in January, I wrote to the Minister about this problem and the response was the same, despite the fact that we had put up several propositions. In this regard I must pay tribute to the parents of the children attending this kindergarten, who have done everything in their power to make the kindergarten a very livable place.

I raised the matter with the Minister again in February, when it was discovered that the enrolment was 50 and the average attendance was 43. Obviously, there is grave concern within the kindergarten that with winter coming on not only are the premises overcrowded but also health problems will be created. I would appreciate a response on this matter from the Minister.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mitcham had the courtesy to contact me previously about this matter, and I asked the Kindergarten Union for another report. We are quite aware that this kindergarten is one of a number in South Australia that could be regarded as being a pressure point in regard to enrolments. The St James Park Kindergarten does have some priority in terms of any staffing that will become available as a result of the rationalisation that is due to take place within the Kindergarten Union, as is normal procedure. Any staff to be made available under these arrangements would take their position in the kindergarten from the start of the second term.

Concerning staffing generally, certain kindergartens could rightly claim extra staff under various staffing arrangements. Shortly after being sworn in as Minister, I asked for a full report on staffing in kindergartens in South Australia and for details as to which might warrant an increase in staff. I was given to understand that, on a full-year basis, on the 1982 figures $609 000 worth of staff appointments was warranted. For the balance of the financial year 1982-83, starting in February this year, that would mean a cost of $255 900. Therefore, there is a significant need to be made up in the staffing of pre-school kindergartens in South Australia, a significant need that could go back to planning for the 1982-83 Budget.

One of the first situations I had to face involved commitments that had been made by the previous Government in respect of certain kindergartens, not including St James or those kindergartens referred to by the members for Davenport and Elizabeth. The previous Minister had given a commitment up to December, with no funding for the rest of the 1982-83 financial year. It was my first priority to find funds from the limited sources available to the Government to meet those commitments, and that has been done. I am referring to real priorities where kindergartens need staff: these are not kindergartens where additional staff could merely be useful. We are doing what we can. The Kindergarten Union has a rationalisation exercise that is normally due to take place now, and the St James kindergarten has a high priority in that regard. In an article in the *Community Courier* a lady is quoted as saying:

> . . . other kindergartens had managed to get funding, so they would keep 'pestering' the Minister until St James did too.

The allocation of Government resources for the pre-school area and for any other area of education, however, will be determined on the just and equitable distribution of resources and not on the basis of who pesters best. We have accepted the proposition that there is a need here and not that there may be capacity to pester. I am somewhat reassured by the understanding of some parents at St James following the publication of this statement by a parent there:

> We are hoping with the change of Government we may be able to do a little better now.

I assure that parent and other parents associated with that kindergarten that the fullness of this Parliament will show that that statement to be very much correct. I appreciate the efforts of the member for Mitcham, who tried to argue the case for the kindergarten. He put the case ably for them, and the points of view he put have been taken into account by the present Government.

FLINDERS HOSPITAL BUSES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport assure members that the diversion of buses into Flinders Medical Centre from South Road during off-peak periods is being given a high priority by the State Transport Authority? When can southern residents expect the new services to commence? At present people attending Flinders Medical Centre, of whom many are aged, infirm, handicapped, pregnant, or have young children accompanying them, have to change buses on South Road.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am happy to inform the member for Mawson that off-peak buses will soon be diverted into Flinders Medical Centre on week days. It is proposed that this operation will commence on Monday, 18 April and that buses will be diverted between 8.45 a.m. and 5.15 p.m., and from 6.30 p.m. to 9.30 p.m. It will not be easy to arrange similar diversions for buses on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays, as this will require major re-timetabling. However, it is proposed to change these services in about October this year, and discussions concerning those alterations have already commenced.

RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Will the Premier say whether the Government has extended the option to the consortium proposed to redevelop the railway station, on the basis that it will not expire until the casino legislation has been taken to a vote in Parliament?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to that question is 'No'. I thought I made quite clear to the Deputy Leader that the question of a casino does not arise in relation to this project. If any option is to be extended or there is a question concerning the length of time of options, they have nothing to do with casinos. As I have already indicated, I am not quite sure why the Opposition is asking these repetitive questions. I would have thought that members opposite would have something better to do.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The first part of the answer is exactly the same as that already given in answer to the Deputy Leader's question. The second part of the answer is exactly the same as that given to the member for Light, namely, that the questions of options and length and duration are matters of commercial sensitivity. If the member for Mount Gambier feels that he ought to be informed about this, I am happy, because the project is important, to advise the honourable member privately, but these matters are not for public consumption.

FACILITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the House of the criteria and the basis of application for the 1983-84 facility development programme?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Department of Recreation and Sport has had difficulty in regard to the amount of money available for this programme. Earlier this year I approved revised guidelines for the administration of the sport and recreation facility development programme. There were two main reasons for this review: the first was to tackle the serious problems faced by a Government department which continued to receive hundreds of applications for financial assistance, far in excess of allocated funds for the programme. The significant changes to the guidelines include, first, priority to be given to facilities which relate directly to the prime purpose of the recreation or sport concerned. Secondly, greater emphasis will now be given to the requirement that applicants consult and discuss their proposal with local councils as well as with departmental officers prior to submitting an application for financial assistance. I have copies of the explanatory notes and application forms for any member who may be interested. Application forms are now required to provide sufficient information to ensure that it is a very serious proposal which has been thoroughly prepared.

Financial assistance in the form of a grant or low-interest loan is limited to one-third of the cost of an approved project, although in exceptional circumstances consideration may be given for a greater proportion. It is intended to continue the process of close consultation with local councils and the priorities made by councils, as well as comments by State associations of the recreation or sport concerned. Applicants are required to forward their applications to the appropriate local government authority in which the project is to be developed by 31 March each year. Council will then forward the application forms to the Recreation and Sport Division by 30 April this year. As I have stated previously, if the honourable member or any other member desires, I will make available to them a copy of the application form with its explanatory notes.

SUNDAY TRADING

Mr ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Labour explain the apparent discrepancies in relation to those retail businesses that are able to trade on Sundays? I have been told by a constituent of mine who owns and operates a furnishing business in the north-eastern suburbs that Parafield Discounts

are again trading on Sundays, despite having recently been prohibited from doing so by officers of the Minister's department. That constituent also told me that several firms advertise in the *Sunday Mail* in particular, and that those advertisements indicate that far more furniture is being sold than could possibly be displayed in a floor area that would meet with the requirements of the present Act. He has also been told by officers of the Minister's department that he cannot open his premises because they are too large, and yet I am informed that those premises are considerably smaller than, for example, those being operated by Parafield Discounts. My constituent considers that the law is being applied selectively, inconsistently, and unfairly, and he has asked me to determine whether the situation can be improved so that trading hours are equitable.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The first point that should be made is that the present legislation is a responsibility of the former Liberal Government. If there is something wrong with that legislation, then let the member who asked the question blame himself, because it was he who put up his hand in this place when I opposed aspects of that legislation. Also, he must have put his hand up in his Party's Parliamentary meeting, so he should accept that it was his Party that was responsible for the legislation.

Mr Ashenden: You're always—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The member does not like the reply, but he is going to get it. It was his Party that introduced this mish mash of legislation about which I am getting letters daily. Do not let us forget that the Liberal Party, which includes the honourable member, was responsible for this legislation. Perhaps the former Minister of Industrial Affairs was responsible for this mish mash piece of legislation.

Mr Lewis: We are talking not about the legislation but about the responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I have laid the blame where it clearly has to lie, that is, on the Liberal Party. I warned the Liberal Party at the time about the trouble it was getting itself into, but the member, who was quite new in this House then, did not know what he was about and was probably hoodwinked by other members of his own Caucus. He now realises that this legislation caused some problems, and that the legislation was no good in the first place.

The second point is that the administration of the department has not changed dramatically in any way in regard to enabling inspectors to be available to go out on the job and catch people who are trading unfairly. I do not support anybody who trades unfairly. I believe that everybody is liable to carry out the law of the land irrespective of what that law is. If it is bad law then one attempts to change it, or one has to accept it. In those circumstances, inspectors are working overtime, just as they were under the previous administration, trying to warn or attempting to catch people if they do it more than once. However, I still say that it is bad law. My third point refers to the Parafield situation, which has been the subject of Crown Law opinion.

An honourable member: What has been its contribution?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I wish that you would keep quiet, because you are not making much of a contribution. You are sitting there like a chirpy bird, and that is about what you are most of the time: sometimes you are chirpy and sometimes you are just a bird. If the honourable member wants his reply, he will get it if you are prepared to keep quiet.

As I was trying to explain, a Crown Law opinion has been given. The situation has been discussed since I have been in office. I am sure that that was the case under the previous Minister. Whether or not the previous Minister tried to do something about it, it has now come to fruition. Crown Law advises that if these people merge in a partnership they will be able to operate within the confines of the law. About eight or nine days ago advice from Crown Law suggested that, if a compilation of four or five people merged their tenancies, they would have the right to trade. Whether or not that has happened within the law, I do not know at this stage, but if the honourable member desires more information, I will certainly get it for him.

FLOOD MITIGATION WORKS

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Transport urgently examine proposals leading to funding flood mitigation works along Fourth Creek at Campbelltown? In this morning's *Advertiser* a report states:

> A $2 300 000 plan commissioned by the Campbelltown council for flood mitigation on Fourth Creek has been approved by the Commissioner of Highways, Mr A.K. Johinke.

The article states that the approval was in terms of its concept and the approval was in his capacity as administrator of the State Government's storm water drainage subsidy scheme. The next step in the chain is the funding of the proposals. Members may recall that in June 1981, the Hartley District (especially the Campbelltown area) was subjected to extensive flooding when Fourth Creek burst its banks and caused widespread damage in the Campbelltown area.

The area was more fortunate in the recent rains as the Fourth Creek catchment area did not receive the high level of rain received in other areas and escaped flooding. Had the catchment area received such rain, Fourth Creek may have again flooded surrounding residential areas. Consequently, the matter is of grave concern to my electorate.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: As the member points out, the flood mitigation study has been finalised and approved for that area. I understand that the Campbelltown council should now apply to the department to qualify under the 50-50 Government subsidy scheme. When the applications are presented to me, I shall be pleased to consider them and advise the member of funding arrangements for this important programme.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Will the Minister of Education give the House an unequivocal assurance that the Government will not introduce compulsory unionism or so-called 'preference to unionists' for registered teachers, thereby requiring applicants for teaching positions to sign a document stating that they will join an appropriate union if appointed, such document to be witnessed by the principal?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The shadow Minister of Education is referring to the *Gazette* notice of some weeks ago about preference for unionists notice for school assistants staff in South Australian schools. This carried on a Government policy that started in 1973 with regard to preference to unionists. It is a policy that the Government has re-enacted as it believes it works in the best interest of employees in South Australia.

It is not intended that such notices will be issued to new applicants for the teaching positions in South Australia. However, it is the policy of the Government that preference should be given to the employment of such people. We believe that employee associations represent the best interests of these people in getting a fair deal for those employees, and they have a right to be so represented.

SCHOOL FEES

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Education make a statement regarding the level of Government assistance to Government assisted scholars in State schools? I have recently received a letter from a primary school in my district that states that the school fee for that school amounts to $40 a year, an amount that the school regards as realistic and moderate. The Government provides $33 a year to schools in respect of each primary school student whose family applies for assistance and is found to be below a certain means-tested level. These students are known as Government assisted scholars.

The school that contacted me is concerned that there has been an increase in the number of Government assisted scholars and that this has lead to a reduced income for the school, the amount of reduction being equal to the number of Government assisted scholars multiplied by the $7 difference between the school fee and the Government provision. Will the Minister comment on a problem that obviously extends well beyond the confines of that one school that raised the issue?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This is an important problem. There was a change of policy under the previous Government that resulted in a change of the name of this scheme. The change of name that we fully supported, was a change from the Free Book Scheme to the Government Assisted Students Scheme, because it recognised that the cost of educating such students went beyond merely the cost of their book materials and also involved other costs to their education.

However, at the time the amount of financial allocation that was attached to that was not particularly significant and the reality of it was that the money made available under the scheme basically still only met the cost of books. In several cases some schools found themselves forced to ask for extra financial imposts from the people who had been deemed eligible to receive funds under the scheme.

The present policy is to improve the rate of funding for schools in this State by several means. First, it recognises that the Government Assisted Students Scheme and the financial allocation attaching to that should keep pace, at the very least, with the rate of inflation. We also have several other policies that I think are fairly significant. We have indicated, on the basis of grants to schools, that the global amount should be indexed, but that the way that that is applied individually to schools should be somewhat positively discriminatory, namely, that every school would be guaranteed 50 per cent indexation but the remaining 50 per cent of the indexation total would be allocated on a basis of positive discrimination according to financial means. That will embrace the situation of those schools that have a significant number of Government assisted students where there is indeed a cost short-fall to the school. Secondly, some schools have found that their bad debt rate, if we can use that term, has increased significantly because of economic circumstances in their area, namely, the incapacity of some homes to meet the school fees even though they are not eligible for the Government Assisted Students Scheme according to the means test criteria. That situation is posing particular problems for some schools, and the kind of funding mechanism we propose will help partly to resolve them.

In addition, we are proposing that there should be a supplementary element to funding for schools to cover the extra increases over and above the normal CPI increases that apply to many school materials. The Government does not intend to take full responsibility for that increase in costs but to at least acknowledge that there should be some financial contribution. I fully recognise the concern that the member has raised: it is a genuine concern shared by many schools throughout this State, and we believe that the policies which we promised before the recent State election and which we will enact, will go a long way towards meeting many of these real difficulties.

PORTER BAY SEWERAGE SCHEME

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Water Resources say whether the anticipated programme for the construction of the Porter Bay sewerage scheme is on schedule? In November 1982 the Minister of Water Resources told me that although the previous Government had not allocated funds for the project in the 1982-83 financial year, it was expected that funds would be provided for the project over the following two years. It was also stated that it was expected that construction would commence in July of this year. Is that programme still on schedule?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: As I do not have that information with me, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and advise him accordingly.

ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Transport advise and hopefully give an assurance concerning the future of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line? I have received many inquiries from within and outside the railway industry expressing concern at the rumours abroad in those areas that the Alice Springs to Darwin line will be adandoned by the Federal Labor Government.

It also concerns me that this would eliminate about 1 250 projected jobs and would have an effect upon the steelmaking industry in Whyalla as well as concrete and steel sleeper manufacturers. Can the Minister advise whether any assurance has been given by his Federal colleague about the future of this project?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: This matter was raised at the ATAC conference held in February in New Zealand. The former Federal Minister (Mr Ralph Hunt) was not at the conference because the former Prime Minister had called the election at that time. However, I directed my questions about the standardisation of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line to officers representing the former Minister, and they promised me at that conference that they would provide some of the detailed material and the stages and funding of that project. Unfortunately, I have not received that information and I doubt, now that there has been a change in the Government, that I will.

However, from the brief discussions that my officers have had with officers of the new Minister for Transport in Canberra, it appears that the standardisation of that line will proceed in accordance with Federal transport policy. Should I be able to get further information on the stages and funding programme, I will be happy to provide that to the honourable member when I receive it.

RANDOM BREATH TESTING

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport indicate whether the new operating procedures for random breath testing announced in the newspapers this morning will continue indefinitely after Easter, or is it a short-term change for the Easter holiday period only?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I will explain why the question was directed to the Minister of Transport. It was announced this morning by the Police Commissioner that new random

breath testing procedures would be implemented which would mean that many more testing stations would be operational and that the effectiveness, particularly cost effectiveness, of random breath testing would be significantly improved as a result of that.

Late this morning, I understand, various public statements were made by a spokesman on behalf of the Minister of Transport, and that is why the question is directed to the Minister. The spokesman said:

The expansion of R.B.T. operations to increase the number of testing points will apply to Easter. After that, the police have the right to submit an application to continue the operations at that level, but as things stand the expansion only applies to the Easter period.

That is quite black and white—it is only for the Easter period. However, the Assistant Commissioner of Operations for the police (Mr Stanford) said today:

The new R.B.T. measures were an on-going project and not just a temporary measure for Easter. 'We will be continuing the new system after Easter'.

There is no doubt, from looking at the reports and the announcements made this morning by the police, as reported by the *Advertiser* and other media, that the new operations will be on-going and—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is now debating the matter. I ask him to come back to his explanation.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: In the paper there is obviously a conflict, and I ask the Minister to resolve that conflict immediately.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I indicated to the Chief Secretary, following a docket that came to me on the question of extending random breath testing in South Australia, that I would prefer the Police Department to leave any expansion of that programme until the carrying out of the complete review that has been promised by the Government into the whole area of random breath testing.

I also indicated that I had no objection to the Police Department's expanding the testing over the accident-prone period of Easter, and I understand that that is the period for the expansion. If that is intended to continue, it is not on my say-so but on the say-so of the Police Department, which is under the control of the Chief Secretary. That is all I have to say on the matter.

At 3.6 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF MEADOWS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move two motions without notice.

The SPEAKER: We have had some difficulty with this Standing Order previously. At the moment, the honourable Minister has the opportunity to explain the reasons for his seeking the suspension. He has that opportunity; he does not have to exercise it.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I move:

That the Select Committee on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Council of Meadows have leave to sit during the sittings of the House.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT COUNCILS OF BALAKLAVA, OWEN AND PORT WAKEFIELD

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the Select Committee on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Councils of Balaklava, Owen and Port Wakefield have leave to sit during the sittings of the House.

Motion carried.

LAW COURTS (MAINTENANCE OF ORDER) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is principally concerned with the replacement of police orderlies engaged in courts of summary jurisdiction in the metropolitan area with civilian court orderlies and the conferring upon them of appropriate authority to carry out their duties. The implementation of a civilian orderly scheme will release police officers from the courts to perform duties for which they have been trained and thereby achieve greater police efficiency. The Police Commissioner in a report to the Director-General of the Law Department said that the release of police personnel from court orderly duties would increase their capability of maintaining law and order. The first intake of civilian court orderlies was to the Adelaide Magistrates Court in August 1982. The second intake was in January of this year, when some of the first group were allocated suburban courts of summary jurisdiction and the new recruits began their service at the Adelaide Magistrates Court.

It is intended that the Sheriff will be the officer responsible for the recruitment and implementation of the scheme, upon the direction of the Attorney-General. The scheme will be similar to the civilian orderly service operating at the criminal sittings of the Supreme and Districts Courts. To facilitate the implementation of the scheme, it will be necessary for the Sheriff to have appropriate authority and for civilian orderlies to be adequately trained and empowered for the proper performance of their duties.

The amendment to the Law Courts (Maintenance of Order) Act, 1928, is the appropriate vehicle to introduce the proposal and creates a standard approach between the existing civilian orderly service in the criminal courts and the proposed service. The standardisation of the two services will result in greater flexibility and efficiency of operation. Sixteen full-time equivalent police officers will be replaced in this scheme by 29 civilian orderlies (three of whom are women), who will be rostered on a call system and engaged on the casual rates under guidelines established by the Public Service Board. It is expected that there will be a cost saving which will result from the civilian orderlies being engaged on casual rates when compared with the full-time salaries of the police officers who will be released for police duties. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends the long title of the principal Act to provide for mention of the appointment of court orderlies under the Act. Clause 4 inserts a heading

before section 1 of the principal Act. Clause 5 provides for the new arrangement of the principal Act. The Act is now to be arranged into three Parts, 'Preliminary'; 'Power of Court to Refuse to Hear Persons in Certain Cases'; and 'Court Orderlies'. Clause 6 inserts a new heading before section 2 of the principal Act, 'Power of Court to Refuse to Hear Persons in Certain Cases'.

Clause 7 substitutes the word 'Part' for the word 'Act' in section 2 of the principal Act. Clause 8 provides for an amendment to section 4 of the principal Act. This provision accords section 4 with the proposed new arrangement of the Act, and also revamps the section. Clause 9 substitutes the word 'Part' for the word 'Act' in section 5 of the principal Act. Clause 10 inserts a new Part III in the principal Act, 'Court Orderlies'. New section 6 provides for the definitions required in this Part. The Part is to apply to the Supreme Court, District Courts, the Children's Court and Magistrates Courts. New section 7 provides that the Sheriff is to be responsible, to the Attorney-General, for the assignment of court orderlies to courts, as occasion requires, and the supervision of their work. Section 8 provides for the appointment of court orderlies, either under the Public Service Act, 1967-1981, or by the Sheriff upon terms and conditions approved by the Attorney-General. New section 9 sets out the duties and powers of court orderlies appointed under the Act. New section 10 provides that it is an offence to hinder or resist a court orderly in the performance of his duties. New section 11 provides for the personal immunity of court orderlies in the course of performing their duties; liability is to rest with the Crown. New section 12 confirms that court orderlies may hold other offices. New section 13 provides for regulation-making powers, including regulations for the supervision, training and discipline of court orderlies.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

Where two people enter into an agreement to commit suicide and one person kills the other but himself survives, the survivor is guilty of murder. Sometimes the circumstances surrounding the survivor are tragic, and it would be unrealistic to expect a jury to find the survivor guilty of murder. Accordingly, provision is made in the Bill for a jury to bring in a verdict of manslaughter in those circumstances if they believe that the accused was a party to a genuine suicide pact. The judge will then be able to impose an appropriate sentence based on the facts surrounding the suicide.

While the Government believes that neither suicide nor attempted suicide should be an offence it does not believe that people should be free to incite others to commit suicide or bring pressure to bear on them to commit suicide. The Bill makes it an offence to aid, abet or counsel the suicide of another and a person who by fraud, duress or undue influence procures the suicide of another will be guilty of murder.

The Bill also clarifies two matters that are directly raised by it but which have wider implications. These are, first, the question of whether there is or should be an offence of attempted manslaughter and, secondly, the legal basis for the practice of convicting an accused charged with an offence of a lesser offence to which he has pleased guilty and of which he may be convicted upon trial for the offence charged. In relation to the first matter, there has been considerable doubt as to whether such an offence exists at common law. The Bill adopts the approach recommended by the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee so far as it applies to cases where there is an actual attempt to kill. That is, the Bill proposes a new provision providing that where a person attempts to kill another or is a party to an attempt to kill another and the person would, if the attempt had been successfully carried to completion, have been guilty of manslaughter rather than murder, the person shall be guilty of the felony of attempted manslaughter.

In relation to the second matter, the Bill proposes a new section designed to make it clear that where by another provision it is provided that the jury may find an accused charged with an offence guilty instead of a lesser offence, then it is open to the accused to plead guilty to the lesser offence rather than the offence with which he is charged, in which case, if the prosecution accepts the plea, the accused may be convicted of the lesser offence. Where the accused is convicted of the lesser offence in this way, the conviction operates as an acquittal of the offence charged and, if the accused has been placed in the charge of the jury, the jury shall be discharged without being required to give a verdict (unless the trial is to continue in respect of further counts not affected by the plea). I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts in the principal Act a new section 13a. Subclause (1) of the proposed new section provides that it is no longer to be an offence to commit or

attempt to commit suicide. Subclause (2) provides that a person who finds another committing or about to commit an act which he believes upon reasonable grounds would, if committed or completed, result in suicide is justified in using reasonable force to prevent the commission or completion of the act. The effect of this subclause is to retain the present position whereby reasonable force may be used to prevent the commission of a felony, suicide being presently a felony. Subclause (3) provides that a homicide that would constitute murder is reduced to manslaughter if the killing was done in pursuance of a suicide pact. This would also apply in relation to an accomplice to a homicide if the accomplice acted in pursuance of a suicide pact. 'Suicide pact' is defined in sublause (10) as an agreement between two or more persons having for its object the death of all of them whether or not each is to take his own life. Under that subclause, a person is not to be regarded as acting in pursuance of a suicide pact unless he was acting at a time when he had a settled intention of dying in pursuance of the pact.

Subclause (4) of proposed new section 13a provides that where a person is killed in pursuance of a suicide pact, an accomplice to the killing shall, if he was not himself a party to the suicide pact, continue to be guilty of murder even though the offence of the principal offender is reduced by subclause (3) from murder to manslaughter. Subclause (5) provides that a person who aids, abets or counsels the suicide of another or an attempt by another to commit suicide is guilty of an indictable offence. Subclause (6) fixes the penalty for such an offence. This is fixed at a term of imprisonment not exceeding 14 years where suicide was committed, and at a maximum of eight years imprisonment where suicide was attempted. Where a person convicted of an offence against subclause (5) is found to have acted in pursuance of a suicide pact, the penalty is fixed at a maximum of five years imprisonment where suicide was committed, and at a maximum of two years imprisonment where suicide was attempted.

The penalties fixed by subclause (6) where suicide was attempted reflect the penalties fixed for corresponding attempts under section 270a of the principal Act. Subclause (7) provides that a person who by fraud, duress or undue influence procures the suicide of another, or an attempt by another to commit suicide, shall be guilty of murder or attempted murder, as the case may require. Subclause (8) provides that a person charged with murder or attempted murder may, if the jury so finds, instead be convicted of an offence against subclause (5). Subclause (9) places the burden of proving the existence of a suicide pact and that he was acting in pursuance of the pact upon the accused. Subclause (10) provides the definitions outlined above. Subclause (11) provides that where a person induced another to enter into a suicide pact by means of fraud, duress or undue influence, the person is not entitled in relation to an offence against the other to any mitigation of criminal liability or penalty based upon the existence of the suicide pact.

Clause 3 inserts a new section 270ab dealing with attempted manslaughter. The proposed new section provides that where a person attempts to kill another or is a party to an attempt to kill another and would, if the attempt had been successfully carried to completion, have been guilty of manslaughter rather than murder, the person is to be guilty of the felony of attempted manslaughter. The penalty for this offence is fixed at a term of imprisonment not exceeding 12 years. The proposed new section also provides for the bringing in of a verdict of guilty of attempted manslaughter on a trial for attempted murder if the jury is satisfied that that is the appropriate verdict.

Clause 4 inserts a new section 285b. This proposed new section is designed to make it clear that where by another provision it is provided that the jury may find an accused charged with an offence guilty instead of a lesser offence, then it is open to the accused to plead guilty to the lesser offence rather than the offence with which he is charged, in which case, if the prosecution accepts the plea, the accused may be convicted of the lesser offence. Where the accused is convicted of the lesser offence in this way, the conviction operates as an acquittal of the offence charged and, if the accused has been placed in the charge of the jury, the jury shall be discharged without being required to give a verdict (unless the trial is to continue in respect of further counts not affected by the plea).

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.
It removes from subsection (5) of section 11 of the South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1981, the requirement that, where a Chairman of the commisison vacates his office before his appointment expires, his successor can only be appointed for the balance of his predecessor's term of office. Subsection (5) provides that where the office of a member of the South Australian Health Commission is vacated (including the Chairman) in mid term the person appointed to replace him may be appointed only for the balance of the previous member's term of office.

The former Chairman of the commission resigned in January this year, part way through his term of office, to take up the position of head of the New South Wales Health Department. Section 11 (5) places unreasonable restrictions on the Government in relation to the term it can offer a new Chairman. The amendment is intended to provide the Government with flexibility. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 11 (5) of the principal Act.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 22 March. Page 511).

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the Bill, which was introduced in another place by our colleague, the Hon. John Burdett. Its provisions are consistent with action that he was taking as Minister before last year's election. The Hon. Mr Burdett reintroduced the measure in the Council this session, and the Government has accepted it and provided Government business time for its passage. Indeed, if it were not for that we would not be discussing it today.

In undertaking this course of action, the Attorney-General in another place referred to the input over some years of successive Ministers and other spokespersons, and recognised that in 1974 the concept of a building indemnity fund was introduced into the legislation by the Hon. Murray Hill in another place. That interest has been consistent throughout by members of this side seeking to iron out certain difffi-

culties that we had perceived in the legislation. Whether or not the provisions of the Bill will completely resolve the areas of difficulty we will have to wait and see but, most certainly, the variations to be made by the Bill are the culmination of a long discussion process by the former Minister (Mr Burdett) with 15 community groups directly associated with activities relative to the legislation.

In the material to which the Hon. Mr Burdett referred in preparing this document, he made the point that he instigated a complete review concerning the matter of defective warranties under the Defective Houses Act, Consumer Transactions Act, and the Trade Practices Act, and that he had been examining the various proposals to incorporate the provisions of the Defective Houses Act in the Builders Licensing Act as a part of that comprehensive review. Mr Burdett acknowledged that the review was not complete at that time, but that there was a need to proceed to rationalise the legislation requirements affecting buildings. To do that he sought to repeal the Defective Houses Act and to incorporate those provisions in the new Part IIIC of the Builders Licensing Act.

He also picked up the point that the provisions could be extended to cover consumers who purchased from a builder an established house on which the builder had carried out building work prior to selling it. This was a grey area and one that was starting to cause some trouble, because it was a form of real estate activity that was becoming more prominent, in line with something like the Housing Trust's own arrangements whereby it was purchasing older properties, having some restoration work done on them and then putting those properties back on the market or using them as part of the trust's rental stock. Therefore, it was a development which was all-embracing and which required decisions to be made.

The other point that he picked up concerned the case of a builder who has renovated a house but who has failed to carry out building work in a proper and workmanlike manner, or who has failed to use good and proper materials, in which case the purchaser or any subsequent purchaser within five years may rely on statutory warranty provisions to pursue a remedy. Therefore, incorporation of these measures was considered. The Hon. Mr Burdett also indicated that there was to be an involvement with local councils as a result of the proposed changes, and it was proposed that councils be unable to approve building work without sighting and recording an indemnity policy in those cases where it is compulsory. This was to make quite sure that the agreements that had been reached and the consideration given to maintaining the safety of the purchasing community were to be legislatively backed up and that there would be no subsequent inquiry or legal battle in an attempt to justify the indemnity and the determination that the Government had made.

The regulations aspect of the Bill was a matter to which the Hon. Mr Burdett gave a great deal of consideration. On many occasions in this House members of both political persuasions have either criticised or in some cases lauded the use of regulations intended to throw power back to the Parliament which has the right of either considering a motion for disallowance or leaving it purely and simply to a provision of executive control, although executive control has not always been totally acceptable to members. Therefore, the Hon. Mr Burdett picked up the fact that there would be many regulations, and I refer to the statement that he made, as follows:

> The regulations will include such matters as the information to be included in a building indemnity policy, such as premium levels, the maximum value of claims payable, total insurer liability, and the criteria for premium determination.

Mr Burdett's recommendation to Cabinet of the day was that the Builders Licensing Act and the Consumer Transactions Act be amended and that the amendments be circulated to industry and other interested parties for comment. That approval was given and the consultation process took place with 15 major groups being consulted over a period. All interested parties supported the introduction of the scheme. My inquiries have indicated that that is still the situation so far as major groups are concerned. That is the message that has been conveyed to me by several groups with whom I have discussed the matter since the Government introduced this measure into the House. I have no doubts that such a method of approach involving consultation and discussion is one that should be undertaken on all occasions when the Government seeks to introduce legislation. We know that that has not always been the case and that, indeed, some measures before the House have not been subject to adequate consultation. Suffice to say that the preparation of the original Bill was based on consultation.

I have no doubt that the present Government accepted the previous preparation procedures and consulted widely to ensure that the climate was still favourable to the passage of this legislation. Undoubtedly, it will be beneficial to the people of South Australia undertaking to purchase homes, and it will guarantee that they are purchasing not a pig in a poke but a realisable asset which can be upgraded if and when necessary. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, although I am disappointed that it has taken so long to reach its present stage. These provisions have been sought by people in the building trade since the 1950s. Those of us who were in the trade and experienced the problems that existed knew of the problems concerning builders becoming insolvent or of small operators where, say, a death could occur leaving them in a very serious situation and sometimes involving legal wrangles, with people having to decide who was responsible and whose assets were to be wound up or where money should or should not be paid. Such matters took many months to resolve. Quite often a potential home owner had the difficulty of carrying bridging finance or other finance while matters were being resolved. In the more obvious cases where builders became insolvent or where smaller operators left the State, it was obvious that something was needed to pick up the debt by means of insurance, whether, as suggested here, by an indemnity fund or by some form of insurance through an existing insurance operator prepared to offer policies for such cover.

I suppose that I was the first person to raise the subject in the House in 1968-69. At that time the Liberal Party was not prepared to take up the matter and neither was the Labor Party when it came into office. The Hon. Mr Hill had the opportunity to pick up the idea in the other House and, because of the numbers game, was able to move an amendment in that place. That amending provision became part of the Act in the early 1970s, but the opportunity to use the provision has deliberately remained dormant since that time.

Much financial suffering has been caused over those years by builders' failures, and this has resulted in mental trauma to individuals and families. In some cases those problems were brought about because political Parties were not prepared to take up the challenge. This was more particularly because the A.L.P. Government in the 1970s was not prepared to implement a provision in the Act designed to protect consumers or potential home owners. I was always amazed at the Government's attitude in this matter. That provision was discussed many times in this House but it was first introduced by the Hon. Mr Hill in the Legislative Council.

There can be no other conclusion than that the attitude previously shown to this provision represented a deliberate rejection by that Government of the processes of Parliament. Now the same political philosophy which rejected and failed to implement that provision in the 1970s has at least implemented it in part, if not in total. I therefore commend this Government on behalf of those people who in the future may find themselves in a difficult situation, but I regret that there have been those who have fallen by the wayside in the meantime and who have been unable to make use of this opportunity. I support the provision, as I believe that it is an important one, indeed, one that should have been operating for some years.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate and for their support of this measure. As has been explained, this measure originated in its current form as a private member's Bill in another place, and indeed the member for Light has gone through the long and complex history of the actions of this Parliament and, indeed, all respective Governments, in trying to come to grips with the matter of home warranties in one form or another. The Government is pleased that this matter will be provided for in the legislation and that it will afford some remedy for home builders who find themselves in that invidious position that we have seen in the past. I am sure that all of us as local members have had cases brought to our attention where no remedy is available in these unfortunate circumstances.

The scheme proposed in this legislation is not perfect, and the Government recognises that. It has foreshadowed that there may be a need to bring the matter back to the Parliament for further amendment. However, we believe that this matter is of such urgency that, even with its imperfections, the provision should be implemented and that the undertaking should be carried out by Parliament to negotiate with interested groups and insurers in order to implement the scheme so that benefits to the community can be effected.

In conclusion, I point out that the events of recent months, the tragic bush fires and floods, have highlighted the importance that the Australian family places on their dwelling. We have seen the response from the Australian community, and even from people living beyond our shores, when it is known that there has been such incredible destruction to the homes of so many Australians. We have seen how vital the home is for family life in this country; indeed, a home is often an extension of the personality of its inhabitants. The family home is often the biggest purchase that the great majority of Australians will ever make. It is something which is the centre, or focal point, of family life, and it plays a vital role, as I see from my Ministerial perspective, in the structure of our society.

If this measure can in some small way contribute such positive factors affecting members of the Australian community in the habitation of their homes and can afford such great benefits in the living standards that we enjoy in this country, this Bill will be seen as an achievement by both political Parties and, indeed, by Parliament and its processes. I thank members for their contributions to and support for this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Repeal of the Defective Houses Act, 1976.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister say whether the Government, while considering this measure and the repeal of the Defective Houses Act, believes that the provisions of the Housing Improvement Act, which are in some way parallel, might eventually be incorporated in this area? I would appreciate any general information that the Minister can give in this matter.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The Housing Improvement Act is related to this measure only in an indirect way. Under the previous Administration, there was substantial alteration in responsibility for the administration of the Housing Improvement Act. It was, in fact, transferred to local government, where it met with not only a stormy reception but also some indifference as to its implementation and, indeed, some variance from council to council on how that Act was administered. Such responsibility has now been returned to the function of the Housing Trust and is being implemented by that authority.

There is still a substantial number of properties in this State subject to the Housing Improvement Act, and I understand that it has been one of the great instruments in bringing about a general upgrading of rental accommodation in South Australia. It is very much an instrument of the tenancy laws as much as it is of housing improvement and the building codes. However, the honourable member raises a matter which is most certainly worthy of further consideration, and I shall refer his question to the responsible Minister who will perhaps provide him with some information in due course.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I thank the Minister for undertaking to follow that course of action. I am fully appreciative of the variance which exists between what we are discussing and the improvements which it encompasses. As the Minister acknowledges, the matter regarding sufficient overlap would require further research. It may well be that the Opposition, along with the Government, would in due course be able to give adequate assistance in the changes that might prove necessary—changes which for the present allow, for example, homes to be declared under the Act but seemingly never to be removed from the register. That, in itself, is a tremendous impediment which requires considerable attention.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Arrangement of Act.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I notice that my colleague in another place, in introducing this measure, indicated (and it was a view that he had developed during his time as Minister) that the minimum value of the building work to be covered by the scheme was to be set out in regulations and that he expected that the sum involved would be $5 000. Can the Minister say whether there has been further discussion by Government on that matter, and whether the $5 000 contemplated by the Hon. Mr Burdett is the figure the Government has accepted. If there has been a variation, what is it, and why?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I believe that no final decision has been reached in respect to the minimum value of the building work to be covered by the scheme. However, as that amount is referred to in my second reading explanation, it is proposed at this time (and is the best the Government can predict) to be $5 000. I imagine that a firm figure will result from discussions with the insurers. Until the insurers have a firm enactment on which their actuaries and advisers could base the premium details, the matter could not be resolved finally by the Government. However, the Government intends to aim at a figure of around $5 000.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Whilst I recognise that consultation takes time and that the preparation of regulations can be seemingly indeterminate, has the Government set itself a time schedule in relation to these provisions coming into effect? Does the final decision about the regulations in any way leave a void in the normal activities by the passage of the Bill, allowing for the repeal of the Defective Houses Act. Because the Act is now proclaimed, and because there

is a removal in the immediately preceding section of the date of commencement, is there likely to be a void of any kind? I am not seeking to find a hole, but I suddenly realised, in looking at the previous deletion coming under the general subheading of 'Commencement', that that situation may arise.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I do not believe that that will occur. However, it is a matter that can be attended to because the proclamation of this Act can withhold that procedure, but it needs to be considered. The preparation of regulations will not take a long time: in fact, some preliminary work may have been done. The fact that the measure has been introduced and adopted by the Government indicates the urgency that the Government recognises in having this law implemented and available to consumers. I assure the honourable member and others that the Government will take all necessary action to ensure that the negotiations now needed and the preparation of the regulations are done with all due speed.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Repeal of Part IIIC and substitution of new Part.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I ask my question under the general blanket of liability of insurers, and refer to the statement made to the Chamber:

> The likely premium cost is expected to between $100 and $150, subject to further consultation with the industry. However, the Government and industry will endeavour to ensure a fair premium level.

Can the Minister say whether, in reaching what is described as a fair premium level, the Government intends in some way to compensate for indemnity or of providing funds towards the meeting of the insurable undertaking? I recognise that that would not normally be an action that the Government would contemplate at any time, least of all at present. However, it is an anticipation of what might take place, but is a hollow statement if it is being promoted on the basis of a fair premium level.

The Government is undertaking to have a major input to the creation of that fair premium level, if any endeavour or action was likely to be taken against the insurers to place them in an untenable position. If they are placed in such a position, the workings of the whole scheme will be fraught with many dangers. That is the basis upon which I would like the Minister to approach the question, and not on the basis of 'keep out or else'. It should be approached on the basis that it must be a proposition that is of business benefit to the people who will become the insurers, otherwise we may finish up with the only insurer being one closely allied to Government activity.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I guess there is always a degree of uncertainty in insurance. It is impossible to predict what will happen in the future, as insurers well know from recent events to which I earlier referred. Under the previous Administration, and under the present Government, discussions have taken place with insurers on this matter. It is expected that the premium would be between $100 and $150. However, the report given to Parliament states that that is subject to further consultation with the industry. There has been a general indication that the premium may fluctuate, depending upon how the warranty proposal pans out.

The Government has also indicated that it may be necessary to return the measure to Parliament if major problems occur. However, whilst there is a degree of uncertainty (perhaps more than usual in this instance), sufficient information exists within Government and the insurance industry to at least have sufficient certainty in the matter to assure the community that it is a practical proposition. It is well worthy of our support and of being implemented to ascertain whether or not it is the solution to a vexed matter and one which Governments have been reluctant to enter into in other jurisdictions. I cannot take this matter any further than has been indicated in the report to the Chamber.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 March. Page 511.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition accepts this measure. It is consequential upon the one that has most recently been considered by the House, and I do not believe that we require any further discussion than the assurance that it will be passed with Opposition approval.

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

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March. Page 612.)

The Hon. M.M. WILSON (Torrens): This Bill in the main brings into effect certain public promises made by the Government before the recent State election. I believe that it also brings into effect certain promises made privately by the Government before the recent State election of which the public were not aware when they went to the polls. I will deal with that matter later.

The Bill seeks to bring into effect a package of measures designed to assist the racing industry. These measures were agreed to by the Liberal Government to come into effect on 1 January 1983: in fact, there was a Cabinet decision to that effect. The measure includes the sharing of unclaimed dividends with the racing codes, the sharing of T.A.B. fractions with the racing codes, and agreement between the Government and the T.A.B. that the outstanding balance in the capital loss account of Databet will be amortised over a period of 10 years, thus allowing the resultant surplus in the T.A.B. accounts to be shared equally between the Government and the racing codes.

Additionally, the interest earned on the capital fund and commission fees received from the operation of the Broken Hill agency will also be shared on the same basis. In total, these measures would generate an estimated $924 250 a year to the racing industry. The amount generated by the first two initiatives, that is the sharing of fractions and unclaimed dividends, $761 500, will be distributed to the codes through the Racecourses Development Board to give additional control.

I think that it is very important to also say that the secondary purpose of the Bill is to reduce the bookmakers' turnover tax by .23 per cent, and we are assured by the Minister in his second reading explanation that this will result in no reduction in moneys going to the codes. In other words, they will still retain the 1.4 per cent that they now receive and, therefore, according to the Minister's second reading explanation we will see a net loss in the Treasury of about $390 000 on that measure alone. I will canvass that matter more fully in the latter part of my speech.

However, I think that it is important to put on record how this package of measures first came about, and why this legislation is now before the House. Well before the

recent State election the previous Government was in consultation with the racing industry. It should be remembered that the Tonkin Government early in its Ministry commissioned the report of the committee of inquiry into racing known as the Byrne Inquiry. This followed another famous inquiry into racing that occurred about seven years before known as the Hancock Inquiry. Upon receiving that report the Tonkin Government instituted almost all of the recommendations of that committee of inquiry. I think that it must be unprecedented in the history of Government reports that a Government has instituted so many recommendations of a committee of inquiry, a committee of inquiry that was very widely respected throughout the community. These recommendations were implemented by the Tonkin Government because there was no doubt that the racing industry (and I use that term to encompass the three codes—the horse racing code, the trotting code, and the greyhound racing code with which you are quite familiar, Mr Speaker) was in financial trouble and, in fact, continued to be so. I suggest that it is still not completely out of the woods.

No doubt the implementation of the recommendations from the Byrne Inquiry put the racing industry on its feet once again, as indeed did the implementation of some of the recommendations of the Hancock Inquiry in about 1973. Following the implementation of the Byrne Inquiry, we had the situation where the South Australian Jockey Club in particular found itself in extreme financial difficulty mainly because it found that the interest on the new grandstand was proving extremely hard to cover. It was in a situation where it had to come to the Government and say, in effect, 'Look, we cannot carry on unless something is done.' At the same time there were rumblings within the Jockey Club that resulted in a spill of positions on its committee resulting in elections, and a new committee. If I remember rightly, I believe that almost one-third of the members of the Committee were new members.

That being so, the Tonkin Government had to consider seriously what could be done to help the Jockey Club in particular and also the other two racing codes, because not only was the Jockey Club making representations to the Government but so were the South Australian Trotting Control Board and its associate clubs and the organisations connected with greyhound racing. It was obvious to the Tonkin Government that if something was done for one of the codes then something had to be done also for the other two codes. Obviously, the best way to go about that was to allocate any resources that might be able to be applied to the racing industry in a normal sharing ratio of the three codes, that is, the ratio on their performance with the T.A.B. I believe that that is something that we all accept: the Minister accepts it because it is in the Bill, and it is probably the only way it can be done equitably.

Having said that, I think that it is important to also say that the Tonkin Government decided in early October last year that a package of measures would be agreed to by the Government and, in fact, that package of measures is exactly the same as the package of measures contained in the Bill. To make sure that I get this on the record, I intend to read into *Hansard* a letter I wrote to the Secretary/General Manager of the South Australian Jockey Club that is the same letter I sent to the other codes in October 1982.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Election promises, I suppose.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: If I were the Minister, I would be careful before I started talking about election promises. The letter states:

Dear Mr Paramour,

I have much pleasure in advising you that the Government has taken a number of initiatives which will provide additional financial assistance to the racing industry in South Australia.

In consultation with the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board, a scheme has been devised whereby the three racing codes will be able to share proportionately additional moneys totalling $930 250 per annum.

The features of the scheme which was approved by Cabinet on 18 October 1982 may be summarised as follows:

1. The Racing Act will be amended to provide that, as from 1 January 1983, fractions and unclaimed dividends will form part of the income of the TAB and will be distributed to the three codes proportionately in the usual manner, but will be paid direct to funds controlled by the Racecourses Development Board. The estimated amount to be made available to the three codes from these sources will be $770 500 per annum.

2. The TAB has agreed to write off the outstanding capital loss in respect of Databet over a 10-year period. As a result of this action $142 500 per annum will become available for distribution, and the three codes will share these moneys in the usual way.

3. The TAB proposes that the interest earned on the Capital Expenses Fund and the commission fee received from the operation of the agency at Broken Hill, New South Wales, will also be made available for distribution. The three codes will receive proportionately an additional $17 250 per annum from this source.

To summarise what I have said, the following table sets out the annual distribution estimated to be made to the three racing codes based on horse racing receiving 66.9 per cent, trotting 20.5 per cent and greyhound racing 12.6 per cent of available funds.

Then follows a table entitled: 'Additional Funds—Government Initiatives'. I seek leave to have the table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Additional Funds—Government Initiatives

	Total Available Funds to Racing Industry $ per annum	Horse Racing $ per annum	Trotting $ per annum	Greyhound Racing $ per annum
Fractions	540 000	361 000	111 000	68 000
Unclaimed dividends	230 500	154 500	47 000	29 000
Capital loss Databet	142 500	95 350	29 250	17 900
Interest on Capital Fund	15 000	10 000	3 000	2 000
Commission New South Wales Agency	2 250	1 506	462	282
Total	930 250	622 356	190 712	117 182

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: The letter continues:

To be paid direct to the appropriate Funds controlled by the Racecourses Development Board as from 1 January 1983.

In addition, because of improved operations resulting from initiatives taken by the TAB it is anticipated that an additional $500 000 above the original budget surplus of $4 650 000 will be available in 1982-83 for distribution to the three codes in the usual way.

The Government believes that these initiatives and the resultant injection of new funds will provide a significant improvement in the financial base of the racing industry in South Australia and will enable the industry to be more buoyant and prosperous.

That letter was signed by me, as the then Minister of Recreation and Sport. I make two points in relation to that letter. I read that letter into *Hansard* with the accompanying table because the Minister's second reading explanation does not give much financial detail. The letter I have just read provides full financial information on this package of measures that the Minister has introduced. The figures were up to date when the letter was written but they might be now slightly out of date. I think it is inherent on any Minister when introducing legislation to provide the full financial details of the effects of that particular measure not only on the Treasury but also, in this case, on the racing codes and on the public. That is the first point I want to make.

The second point is that this measure, as promised by the Liberal Government and decided by that Government on 18 October in Cabinet, was destined to be put into effect on 1 January 1983. Immediately after that was announced we saw a public auction for the racing vote.

Mr Ashenden: Buying votes.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: It was a case of buying votes by the Labor Party, then in Opposition, which was caught on the hop by the then Government's announcement of this package of measures, and it is a good package of measures, otherwise the Minister would not be introducing it. It was caught on the hop, and it went into a huddle and consultation about it. It came out and said that it would do the same thing, but it would back-date it to 1 August. That is the promise to buy the votes. That is the type of irresponsible pre-election promise that is now getting this Government into trouble, not only in recreation and sport or in racing but also in education and other areas of government.

Mr Ashenden: The Public Service Association.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: My friend the member for Todd reminds me of the promises made to the P.S.A., the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and other unions. It is that sort of irresponsible promise, that vote buying by the former Opposition, now the Government, that is causing it financial difficulties.

Nevertheless, I support this measure. It was a Government promise, and I believe that the Government should carry out its promises, and if it had not back-dated it to 1 August I would have wanted to know why, because it promised that it would be back-dated to 1 August. We will be asking the Minister in Committee just what effect that back-dating to 1 August will have on the Treasury this financial year. We will be asking how much additional revenue is the Treasury, which is already in dire trouble, to lose as a result of this measure.

Before dealing with clause 5, I refer to the Racecourses Development Board. In this legislation the Minister (and I agree entirely) is to have funds flowing from the sharing of fractions and unclaimed dividends to be distributed through the board. The Minister said that this amount would be $761 500 in a full year. When the Tonkin Government assumed office, this board funded the three racing code statutory funds to a certain extent for various public facilities on racecourses, trotting tracks, dog tracks, and the like. The amendments introduced by the Tonkin Government, with the support of the present Minister, included an amendment to give the board power to allocate moneys for stake money, and the relevant provision of this Bill changes the whole complexion of the Racecourses Development Board which will now become a *de facto* funding authority.

Mr Evans: A financing authority for the racing codes.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Yes. As such it will have a vastly changed role from that which it had 3½ years ago: it will now become an important statutory authority in terms of the racing industry. Therefore, in Committee I will ask the Minister questions about the composition of the board and what plans he has for it, because it will now have an enormous responsibility.

Mr Becker: Will it have a vested interest?

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: The honourable member may like to deal with that aspect himself, but the board will have a serious role.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It always did have.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Well, it will have a far more responsible role than it has had in the past: it will deal not only with tracks and facilities, as the Minister knows. Clause 5 of the Bill deals with a reduction of .23 per cent in the bookmakers turnover tax. This tax was increased by the Tonkin Government. Indeed, I introduced legislation based on the relevant recommendation of the Committee of Inquiry into Racing. At page 39 of the report it submitted in November 1980, the committee said:

> Bookmakers who as a group are enjoying an exceptionally high percentage of total on-course betting turnover, are dependent upon the success and growth of racing.

I admit that here the committee was talking about the position in 1980, whereas now we are in 1983, and the racing industry has undergone great changes in the meantime. Nevertheless, that sentence is pertinent today. The report continues:

> The committee considers they should contribute additional amounts to ensure their future position in the industry, particularly as the opportunities for bookmakers to conduct their businesses are provided entirely by the clubs. The Bookmakers League submitted that bookmakers do not have the capacity to pay additional commission because overall costs are too high. The committee notes that on-course bookmakers as a group held $168 000 000 in 1979-80 which, after costs and commissions, left them with an estimated $2 550 000 profit.

I say '$2 550 000' because, although the report states '$2 650 000', I understand that that is a misprint. The report continues:

> In view of the total turnover held by bookmakers, if the sharing of that $2 550 000 unreasonably reduces the profitability of individual bookmakers then the committee considers that the present number of bookmakers should be reduced. Furthermore, it is this committee's opinion that the adoption by the Government of the recommendations in this report would provide substantial additional funds to the codes to increase stake moneys. As a result, the quality of racing will improve, the industry will grow, and bookmakers will benefit from increased turnover.

Then comes the recommendation of the committee:

> The committee recommends that section 114 of the Racing Act be amended to increase the tax on all bookmakers turnover by .3 per cent with the additional revenue from on-course operations to be paid to the respective clubs and from premises bookmakers to the Government.

I could go on and quote much more of the report, but I shall not weary the House. Members can read it for themselves. The Tonkin Government accepted that recommendation and increased the bookmakers turnover tax because it was part of a whole package of measures to help the racing industry, and the codes ended up sharing 1.4 per cent of turnover. Now, however, this Government is introducing legislation to reduce the tax by .23 per cent.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: To where it was before.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Yes, but why is the Government bringing this legislation before the House to reduce the turnover tax by .23 per cent? Some weeks ago in this House the member for Alexandra postulated that the Australian Labor Party received $40 000 in campaign funds before the last election, and it was also postulated that the Labor Party, when in Opposition, gave representatives of the Bookmakers League an undertaking that, if the then Opposition became the Government, it would reduce the bookmakers turnover tax to what it had been previously. I understand that the Minister of Recreation and Sport has already replied to questions on this point, but he has not denied that charge. Therefore I believe that that is exactly

what has happened. In my time in this House I have not seen such a blatant example of political pay-off as we are seeing in clause 5 of the Bill. I believe that the A.L.P., when in Opposition, was offered $40 000 in campaign funds by the bookmakers on an undertaking that, if and when elected, it would reduce the tax, and here we see the result of that commitment.

If the Opposition had said publicly that it intended in Government to reduce the tax and told the people the truth, it would not be so bad, although it would be bad enough. However, this reduction in turnover tax will cost the Treasury $400 000 in a full year. It will cost the codes nothing because they retain their percentage. With the community crying out for funds and with departments short on their budget (indeed, we have been told that some departments have overspent their budget), we have the Government in this measure introducing a provision that will cost Treasury $400 000. It is the most blatant example that I have seen of such a commitment by a political Party, in what I believe to be a payoff being honoured. I hope that I do not see it again.

Mr Groom: What about when you sent Mr Rundle to London following the 1979 election?

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What about Sangster and Murdoch and the soccer pools?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I hope that the Minister will explain that remark when he replies because, if he is insinuating that a bribe was offered by the Murdoch organisation to any member of the former Government, I hope that he will step outside the House and say so. I will support this Bill, because most of the provisions were promised publicly by the Government before the last election. The clause concerning bookmakers is a financial measure and, if the Government wishes to cost itself revenue, then that is a decision of the Government. Therefore, I will support the measure, but I do so with grave reservations applying to clause 5 of the Bill.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support the Bill because, basically, it is a Liberal Government initiative and one, as the member for Torrens ably pointed out, that was part of a package put together during 1982 as a result of an extremely large amount of work on the part of the Minister, his officers, and the committees operating together behind the scenes in an endeavour to bring some sort of relief to the racing industry generally. I also support the Bill because I have always believed that it was right to use, or attempt to use, revenue derived from the racing industry by returning that revenue to the racing industry to help it through its cash crisis. In fact that was the situation that occurred during 1982.

During that time enormous pressure was placed on the Government to bale out the South Australian Jockey Club. Proposals were put forward that the Cheltenham racecourse should be sold. We heard that the car parks at the Cheltenham and Morphettville racecourses should be sold off, that the ABCOS land should be sold, and proposals were made concerning Victoria Park. One school of thought indicated that we should have disposed of Cheltenham completely and reverted to two racecourses. All of these schemes (and I have made my views public on this matter) would have been disastrous for the racing industry in the long term, because South Australia needs three tracks—two tracks for regular mid-week and Saturday racing and a third track as a training facility.

As it would have been folly for those in the racing industry in the past to have sold off land that we use today, so too would it have been shortsighted of the Government to have sold off land that in the future may be desperately needed by the racing industry. The Liberal Government took all these considerations into account and looked at all the options. It is no secret that the previous Government asked the S.A.J.C. committee to investigate the sale of Cheltenham and whether that would help it out of its trouble. Fortunately, that did not eventuate. Honourable members also should be reminded of the conditions under which the S.A.J.C. committee was working in 1982. There had been a disastrous fire at Morphettville necessitating rebuilding of the stand. Then a sequence of events overtook the S.A.J.C. committee, and I refer to the international phenomenon of the hike in interest rates, which meant that the club had trouble servicing its loan.

Also, it had the problem of a drop in patrons, and it had to contend with the fact that stake moneys interstate were soaring, making interstate racing very competitive in comparison with South Australia. For South Australia to hold its class horses in this State there was a real need to do something about increasing stake money. The club was caught in a Catch 22 situation of having to service an enormous loan growing on a monthly basis while attempting to address itself to increasing stake money in an endeavour to attract class horses to South Australia and to hold class horses already in South Australia, because without these horses the club does not attract patrons and without patrons there is not sufficient turnover on the T.A.B.

The committee had to address itself to this matter. Therefore, there was a need to assist the committee through its trouble. At times the public is inclined to overlook the fact that the racing industry produces a very healthy source of revenue for the Government which it would not enjoy if the industry did not exist. This racing revenue is quite apart from general taxpayers' revenue, and any Government must think very carefully about directing taxpayers' money into a sector of the community at the expense of another. However, it is a different matter if a Government decides to reinvest revenue derived from racing back into the racing industry for the long term betterment of that industry. The former Government did this by way of a package which meant that not only did the galloping code benefit, but, because it was a carefully prepared package, all three codes benefited. I was pleased that this happened, because it would have been grossly selfish if the money had to be channelled into only one direction with the other two codes having to provide increased stake money while attempting to keep their patrons.

There is a distinction between the two sources of income, and I am pleased that this matter was addressed by the previous Government. The package introduced concerning returning the unclaimed dividends and fractions of dividends was a very fair way of addressing the situation whereby revenue that was circulating within the industry is returned to the industry. One day I hope to see a slight increase in the percentage of T.A.B turnover returned to the industry so that once again we can make the industry far more competitive with interstate fields. The average stake money for a Saturday is in the order of $8 000 or $10 000, whereas interstate it is many times those amounts. Of course, it all depends on the amount of money circulating through the T.A.B.s and on the percentages taken out and returned to the State. I hope that one day we will see the Government being in a position to increase the percentage of the turnover being returned, in the correct proportions, to the three racing codes.

In regard to clause 5, I do not want to enlarge much more on what the member for Torrens has already said, other than to say that it is the most blatant political pay-off I have seen in the racing industry. There is no need to hide the fact that I go to the races regularly, as most honourable members would know. It was well known around all of the

betting rings prior to the election what had happened, as it was well known around the betting rings prior to the 1979 election, namely, that all the bookmakers had been pressured into paying a couple of hundred dollars each to the A.L.P. campaign fund, on the understanding that if one did not pay that money one had no show of being promoted from the derby stand to the grandstand where some of the larger sums move. This was an insidious thing. Members opposite laugh, but unfortunately it is a fact of life that bookmakers over the years have been expected to contribute to A.L.P. funds, because not to do so would jeopardise their progression in seniority from one area to another. That also is general knowledge around the racing fraternity; I am not telling members something that they probably do not know at the moment. I thought it was, as I said, an insidious approach to politics to use bookmakers in this way to get them on-side, and I totally disapprove of it.

The former Minister pointed out this $400 000 which is to be returned to the bookmakers. I would like to multiply it by three, because this Government has given back to the bookmakers $1 179 000 over its projected life in return for a paltry sum of $40 000 which was donated to the A.L.P. campaign funds. That, I think, is a most disgraceful position for any Party to put itself in, going out and buying votes. It is not good, and I do not think that the people of South Australia would think highly of a Government which embarks on that type of activity. In summary, I support this amendment to the Racing Act. I have some questions, but I will ask them of the Minister in Committee.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I support the measure and congratulate the Minister on introducing this innovative Bill. The existing section 76 requires the payment of the balance created by the non-payment of fractions to be paid to the Treasurer and accredited to the dividends adjustment account which eventually finds its way to the Hospitals Fund. Under section 78, unclaimed dividends are credited to the Hospitals Fund. The effect of the amendment is that, of the fractions on dividends and unclaimed dividends, 50 per cent will in future go to the Hospitals Fund and 50 per cent to the racing codes. The benefits to the racing industry in South Australia are quite obvious. In addition, the turnover tax will also reduce by .23 per cent. Make no mistake; although that will cost something like $393 000 in a full year based on 1979-80 figures, there is not doubt that the lowering of that tax will encourage bookmakers to expand their turnover.

I would think that one could reasonably predict that within a short space of time that lost revenue will be made up simply by the expansion of bookmakers' turnover which, in so doing, will increase the revenue. I think that although in the short term there may be some short-fall of revenue, over a longer period it will be made up relatively quickly. There is no question that this is a bold piece of legislation. Making it retrospective to 1 August 1982 will make available just under $800 000 to the racing industry, which is a massive injection of funds. I think it is with regret that the member for Torrens suggested that back-dating the measure to 1 August 1982 is irresponsible.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: They were the member's words. He suggested that back-dating the measure to 1 August 1982 is irresponsible. By implication, that must mean that it is irresponsible to inject into the racing industry just under $800 000 at this point of time. I suggest that, if one looks at the present plight of the racing industry, the suggestion by the member for Torrens is in itself irresponsible, because, make no mistake, the racing industry provides employment for some 11 000 people, both full and part time; it provides benefits by way of investment, purchase of equipment, and so on. It is a very essential part of our economic base.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: The fourth biggest—

Mr GROOM: It is a large industry, but the suggestion that to back-date this legislation is irresponsible is in itself irresponsible. I think all members know that the racing industry needs that injection of funds. The Government, of course, was pledged (it was part of its pre-election promise) to reduce the turnover tax by .23 per cent, bearing in mind that the Tonkin Government increased it by .3 per cent.

The Hon. H. Allison: Was that a public promise? I never read that one.

Mr GROOM: The honourable member should pay more attention to our policies at election time, because the public certainly did. It is time that honourable members opposite stopped bleating about campaign donations.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. Allison: I never mentioned campaign donations.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: The question of who donated to which Party is a perennial allegation, and either side can make it. Honourable members should support public disclosure of campaign funds and stop bleating on occasions such as this. This measure is important to the racing industry and politics should be kept out of it. As the member for Torrens said, some of the foundations of this legislation were considered in the honourable member's time. He wants to stop bleating about who made donations to which Party and get on and support disclosure of campaign donations. This financial year, on unclaimed dividends alone, some $423 000 will be divided equally between the Hospitals Fund and the racing codes. On fractions, about $1 100 000 will be divided: 50 per cent to the Hospitals Fund and 50 per cent to the racing codes. It is a great benefit to the racing code in all its branches, and provides a sound base for continued employment and growth in this industry.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to speak briefly to the Bill. First, in relation to the fractions that are to be split between the Hospitals Fund and the racing industry, it is fair to make the point that until this change is made all of the money, the $400 000-odd, will go to Treasury and can be used by Treasury for whatever purpose it wishes. Treasury may wish to give it all to the Hospitals Fund. The argument about the Hospitals Fund is a false one; we all know that. It has gone on since the Lotteries Commission days, and has no real strength or basis. All that happens is that the money goes from the lotteries to the Hospitals Fund, not putting the burden back on the Treasury. If all money from the lotteries went to Treasury funds, Treasury would have to make a decision on how to split it up. Therefore, this does not really mean anything.

The argument that half of the fraction would go to the Hospitals Fund does not mean that the hospitals will receive $200 000 a year. What does it mean in the overall budget in that area? It is peanuts. If all of it went into Treasury, the Treasury could decide to give $200 000 to the hospital or half to the hospital and half to the racing industry, or whatever. It is a false argument. It does not mean anything to me except that it gives a bit of public credibility.

The Government has inserted the words 'Hospitals Fund', and that will please the rank-and-file taxpayers in the community and, at the same time, it will please the racing industry. That is what it boils down to. It is a sop to both areas of concern.

In relation to my colleague's comments about the racing industry and what it puts back into Treasury, I agree in part. I respect the racing industry for what it does as an industry (as it is now called) for employment. Once it was called a sport: the sport of kings, or the king of sports. When Governments supported it and started taking an

interest it was called an industry. I think it is best to call it a sporting industry, and whatever category we put it in does not matter. Many sports are becoming industries. If one looks at some of the competitive ones where human beings participate, one will find that people are paid large sums of money. People who used to be volunteers are paid; competitors who used to be volunteers are paid. The amount of money involved in sports such as tennis, cricket, football, soccer, basket ball, and many others is enormous. People now employed on a full-time basis used to be employed on a part-time basis or were total volunteers. This trend is growing yearly. It is an area in which the Government will become more involved as years go by.

In fact, the main benefit to Government from the racing industry is gambling. That is not a reflection on horse-racing, trotting or dog-racing, but if gambling were not allowed not much money would be going back to Government. If we had no gambling, not as much money would be paid for thoroughbreds—either dogs or horses. That is not a derogatory statement against the sporting industry—it is fact. It may be, as was tried in Melbourne in recent times, an idea to allow gambling to some degree on football. In years to come we may find pressures coming about for gambling facilities to be made available to other sports, and from that there may be some benefits to Governments. I say 'may', as there is a limit to the number of gambling dollars within the community. If we broaden the base for gambling, we do not automatically increase the overall amount spent on gambling but rather spread the gambling dollar to other areas and sporting industries.

Governments give a privilege to certain sections of the community. One section happens to be within the racing industry, which uses it responsibly. I am not attacking the industry or saying that it is irresponsible. Within that area we give a privilege to people to be licensed as bookmakers. It is a privilege, as not everyone can go along to the races and start up as a bookmaker. Bookmakers use their licence responsibly, in the main. It is an old profession, and is better than having S.P. bookies floating around in hotels and cheating not only on State Government but also on Federal Government revenues. We are not to know whether the people concerned will disclose their takings in their income tax returns. It is a responsible action by Governments, through the Parliament, to license bookmakers.

In saying that, we also need to be conscious that, regardless of the position in the past with two $20 000 cheques being paid over from one organisation as a guarantee to another, the world (not only South Australia and, indeed Australia) is in an economic crisis situation. From what I can gather from leaders (Prime Minister or Premiers), Governments are short of money and are running out of areas from which to obtain money to finance programmes. Governments are saying that there has to be constraint. On the Federal scene it is contemplated that superannuation benefits for Parliamentarians (and ultimately public servants) will need to be looked at, as they have become exorbitant. There has to be constraint. Whilst we are talking of constraint in these areas involving certain groups, we are saying to another group (although none are in dire trouble—good bookmakers are still able to operate and show a profit) that the State coffers can afford to take away $400 000 a year from that area of collection.

If we pick up the point made by the member for Hartley, because we take away .23 per cent we will get an increased turnover back to the bookmakers. It is an interesting concept that suddenly more people will go to the bookmakers and bet because the bookmakers will suddenly alter their odds on receiving .23 per cent from the Government. The possibility of the odds varying, because of that amount of money being involved, on each individual bet is so minute and so unlikely that we should throw that concept straight out of the window. As the member for Torrens interjected, if that is the argument, will it retract from the amount of money invested in the T.A.B.—the very area that the racing industry has been trying to promote to support the industry because it believes it is the most important area of fund-raising for them in the long term? A conflict of thinking exists between what the Government is setting out to achieve and what the member for Hartley is saying.

I go back to the concern we must have as a Parliament when we say to people that there must be wage restraint. Government is saying that there are no other easy areas to tax. The population is saying that it is being taxed too much already and that it cannot afford to pay any more taxation. That is being said by all sections of society. At the same time, we have many groups of people saying that we need to spend more money in different areas within the community for the benefit of the poor, the underprivileged, the disadvantaged and those trying to build their own homes.

Almost every one of the minor sports (as far as spectator participation is concerned) is struggling to survive. We have not got national, let alone international, facilities for many of them. We are saying to industries that we are short of money and cannot help them but that we will give to bookmakers money which would normally go to Treasury and be passed on to the Department of Recreation and Sport to help other sporting groups. We are telling those groups that we are sorry but that bookmakers (although only a small group) are able to put more pressure on us to justify their argument in support of a $400 000 benefit than can all the minor sporting groups. I find that unbelievable.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You don't understand.

Mr EVANS: The Minister will tell me that an extra $400 000 will go back to the bookmakers and races, and by that method more gate money will go towards the racing fraternity, more money will be spent on catering and more money spent at the races, as the odds will be better. If the Minister is going to use that argument, we will throw it out of the window. If he is going to tell me that bookmakers are struggling and cannot survive with the present tax, I do not believe that that is true.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Look at the Betting Control Board's report of last year.

Mr EVANS: It may be true. There is no doubt in my mind that the bookmakers are not receiving the same sort of profit as they received in years gone by. I do not deny that there has been a move by people towards the T.A.B. Some countries in the world do not even have bookmakers.

An honourable member: Are you advocating that?

Mr EVANS: No, I am not; I am saying that, if the Minister is going to use that argument, how many other small business men in this State have had to cut their cloth or could not survive in their operation and have had to give up altogether, including even some medium and large businesses in times of economic crisis? Is the Government saying that, because of the economic crisis, it is prepared to give $400 000 of taxpayers' money (a concession) to a small group of business men—the bookmakers—but it is not prepared to give it to others, in the form of stamp duty on cheques, or by other means?

An honourable member: We've already reduced their taxes.

Mr EVANS: If the honourable member is talking about reducing taxes, I point out that, if one does not show a profit in the area of income tax, one does not pay tax. If one is showing a loss, there is no benefit in having reduced income taxation—it means nothing. I recognise the major part that the racing industry plays in this State and the way it operates, and is allowed to operate, through legislation. I appreciate the responsible way it operates and the minimal amount of what one might call malpractice that occurs in

this State compared to what occurs in some other States. I believe that it has a very good (if I can use it not as a pun) track record, and that is a credit to those who manage the industry.

I recognise the point that the member for Morphett made in relation to losing Morphettville through a fire, having to rebuild and taking the gamble to build a large complex which, in the long term, must be of great benefit to the State and to that industry. However, at a time when we are talking about constraints, to direct $400 000 away from Treasury back to a small section of the business community is a little difficult for many people to understand. I suppose that the vast majority of society will never hear about it: they will not even know that it has occurred, and the pity of it all is that Governments are able to do this, when those in the community who are really in need never know how the handouts or the schemes of arrangement are put into operation.

I, like the member for Morphett and the member for Torrens, will not set out to oppose the measure. I think that it is quite clear that the Government is saying, 'This is what we want to do,' and it has the numbers: it is a numbers game. I say, 'Let the people judge,' that is, those who find out about it and how it operates. It will be interesting to see how many people support the bookmakers in their operations and to see whether the T.A.B. does not go on taking away more and more from them, especially now that the Minister will move to have T.A.B. machines in hotels as an experiment.

Of course, it is logical that one cannot just put them in some hotels, find them successful, leave them there and not put them in others, because that would also be unfair. There would then be a conflict of trading interests, as people would be attracted to one hotel and not another. That is hardly likely to push more people towards the bookmakers, either. Therefore, the Minister's concern for the bookmakers is not constant if he is authorising those machines. I believe that they are not only going to hotels but that they also could end up in shopping centres. Therefore, I merely say that I leave it to the community to judge.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to address myself this afternoon to only one aspect of the proposed amendment which is before the House, and that is clause 5, because I object very strongly indeed to the way in which the Government is pandering to a very small select group at the cost of the rest of the general community. The Government is proposing to reduce by .23 per cent the payments of money to Treasury that is being bet with bookmakers. There is only one way to look at this, and that is that there is to be a reduction of some $350 000 to $400 000 which would normally have come into Treasury but which will no longer come into Treasury under the proposal in this Bill.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: It does not matter how they put it: it is money that would have gone into Treasury funds. We have a Government which, rightly, is pointing out to the community that we are in very hard times: there is no denying that, although when the roles were reversed—when we were in Government and Government members were in Opposition, and we made that point—all they said was, 'Get out. We'll come in and fix everything.' In fact, the day after they were elected suddenly things changed and the Premier very quickly said, 'Well, of course, things are bad. We will not be able to do all the things we promised, and it is going to take a long time before we are able to get the State back on its feet because of the prevailing economic conditions.' He made the point that the situation in South Australia is not as a result of the South Australian Government: it is because of decisions that are way outside the reach and control of the State Government. That is a real turn-around. However, the point is that suddenly when members opposite are in Government they are at least admitting that times are difficult, of course, not only in South Australia but in Australia and throughout the world.

They have pointed out that despite their pre-election promise not to increase taxation they will now have to increase State taxes. How do they think that the general constituent out there who will have to pay additional taxes will feel when it is pointed out to him that the Government has made a number of decisions that will deliberately result in increased taxes to South Australians? I point out just two decisions this Government has already made which will cost South Australian taxpayers more. I refer not only to the $400 000 in this case but to another Government decision which will cost some $32 000 000, namely, the decision not to allow Honeymoon and Beverley to develop. The Government has wiped out $32 000 000 in royalties which could have come to South Australia, and that means that $32 000 000 has to be raised in taxes to pay for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: The point is that we now have yet another action by this Government coming before this House which will again cause the ordinary South Australian taxpayer to pay even more taxes, only because of the decision of this Government. We have found that this measure will remove $400 000 from State Treasury (it is as simple as that) for a very small select group of approximately 100 people. How does the Government think that the 50 000 or 60 000 residents of Todd will feel when I point out to them very clearly that this Government will cause their taxes to rise to look after 100 or so people who are purely and simply in the bookmaking field?

There is no doubt about that at all, and in fact the Minister has said in an aside during the debate that this is necessary because the income to the bookmakers is such that it is not profitable to some of them. I point out to the Minister that, according to the committee of inquiry into racing in 1980, a very strong recommendation was made that if bookmaking is not profitable the Government should act to reduce the number of bookmakers. The report does not recommend that more money be paid back to them by reducing the turnover tax by .23 per cent as outlined in the Bill presently before the Parliament. Therefore, we find that the taxpayer is subsidising the South Australian Government which is in turn making a payment to a very small, select group of people. I think that we as members of Parliament have every reason to ask why this is being done.

I would like to go back to the first day on which this Parliament sat, on 8 December, when we found that the member for Alexandra addressed a question to the Deputy Premier asking whether the bookmaking fraternity, in fact the South Australian Bookmakers League, had donated $40 000 to the A.L.P. for the campaign leading up to the election in November 1982. What do we find? We find that the Deputy Premier did not deny that that had occurred. He could have easily said, 'No, that is not true.' His reply was so evasive that one can only assume that, if the answer had been 'No,' he would have said 'No,' but he did not. He did not answer the question. Then what do we find? On 9 December the present Minister of Recreation and Sport made a personal explanation to this House about the question asked by the member for Alexandra. I have read it many times, and at no point in that personal explanation of the Minister does he deny that a gift of $40 000 was made by the Bookmakers League to his Party to assist in funding for the State election.

I would invite the Minister, if he so wishes, when he speaks very shortly to state quite categorically to this House

that the allegations in relation to the donation of $40 000 by the Bookmakers League to the A.L.P. for campaign funds are not true and that it never occurred. I invite him to do so because, at this stage he has not denied this and neither has his Deputy. Therefore, I believe that I have drawn a conclusion which many others in South Australia have drawn, and that is that this gift of $400 000 to the Bookmakers League is a pay-off for the $40 000 which it contributed to election funds.

As the member for Mallee said, odds of 10/1 are not really bad, and I bet the bookies wish they could have those odds in their favour on every bet they take on course. It is for this reason that I look at the actions of this Government most cynically. We have seen it welch on important election promises but it has not welched on its promises to repay the debts of the Institute of Teachers, the P.S.A. and the Bookmakers League—and to hell with the welfare of South Australian taxpayers! We are told not to worry about the $32 000 000 royalties we could have had from the mining industry—let the South Australian taxpayers cough up. So what, if $400 000 is given to the bookmakers! The taxpayers of South Australia can pay for that! I think the taxpayers of South Australia will quickly realise that they have elected a Government that is totally disinterested in their welfare and interested only in the money it can rip off them to support its promises to the groups that supported it during the election campaign.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They were buying votes.

Mr ASHENDEN: I think the only way we can describe it is the buying of votes, and I thank the member for Kavel for his comment. The dishonesty of this Government is such that I object very much to what the Government is doing about this payment. I cannot accept it; I certainly speak strongly against it, and I believe that the Government will find that the residents of South Australia will also object strongly to the Government's looking after a small, select group to pay off an election debt.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I have found this debate intriguing, to say the least. Apparently this Bill involves a payment of $40 000 to the Australian Labor Party and will increase taxation in the District of Todd. To be quite frank, I thought this Bill continued the attempts by the previous Minister (the member for Torrens) to improve conditions within the racing industry and to try to do something about making it more viable than it was in the past. That is what I thought the Bill was all about, and that is how I will debate the Bill.

I will not worry at this stage about $40 000 being given to the Australian Labor Party or the fact that the Bill would increase the taxation of the constituents of the member for Todd. I do not intend to speak at any great length to this Bill, because other members have shown that they want the Bill to pass. However, I believe it would be remiss of me at this time, having spoken previously to a similar Bill, not to reiterate my belief that the racing industry in any Australian State, whether we like it or not, has had a substantial effect on the economies of those States. I believe for that reason, if for no other, that we ought to be thinking about the provisions in this Bill.

The viability of the racing codes, not only of horse-racing but also trotting and dog-racing, has been examined and debated in great detail because it has played an important role in the economy of the State, and the issue of the viability of those three codes has become one of grave importance. For that reason I welcome the Bill. I was interested to hear the Minister say in his second reading explanation that T.A.B. turnover has increased recently both on and off course, particularly when we consider that recently there has been the continuing dramatic down-turn in the economy and in the spending power of ordinary people. The member for Fisher questioned whether it could be substantiated that the spending power of the ordinary people will continue in this area. It might well be that the honourable member will be proven to be correct, but I think it is important that we not be sidetracked on that issue in relation to this Bill. The important point that ought to be made in this debate is the recognition of both political Parties when in Government of the need to amend the Racing Act. What we have been putting up with this afternoon is the greatest amount of ballyhoo that I think I have had the misfortune to listen to in this House.

The racing industry has provided political Parties of all persuasions with considerable economic returns and, more importantly, it has provided employment. I thought that the question of employment was the most important thing about this Bill and the previous Bills introduced. This industry provides employment for many people. However, there is concern about the acceptance of computers in the T.A.B. operation which has resulted in a pronounced reduction in employment opportunities in the T.A.B. I regret this very much, as I am sure do all members. On the other hand, the financial assistance that this Bill will provide to the racing industry will in no small way help the industry to survive.

The racing industry is labour intensive. One does not have to be very clever to realise that bookmakers themselves provide a tremendous amount of employment. I would hazard a guess and say that one bookmaker could employ four or five persons on any Saturday afternoon. It is important to realise that one person can employ so many people. Also, the catering facilities on course and the T.A.B. operations employ many people, and there are also the trainers, jockeys, stable foremen and stable hands.

Mr Lewis: That is a motherhood statement, isn't it? The more children that are born, the more people there will be to feed, and therefore—

Mr MAX BROWN: I do not know what the honourable member is getting at.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr MAX BROWN: I am saying that the racing industry is labour intensive. As most members know, I have an interest in racing, and I had the pleasure recently of going to Tasmania. I can assure the House that the racing industry in that State is in difficulties. However, they are trying to boost the Tasmanian racing game by introducing what every other State has had for a long time—the support of big business by the promotion of certain races. That might be a step in the right direction, but it is not the be-all and end-all: it is only part of the solution of racing problems, as some parts of this Bill will be. That is why we should concentrate on the important parts of this Bill and not rave on as we have heard some speakers rave on this afternoon.

In this debate, as in previous debates, and as I have told the Minister several times both when he was Opposition spokesman on racing and since he has been Minister, I believe that, because of the big money being handed out to the racing fraternity as a result of this Bill, we should have an outside controlling body to see that the money is spent correctly for the benefit not only of one part of the racing industry but of the industry as a whole. That is important. Such action as was taken recently when we saw the Australian Oaks run early in February and the yearling sales held soon afterwards is important for the promotion of the racing industry. However, even in that case there were hazards that may have resulted in large sums going down the drain.

It is estimated that this Bill will result in almost $1 000 000 going to the racing codes, and I think that is important because such funding is greatly needed by the racing industry. The industry at present is in real need of financial help and this Bill will go some distance towards providing the help

required. I do not believe that we should engage in a debate as to whether bookmakers are getting a pay-out as a result of this Bill.

Mr Lewis: Not half.

Mr MAX BROWN: If the honourable member wants to pursue that point, I suggest that both major political Parties put their cards on the table. Although I have not discussed this matter with my colleagues, I would be willing to suggest to the Labor Party that we should disclose all the financial help we received before the last State election and before the last Federal election, provided that the Liberal Party does the same. That would be fair. If the Liberal Party is not prepared to disclose the financial help it received, its members should shut up. I support the Bill, which is an important step toward giving help to the racing industry, and I trust that the continual ballyhoo we have heard in this debate does not detract from the importance of the legislation.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): In the main, I believe that this Bill would have had a speedy passage through the House had it not been for the amendment as to the percentage of turnover tax to be paid by the bookmakers. Had the Labor Party in the first instance not received the help it received (unbeknown, I might say, to most bookmakers, many of whom were appalled to discover that the help had been given)—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What assistance did you get?

Mr LEWIS: The Liberal Party received no help at all. If it had not provided for the reduction in bookmakers' turnover tax, I do not believe that this Bill would have been any different from that which the former Minister drafted after extensive and exhaustive consultations with all sections of the racing industry. However, that has happened and that is why the Bill is being debated at such length. We cannot simply stand by and let the Labor Party, which won favour with the electors at a recent election by saying that it would, according to its conscience, redistribute the wealth of the community more fairly and equitably, turn around in one of the first measures that it has introduced since that election and redistribute money in exactly the opposite way. The Government's action is both disgusting and deceitful, but let the consequences be on the heads of Government members if that is the way they want it. Let this deceitful action be on the consciences of members of the committee who made the money available without the prior approval and knowledge of all bookmakers who subscribed to the funds that were paid over to the Labor Party.

I would happily place 'ditto' under the remarks of previous Opposition speakers, especially those of the members for Fisher and Todd, as to the comparison between this aspect of the Bill and other aspects of Labor policy. In addition to the points made by those members, I believe that a good way to determine whether bookmakers were making sufficient profit would be for the Government to fix the level of betting tax and that of the licence fee, and then we could determine whether the bookmaker's contribution in particular and that of gamblers in general to the State coffers was being maximised, by holding an annual auction for a certain number of licences. Then the Government could offer, say, 80 licences and let prospective bookmakers bid for them. Once that was done, it would determine whether the tax collected was too great or too small, because bookmakers from year to year would adjust the price they were willing to bid for a licence according to the profit they were making after paying the tax they were certain they would have to pay under the law. If the tax ever went too high, that would reduce the price of the licence, perhaps almost down to nothing. In this way a balance could be achieved between the two. I suggest that that is a fair thing.

Mr Baker: That is economic sense, isn't it?

Mr LEWIS: I think so. I suggest that it is a fair thing, because bookmakers do not have much capital tied up in their enterprises, compared with farming or even owning a deli.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It depends on how big the farm is.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, sufficient to feed a family of a man, his wife and a couple of children. If that were done we would know just how well bookmakers were doing. I believe that if any of the existing fraternity of bookmakers were not interested in making a bid and as a group or a cartel decided not to bid for the licences, plenty of people with the mathematical expertise and capacity for quick analysis of statistics would be willing to come and bid for those licences and take up the trade.

Mr Hamilton: Are you proposing this?

Mr LEWIS: I am suggesting that it is a fair way of determining once and for all what ought to be a contribution to the public purse for a licence to make a book.

Mr Ferguson: Is this your new policy?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I said that. I am advocating that.

Mr Ferguson: Is that your new policy?

Mr LEWIS: It has always been my policy. It is a personal view.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: The honourable member would do well to consider it. I am suggesting the matter as a method of rectifying the difficulties that the Government has got itself into.

Mr Ferguson: I am listening to it.

Mr LEWIS: I had decided earlier that it might be relevant and appropriate to underline the ridiculous situation that exists in regard to the provisions of clause 4, providing that the revenue obtained from levelling these taxes is paid to 'the Hospitals Fund'. What a ruddy lot of nonsense! How deceitful can you be? I think that that is indeed the most wicked of all kinds of deceit, because members opposite would stand in front of public meetings and plead that what they are really doing is helping the poor, the unfortunate, the sick, those who have broken bodies, having suffered injuries on the road or elsewhere, by providing money from this source to ensure that there are enough hospital beds, when all the sods are really doing is simply reducing the amount that they have to take from general revenue for that purpose. Therefore, it is a direct and deceitful act to try to deceive the public into thinking that the funds are specifically earmarked for a particular purpose.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Do you want to know the real history behind that?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I know that it came from Dunstan's idea of how to sugar-coat an unpalatable pill. I think that in this day and age, when the general public are very cynical about our occupation, and also, in large part, the media is criticising us as being cynical and deceitful, it is quite unacceptable that they can find illustrations of that very deceit put into the legislation that governs their lives. Is it any wonder that people are cynical about us? Until we lift our game and become a little more honest as members of Parliament making such laws, bearing in mind the real effect of such laws, then we can expect the kind of contemptuous treatment that is meted out to us by members of the general public and the media.

Mr Ferguson: Well, why aren't you honest enough to tell us where your money comes from?

Mr LEWIS: I did not catch the interjection.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr LEWIS: I well understand that, but I believe that they should be answered when they are made. They contribute to the colour of the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr LEWIS: Not for a moment would I question the validity of your ruling, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would hope not.

Mr LEWIS: I regret that it is not possible for me to respond to that remark, which was out of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: Mr Deputy Speaker, the member for Whyalla said during the course of his remarks that the racing industry increases the amount of revenue that Governments obtain from a variety of sources within the economy. I agree with that: it does. However, what the honourable member did not say was that the racing industry, which encourages gambling (and indeed that is the activity from which Governments derive their revenue), also is responsible for increasing welfare costs, because there are people who have become compulsive gamblers who, if they gamble with their entire assets, together with any dependants they have, become dependent entirely upon welfare handouts.

No Government or Parliament in the history of this country has ever had the guts to finance a sociological investigation of the effects of gambling *vis-a-vis* the increased cost of welfare that can result. Those Governments and Parliaments have simply admitted that they are not prepared to acknowledge that the problem exists, merely wanting to derive the revenue from that source, believing and hoping that the public will also believe that there is no down-side cost on the other side of the scales. Yet in our hearts we all know that there is a cost to be paid.

The other point made by the member for Whyalla concerned the employment that the racing industry creates. I agree that it does. However, the correlation does not go quite as far as the honourable member suggested in that, because someone goes to the races and eats a chiko roll, it does not mean that there will be an increase in the total number of chiko rolls consumed that day: a person may go somewhere else and eat a chiko roll and, therefore, it is quite illogical to argue that eating a chiko roll at the races increases the number of jobs at the chiko roll factory.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I believe that it is necessary to confine one's remarks to aspects which are indeed relevant to the argument.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair recognises the complexity of the honourable member's argument, but I wonder whether he can get back to the Bill.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. I take your point, and I only wish that the member for Whyalla had understood the same point. I also wonder how increasing the amount of money left in bookmakers' pockets will increase employment. I do not see the circumstances arising where bookmakers will employ anyone for one hour longer simply because the provisions of this Bill, if it passes, will increase the amount of money that they retain. I cannot see how that can possibly happen. I do not see any benefit in that proposal. It was not a part of the Bill that the former Minister drafted and proposed to introduce.

Before I conclude my remarks, I also want to refer to some remarks that were made by you, Mr Deputy Speaker, with which I agree, when speaking in your capacity as the member for Whyalla, and your supporting the view that there needs to be greater accountability of the funds that are obtained by the industry through the mechanisms provided in law (that is, by this Parliament) and that there needs to be some greater measure of competence demonstrated by organisations that receive that money and apply it for the purposes for which they say they are going to apply it. I am concerned about the way in which the competence of those individuals could and should be questioned and also about the way in which their motives could and should be questioned in the course of determining accountability. They are both very serious questions to pose concerning people in positions of considerable responsibility. I accept personal responsibility for raising such questions.

Of course, the most glaring example of this in recent times has been the incompetent way in which the S.A.J.C. has handled its affairs and the white elephant-type ivory tower which it built to replace the burnt-out grandstand and which was more particular about providing pleasant facilities for members and their friends than about providing facilities for the racing public. Yet, it was spent in the name of racing. I think that is disgusting.

I think it was equally disgusting for the S.A.J.C. or any part of it to argue that the Government should pick up the tab and save it from its self-inflicted difficulties. I reject that kind of approach utterly. The S.A.J.C. knew what it was doing. If it did not then it ought not be left with the responsibility of ever making such decisions again, collectively or individually.

Mr Ferguson: Who would have the responsibility? Would you give it to the Government?

Mr LEWIS: I do not want to take the time of the House now, but there are mechanisms by which it would be possible, within a matter of a few months, to determine how best to go about that. Amongst them would be examining the implications of establishing a racing commission.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I agree with the interjection of the Minister that that needs to be canvassed in the full spectrum of options available to it. Some select committees have produced good results, and this might be a subject upon which a select committee could do something useful. I have seen select committees in the past which have led me to believe that the truth might lie in the opposite direction. However, I would say in this instance that it might be possible.

Mr Groom: That is a reflection on the former Government.

Mr LEWIS: It is a reflection on anyone who has participated in a select committee that did not come up with anything constructive.

Mr Hamilton: That is a nice statement.

Mr LEWIS: I have no compunction about saying that.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: You would like to get your nose into the public trough, too!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I now draw attention to the difficulty which the codes are having in country areas.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Crows?

Mr LEWIS: Codes. Two areas concern me. The first is the lousy dog-in-the-manger way which elements within the Racecourses Development Board and the rest of the industry that is based in the metropolitan area have treated country racing and the necessity to provide assistance and a fair go for those clubs which would service tourism development opportunities as well as remote communities in the locations in which they operate—clubs like, for instance, the one in my electorate (and other members can speak for their own, I am sure) the Mindarie-Halidon club.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: One meeting a year.

Mr LEWIS: Yes; it is very well attended and it is a good day out, but no-one can spend any money on it except the Racecourses Development Board.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, no doubt about that, and the last three meetings have been almost fly free. It is a lovely place to go for a day's racing and the odds are as good as one can get anywhere. One can look the field over before the horses

go out into the starter's hands. Several thousand people enjoy that picnic race meeting every year.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: How many thousand?

Mr LEWIS: Several thousand. Six thousand at the last meeting were paying customers—the kids do not have to pay. When I go to that sort of meeting for the day, unlike some people here, I just cannot 'tie a knot in it' or 'cork it'. I believe that it would be fair if the Racecourses Development Board recognised the primeval urges in the call of nature by permitting the club to provide some better toilet facilities than the drought affected mallee to get behind. In those circumstances, one runs the risk of not only the redbacks but also some of the 'snakes' that are around the place. I think that it would be fair to provide better facilities in country club circumstances than have been provided in the past, and the board would do well to look into that.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I think that the board has looked into toilets obviously. It is particularly embarrassing for the fairer sex. They should not be expected to expose themselves in a stubble.

Let me pass on (and I mean no pun by making that remark) to another matter, somewhat the same, and that relates to trotting. I will paraphrase briefly a letter sent to me by one of my constituents. He asks me to explain the current situation with country trotting meetings at the present time. He states that there are no longer T.A.B. meetings (there is no T.A.B. available on them), and that 5DN has refused to broadcast those meetings because Harold Park or Moonee Valley are held on the same night. He said that he realised that one cannot influence 5DN, but he asked if I could exercise some influence over the T.A.B. He said that it was a shame that we must always play second fiddle to the Eastern States and, when those Eastern States meetings are supported from within our own State in preference to South Australian sports, he thinks we ought to look again at our priorities.

That is in keeping with the general thrust of this Bill. If we do not encourage interest in country meetings in our own racing industry, how will we improve employment here? If we do not run the T.A.B. on those meetings we will not be encouraging or obtaining interest in them; therefore, we will not see the development and improvement of those employment opportunities that the member for Whyalla and others were referring to. I think that is regrettable, and I agree with my constituent on that point. My constituent also enclosed a newspaper column written by John Tee, a race caller, who writes his column attributable to 'Tee Jay', and he calls it 'Teed up'. This problem has been pointed up when 'Tee Jay' says:

> The Port Augusta meeting recently was the last covered by 5DN and T.A.B. as the format has now been altered to include Moonee Valley and Harold Park meetings only. It certainly seems pretty rough and the worst part is that the clubs concerned can do very little about it. It really makes one wonder about the slogan 'It's our State, mate', as it seems far from the truth, although like most sport, money speaks many languages . . .

In other words, the trotting meetings held at Moonee Valley are more important than are those held at Port Pirie, Kadina, Port Augusta or Strathalbyn, or wherever, in the opinion of those people running the T.A.B. In the short run that may be all right, but in the long term that is a formula for disaster.

The Minister would know, as my constituent has pointed out in his letter, that the Interdominion is to be held in Adelaide next year. That event brings a lot of interest, wherever it is held. Do we really deserve it? We are not promoting trotting in our State by this policy (and the letter I have received from my constituent rightly points that out) but trotting in other States is being promoted by our T.A.B.

Mr Ferguson: Do you want to take it away from South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I have not said that. I am saying that T.A.B. policy may ultimately mean that so much interest will be lost in trotting in South Australia that we will lose recognition and not be considered worthy of running the Interdominion. We should be looking after South Australia.

Mr Ferguson: I agree.

Mr LEWIS: Do not try and ascribe to me opinions that would do otherwise, because they are not ever mine.

An honourable member: That was the impression you were giving.

Mr LEWIS: Only to weak distorted minds that suffer from paranoia. My constituent simply asks that I obtain from the Minister an answer to his concern, his queries, in that matter. I point out that it was also the concern expressed by 'Tee Jay'.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Have you referred it to me?

Mr LEWIS: No, I have only just received it today. It came, I guess, as a direct result of his knowing that the Bill was on the Notice Paper. He has spoken to me before and I advised him of that fact. I have delayed the House long enough. By making that remark I do not detract from the seriousness with which I view the adjudged reasons why the Government has decided to give the bookmakers a pay-out of $400 000 a year, nor do I attempt to excuse the concern expressed by other members on this side of the House about that. It is regrettable that that money could have provided more than the dole for over 100 young people and could have gone a long way towards a number of projects of one kind or another in the welfare area that would have been of far greater value to the State and South Australians than it is to bookmakers who will now retain it.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): It is so often my lucky lot to follow the penetrating eloquence of the member for Mallee. It is always a hard act to follow. Many allegations have been made about bribery and about money paid by bookmakers to the Labor Party for this legislation. I know nothing of it but can recall it being raised a number of times in the House. I have never seen anything come forward to prove it or substantiate it. I believe members opposite are flogging a dead horse unless they can prove it.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: There seems to be nothing to substantiate it. I am sick of hearing about it unless members opposite can back it up. I am sure the public feels the same way. Many comments have been made about the legislation. In all the comments made I do not think I have heard one comment from the Opposition about any benefit to the racing industry.

Mr Lewis: You should read my speech.

Mr PETERSON: I will read it afterwards—I cannot speak on it now. In all the allegations of donations from people and in comparing donations and their sources, all those points mean nothing if the legislation is not of some worth to the industry.

It was mentioned also that select committees are of no use. I take umbrage at that comment. I had the pleasure of sitting on a select committee, the recommendations of which were well considered. That committee worked hard to reach a consensus. It is wrong to say that such committees do not work competently. The future of all Parliaments (especially this one) depends largely on select committees. On that select committee we received delegations from the racing codes. They put forward arguments on difficulties they were experiencing. Part of it was development and part of it was

lack of support from the public. The legislation must surely help to counteract those difficulties.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: But the honourable member has not supported it. The member for Mallee also mentioned a fly-free race meeting. Does that mean that one is flown to the meeting for nothing, as they do in some competitions? He also mentioned the white elephant decision of the grandstand at Morphettville. That was erected on a committee's recommendation—a committee which represents the industry. 'White elephant' might be an exaggeration, especially when we have Football Park. The honourable member said that he cannot stand by and see a decision made to give more money to persons with high incomes and that it is a deceitful act to pass this legislation. He also mentioned auctioning the licences for bookmakers. We could extend that into all areas. We have fishing licences and taxi permits. I do not know too much about bookmakers and do not follow the racing industry. I do not support them but I cannot see anything wrong with the legislation.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: You stick to rugby.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, I am good at that. I cannot see anything wrong with the legislation. If we are talking of auctioning licences, we must apply it to every licence. The concept would then be to sell the capital equipment to any other industry with a licence if we take the concept of auctioning the licence annually. If one has a water licence on the Murray River, one could auction it as it needs only a pipeline to take it elsewhere. That argument is not logical if one considers the concept of the legislation.

It is also mentioned that no Government has been game to appoint a royal commission into gambling. It was proposed by the Tasmanian Government some years ago and was taken to a State conference and rejected by every Premier at the conference. There must have been some Liberal Premiers there at that stage. It seems that both Liberal and Labor alike do not want it.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Yes, it would be fair to say that. It would be a worthwhile undertaking but I do not know how we could get it. If the major political Parties do not support it, there is no way we would get it. Dishonesty of Government in this legislation was also mentioned. As all the comments from Opposition members are against the legislation, does it mean that everybody supporting it is indulging in an act of dishonesty? If members opposite believe that the legislation is not correct, it is their function as an Opposition to vote against it. They cannot speak against it and vote for it and act validly as an Opposition. I support the legislation. I do not see anything drastic in it or anything that will seriously affect the future of the State. In the short and long term it will benefit the racing industry.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I have enjoyed listening to members on both sides in the debate. The Racing Act or any gambling activity seems to promote a good deal of debate in the House. I want to go back in history—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Don't go too far back—you might dig up a few skeletons.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am sure the member for Alexandra would not want me to do that. It would be to his disadvantage. The member for Torrens mentioned the Hancock Inquiry which led to the introduction of the Racing Act in 1976 and, indeed, the committee of inquiry into racing set up by the previous Government when the member for Torrens was the Minister concerned.

I also want to remind him and the House that most of the recommendations, if not all of them, from the committee of inquiry to which he referred were supported by the Opposition at that time and I, as spokesman, supported them for two reasons: first, I believed that it was in the interests of the racing industry and, secondly, I believed in being fair and honourable as far as the debate on the racing industry was concerned.

Before dealing with what I believe is the most controversial aspect of this legislation, that is clause 5, dealing with the bookmakers' turnover tax, I want to make some further remarks. I want to remind the member for Torrens and the House that in 1979 and, indeed, up until the last 12 months or six months or so, the racing industry (that is the gallopers, the trotting and dog racing industry) was not satisfied with Government inquiries, despite those two that occurred in 1976 and in 1979-80. That dissatisfaction has been expressed to me on quite a number of occasions by people involved in the industry itself. From time to time during the course of the three years of the Tonkin Government all sorts of proposals were put forward. From time to time we read in the press and heard in this House of significant improvements in all sorts of aspects of the racing industry. However, I say quite clearly that the racing codes themselves were not satisfied and did not have confidence in the previous Government.

Indeed, it was also pretty significant to me, as the Opposition's spokesman at that time, that certain undertakings in regard to the codes needed to occur as well as the recommendations contained in the report of the committee of inquiry at that time. As the member for Torrens has said, it is true that the major proposals in this Bill in regard to the fractions, unclaimed dividends and other arrangements that were made between the Government and the T.A.B. were the work of the previous Government. I supported them and I still support them. Indeed, I believe that they would still go only part of the way to solving the problems of the codes at this time. However, they are on the way back: there is no argument about that.

Of course, there was reference to the new-look committee of the South Australian Jockey Club and, without casting reflection on those who went before, it is certainly adopting a more positive attitude to the problems of the Jockey Club than has ever occurred before. As a consequence, a combination of factors is occurring. The Jockey Club and the other codes are also showing some initiative of their own which I believe is commendable. The racing industry should not rely on Government hand-outs. I believe that this is not a hand-out: I believe that it is an entitlement. Therefore, as I said, I make due reference to the previous Government which announced this proposal in about October 1982.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: It took a long time to work out.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That may be the case. Nevertheless, it was a significant proposal because one should remember that the figures that we are now contemplating are, of course, based on figures over the last 12 months. Who knows what the situation will be in the future? The amount of money involved, as far as the fractions and unclaimed dividends are concerned, depends on the investment. Of course, if one looks at the reports from each financial year one will see that those amounts have been increasing each year. Therefore, it may be that the amounts that I have mentioned in my second reading explanation and by other means will not be the amounts that will be paid to the racing codes; and half goes to the Government. Of course, as time goes by they will change. There is no doubt that they will increase significantly. Nevertheless, the racing industry is an important industry to South Australia.

I said a moment ago that it should not look for Government support unduly but, at the same time, I believe that the industry is in a position now of having greater confidence, and this is happening, most unusually, at a time of economic

down-turn. The obvious example is the increase in the turnover of the T.A.B. It would appear that this year it will exceed what it calls its budget by something like $4 000 000 or $5 000 000 and it will be a record turnover. Therefore, the point I also make in that regard is that that significantly assists the racing industry because the surplus of the T.A.B. is divided in regard to the amount of betting on each individual code. Therefore, all of the codes will benefit significantly in regard to the increased turnover by the T.A.B. Of course, the proposal now before the House will add substantially to that amount.

A point was made (and perhaps I should take this up with the member for Torrens in the Committee stage) about the proposal in regard to the Racecourses Development Board and the stake money. However, at this stage I would say only that over a number of years the charter of the Racecourses Development Board was changed by the previous Government, and I appreciate that this point was made by the member for Torrens. I support it because I believe that the board plays a very significant part in providing facilities as far as the industry is concerned. We are intending to give them greater responsibility (I think that was the word that the honourable member used) in regard to having an option through to the controlling body in regard to the distribution of stake money to clubs. I personally do not see anything wrong with that because, by comparing stake money here with any other State, there is absolutely no comparison. I think that that point was made by another member in debate. Of course, the problem that arises is that owners are tempted to race good horses in other States where the prize money is much greater.

Therefore, part of the story to get the racing codes back on their feet and running is to ensure that stake money is at least somewhere comparable to that of other States. This is a move to do that as well and to encourage the racing industry and the racing clubs to increase their stake money. I want to move on to what I would describe as probably the most controversial aspect of this legislation, and that is bookmakers' turnover tax. First, I think that there is a general misconception about bookmakers. In the public mind they are seen as rather rich sort of people who somehow or other impose on the public generally, so there is a misconception about the status of bookmakers generally.

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

TRANSPLANTATION AND ANATOMY BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DEATH (DEFINITION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMERCIAL TRIBUNAL—CREDIT JURISDICTION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

COMMERCIAL TRIBUNAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading resumed.

(Continued from page 722.)

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport): Prior to the dinner adjournment I was referring to the status of bookmakers in the community. Remarks have been made during this debate that members opposite believe the reason for the introduction of clause 5 is that it is in some way a 'pay-off' (I think was the word used) to the Bookmakers League. I have said in this House before, and I repeat, that I am not aware of any donation being made to the A.L.P. by bookmakers, or by anybody else. Nor do I care! It has nothing to do with me. We all know that from time to time (probably at the time of every election) donations are made to both of the major political Parties by different groups in the community.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Throughout the course of this debate numerous calls have been made by honourable members for the Minister to reply to specific challenges. As I recall, clause 5 of this Bill is one of the clauses in question. Therefore, I will be paying special attention to debate on this clause.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The accusations made are quite ill-founded. I could not, nor do I, care less whether the Bookmakers League, or anybody else, made a donation to the Labor Party. When legislation to increase bookmakers' turnover tax was introduced into this House by the former Minister I vigorously opposed it on behalf of the Opposition. I will refresh members' memories about this matter by referring to some points I made on that occasion, when I said the following:

> It appears to me that the additional tax of .3 per cent would have a very serious effect on many bookmakers in South Australia. If one reads closely the content of this section of the report—

the committee of inquiry report—

> one will see the committee gives little credence to the fact that many bookmakers do not enjoy the success that one would expect.

There was a table on page 38 of the report that the member for Torrens referred to. That table indicated the bookmakers' profits and showed that their average income at that time was less than $20 000 a year.

There are various categories of bookmaker set out in the *Government Gazette*. All bookmakers must lodge a deposit, a personal bond in a form approved by the Betting Control Board and supported by such security as the board shall from time to time determine. Of the several categories of bookmaker, the class A bookmaker is permitted to bet on the rails at a horse-race meeting in the metropolitan area. He pays a bond of $30 000. A class B bookmaker is permitted to bet on locations other than the rails and grandstand and must pay a bond of $25 000. The class C bookmaker is permitted to bet on trotting and dog-racing meetings in the metropolitan area and pays a bond of $20 000. Class D and E bookmakers pay a deposit of $15 000. Bookmakers on the flat enclosure, which has now been closed (another happening I opposed) paid a bond of $10 000.

When the former Government introduced that Bill in 1980 I vigorously opposed the increase in tax on bookmakers' turnover. I made it clear at that time that I was strongly opposed to that increase because I thought that it disadvantaged bookmakers. I am on the record of 2 December 1980 about that. One of the points I made on that occasion is worth repeating. It is interesting to trace the history of the bookmakers' turnover tax in South Australia and to compare it to the tax in other States because it is higher in South Australia than in any other State. This proposed legislation brings that tax back to where it was in 1979-80, and I do

not think that there is anything wrong with that. Turning to the Betting Control Board report for the year ended 30 June 1982, one sees that the chairman of the board, through the then Minister of Recreation and Sport, had the following to say:

The total turnover of bookmakers for the year amounted to $174 850 553 compared with $173 374 688 for the previous year. Of this turnover, $164 574 299, or 94.15 per cent, was paid out to investors. Out of the remaining $10 000 000, which is 5.85 per cent, $1 960 629, or 1.12 per cent, was distributed to various racing, trotting and greyhound clubs. The balance, $5 881 913, was the gross profit of licensed bookmakers, out of which such bookmakers had to cover all expenses, including payment of licence fees, clerks and travelling expenses, club fielding fees, licence and betting service fees, and the like.

If one examines the Betting Control Board Report, one sees that it is fairly obvious that the turnover of bookmakers has remained more or less static in the past three or four years. There has been a reduction in the number of persons involved but, as I said, there are various categories of bookmakers. There is no doubt that some of them do particularly well. I think that is also emphasised in the Betting Control Board Report where it was mentioned that a percentage of bookmakers do receive quite a substantial percentage of the total turnover. On the other hand, the majority of them do not do exceptionally well. For instance, the derby stand is a disaster area at present for bookmakers. They are in real trouble. What we are trying to do is equalise the situation and bring it back to what it was previously.

The member for Torrens and others have suggested that this legislation is a pay-off to the bookmakers. Nothing can be further from the truth. I want to quote a letter I received from Mr Stevens, Chairman of the South Australian Bookmakers League, dated 15 April 1982, as follows:

Dear Mr Slater,

The registered bookmakers in South Australia pay a tax on turnover which was increased by .3 per cent following a recommendation of the 1980 Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry. On their holdings in fiscal 1981 this represented an increase in bookmakers' expenses each year of over half a million dollars.

The impost has had a serious effect on the viability of some bookmaking businesses. The Betting Control Board's Report for 1980-81 indicated that our members operating in the derby stand enjoyed a winning percentage (on holdings) of only 4.52 per cent before expenses. The board has recently interviewed a number of bookmakers whose asset position has become in the board's terms 'less than satisfactory'.

The members of our league have asked me to determine your Party's attitude in regard to the removal or retention of this intolerable burden. Your early attention to this request would be greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) K.V. Stevens, Chairman

On 24 April 1982, I replied to Mr Stevens, as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 15 April 1982 in relation to the bookmaker's turnover tax and the increase of .3 per cent following a recommendation of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry in South Australia. You would be aware that I and my Party vigorously opposed and voted against the increase in turnover tax when the legislation to amend the Racing Act was before the State Parliament.

I note with interest the contents of your letter in regard to the Betting Control Board's Report, 1980-81, and that your members operating within the derby stand enclosures achieved a very small percentage of winnings on their turnover. You may be assured that the Labor Party in Government would seek to ensure the viability of bookmakers and the racing industry generally. I do not have to emphasise the failure of many of the recommendations of the committee of inquiry accepted by the Government which have not shown any substantial improvement to the industry; quite the contrary, many have had a deterrent effect on the viability of sections of the industry.

The Labor Party would readjust the turnover tax to ensure viability and also consider other financial aspects of the racing codes in an endeavour to provide a more equitable solution to the problems associated with the industry.

Thank you for your letter and the information contained therein.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) Jack Slater, M.P. (member for Gilles) Shadow Minister of Recreation and Sport

I emphasise the fact that I opposed the legislation when it was introduced previously, and one of my reasons for introducing it at this time is to restore the *status quo* as in 1979-80. I think that that is fair and reasonable. I believe that since that time the bookmakers' position has deteriorated even further. As I mentioned previously, we have had substantial increases in T.A.B. turnover. This has not been matched with the turnover of bookmakers which has remained static, so on that basis one would assume that on current indications their turnover has decreased somewhat in actual terms.

In comparison with the on-course totalisator and T.A.B., bookmakers work in a risk situation. They take the risks. Losses are normally made betting on local races and are somewhat offset by betting on interstate races. This was part of the submission made to the committee of inquiry on behalf of the Bookmakers League. Between 1972-73 and 1978-79, there was a 59 per cent decline in bookmakers' real net profits on galloping meetings—a 28 per cent decline in real net profits on all meetings—and that situation has remained static or even declined since that time. That was part of the submission made to the committee of inquiry at the time.

Over the past 15 years the turnover tax payments by bookmakers have increased significantly faster than the turnover itself or the consumer price index, so I believe that we are not patronising a particular section of the community, but just restoring the *status quo* which should never have been disturbed. I believe that the committee of inquiry made its recommendation somewhat with tongue in cheek. One particular paragraph of the committee of inquiry's report was emphasised, namely, that bookmakers enjoyed an exceptionally high percentage of total on-course betting turnover and were dependent on the success and growth of racing. That is so, but I ask the House to note the following comment:

In analysing the betting operations of bookmakers, the committee considered it inappropriate to be guided only by averages because of the widely varying turnover from bookmaker to bookmaker.

Some field on only a few meetings each year with an annual turnover of less than $300 000 per bookmaker. Others field on more than 100 meetings per year with an annual turnover in excess of $3 000 000 per bookmaker.

Therefore, it is very difficult to assess the general situation. No doubt some of the larger bookmakers do quite well. This is emphasised in the Betting Control Board Report. The average over-the-board bookmakers and other bookmakers certainly do not do quite so well. Therefore, I believe that the recommendation previously made is somewhat tongue in cheek and not made with a great deal of enthusiasm. At that stage the Government picked up the recommendation, as it did a number of recommendations in this report. I am not criticising the report at all, as I believe that the committee, chaired by Des Byrne, with members K.S. Ricketts and C.R. Lee, did a good job. Some of the recommendations were exceptional. Although we do not agree with some, and I made that view known when the measure was first introduced, I am still of that opinion on this occasion.

I refer to comments made by the member for Mallee, who suggested that bookmakers' licences should in some way be auctioned. Nothing could be more unusual, because skills are involved in the operation of a bookmaker. One has to know something about the industry, and one also needs quite a deal of experience in fielding at the races or at any of the other events.

Mr Max Brown: You do at Broken Hill!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: As my colleague the member for Whyalla has said, this applies particularly at Broken Hill.

The SPEAKER: At the moment I am giving a generous interpretation of Standing Orders, but I would hope that we can get back to the Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Mallee suggested that in some way bookmakers' licences ought to be up for auction every 12 months. I do not believe that anyone would accept that proposition very seriously because the Betting Control Board keeps a very eager eye on the operations of bookmakers. I believe that the Betting Control Board does an exceptionally good job. The member for Mallee also said that the Racecourses Development Board should be more generous to country racing clubs. For the honourable member's benefit, I point out that the Racecourses Development Board has been fairly generous to country clubs, particularly since the board's operation has been extended, giving it the opportunity to provide not only public facilities but also facilities for the club.

Recently, the Racecourses Development Board circularised country clubs requesting that those clubs advise the board of their needs. That is a move in the right direction. The board cannot satisfy all demands immediately, and I have no doubt that some country clubs are lacking facilities. I take up the point made by the member for Mallee concerning the Mindarie-Halidon Club's need for toilet facilities. That club has been part of the deal for public facilities provided by the Racecourses Development Board. However, I point out that that racing club has only one meeting a year. The Racecourses Development Board must assess the financial aspects of a country club, and I am sure that that will be done.

The member for Torrens mentioned the lack of financial aspects contained in the second reading explanation, concerning dividends, fractions and other matters. In regard to dividends and fractions, if the operation commences on 1 August 1982, as opposed to 1 January 1983 which was the previous Government's proposal, the additional cost per year to Treasury will be $250 000.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Is that for this financial year?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes. The benefit to the industry will be $385 000, and for a full year it will be about $600 000. For a full year the total benefit will be $924 000. I mention that only in passing; it was not intended to hide anything, because I do not think we need to do those things. This is an important piece of legislation for the industry. At present there is a confidence which did not exist before but which has evolved because of a number of factors. I am sure that members of the Opposition would agree with me that racing, trotting and greyhound clubs have taken the view that if they run into trouble they could go to Government. Unfortunately, this view has existed in the past, and I think it is one that the Government might have inherited. I do not think that that is the way it should work. I believe that they should be assisted by Government but that they should assist themselves also. This legislation will assist in that endeavour.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: This clause will allow section 5 to come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. The Minister would not know the exact date, but does he intend the commencement to be backdated, to be soon, or to be in the next financial year? Will he give the Committee some idea when he expects these provisions relating to bookmakers to come into operation?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I would expect provisions to come into operation as soon as this legislation passes both Houses. I would like the legislation to become operational as soon as possible. The appropriate time might be at the beginning of the next financial year. I cannot give any definite undertaking, but I would think that it would be most appropriate to commence at the beginning of the financial year. It certainly will not be retrospective.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—'Application of balance of fractions by Totalizator Agency Board.'

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: According to the Minister's second reading explanation, there is $761 500 per annum to accrue to the racing clubs through the division of fractions and unclaimed dividends. How much of that $761 500 is applicable to fractions?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am not quite sure. The total available would probably be in the vicinity of $540 000 or $550 000 for fractions. It depends on a number of factors. It will vary, and I could not give a precise figure. It is likely that the unclaimed dividends will amount to $230 000 as total funds available to the industry. To summarise, the fractions, unclaimed dividends and other items (capital loss bet, Databet, interest on capital fund and commission to New South Wales agency) amount to about $940 000 a year.

Mr BECKER: I am wondering how the Minister arrives at this figure. He does not say it is an estimate. I quote from his second reading explanation on 23 March 1983 (page 611 of *Hansard*), as follows:

> The Government, therefore, in light of the continuing difficulties of the industry, proposes to provide to the industry additional funds of approximately $761 500 per annum. This will be achieved through the sharing of unclaimed dividends and fractions on dividends related to Totalizator Agency Board betting, one half being paid to the Hospitals Fund and the other half being shared between the separate funds of the three racing codes within the Racecourses Development Board . . .

If we look at page 379 of the Auditor-General's Report dated 30 June 1982, under the heading 'South Australian Totalizator Agency Board', we find that in 1979-80 the amounts payable in fractions to the State Government for the past three years were as follows: 1979-80, $820 000; 1980-81, $895 000; and 1981-82, $1 003 000. At page 29 of the same report, under the heading 'Hospitals Fund', we find under the subheading 'Receipts, South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—transfer of fractions—Dividends Adjustment Account' the amount of $977 000. The three financial years, 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82, show that none of the figures quoted under the T.A.B. as amounts paid to the Hospitals Fund or to the Government actually link up with the amount that was received in the Hospitals Fund.

First, we have a discrepancy there of several thousand dollars on each account. There is no way of tracing where the money from the T.A.B. has gone into the Hospitals Fund. I would have thought that the Auditor-General's Report would be an accurate record of what has happened to the money going from the T.A.B. into the Hospitals Fund and, therefore, I take the point made by the member for Torrens: how is this figure of $761 500 arrived at and how accurate is that figure? Can the Minister also explain to me why the amounts stated as being paid from the T.A.B. to the Hospitals Fund do not add up?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I think that we had better get it clear from the start that this is an estimate and that I am not doubting the accuracy of the Auditor-General's Report. The figures I quoted for the member for Torrens were the funds available to the racing industry and not the total: 50 per cent will go to the racing industy, divided in accordance with the amount of investment from each code. It is on that same basis that we will distribute the surplus now, and

50 per cent will still go to the Hospitals Funds or the Government. The estimate that I have for total available funds from fractions in 1982-83 is $1 100 000. The unclaimed dividends will probably amount to $423 000, but we do not know this because it is not possible to accurately assess the actual amount. This amount varies every three months in distribution.

The total available funds from both fractions and unclaimed dividends is likely to be $1 500 023, of which the Hospitals Fund will receive 50 per cent, amounting to $761 500, and the racing industry will receive $385 000 or thereabouts from fractions and $148 000 from unclaimed dividends.

Mr Becker: You are working this from an inflationary figure?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, it is an estimate. It is not an inflationary figure but one that occurred previously.

Mr Becker: There must be some basis?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The basis of the estimate is on previous figures, and there will be $1 100 000 from fractions of total available funds and $423 000 from unclaimed dividends.

Mr BECKER: The Minister still has not answered the question. The figures quoted under Totalizator Agency Board in the Auditor-General's Report for fractions and unclaimed dividends show that those amounts do not link up with the amounts that have been credited to the Hospitals Fund. This gets to the whole point I want to make that, whilst I accept that the Minister has quoted an estimate of what will be paid to the racing clubs—$761 500—the same amount will be paid into the Hospitals Fund under the dividends adjustment account. I take it really that the T.A.B. turnover has increased substantially over the last seven or eight months, and one would assume that it would keep pace with inflation. Therefore, we would be talking about 11 to 12 per cent. I want to be assured that if we are going to be given an estimate that will not be too far out and we expect this amount of money to go to the Hospitals Fund, it will be an accurate amount. There is a conflict in that the Auditor-General's Report states that the T.A.B. has paid so much to the Hospitals Fund, and yet when I examine the details of that fund I cannot make the figures equate. What has happened to that money, and what has happened to the difference?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The honourable member would, no doubt, be using the Auditor-General's Report to 30 June 1982. I do not have a copy of that report with me, but we are referring to the total surplus of the T.A.B. which, at that time, did not include—

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: We are talking about fractions.

Mr Becker: Fractions and unclaimed dividends.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I cannot recall the figures quoted and I do not know the immediate answer. If members seek the information, I will certainly obtain details on that part of the surplus. I do not have a copy of the Auditor-General's Report in front of me, but if I can obtain the information for the honourable member I will be happy to advise him in due course.

Mr BECKER: I am surprised that there is not an Auditor-General's Report under the Minister's desk. A copy is available to all members. He should also have the T.A.B. report, the Betting Control Board Annual Report and other such reports. This clause is a money matter and deals with the payment of funds and what is happening for the future of the funds. I will be seeking information on the Betting Control Board and the Racecourse Development Fund. The Minister should have some briefing notes. I want to be positive in my own mind, as would the taxpayers of the State, the people who support the industry and those who oppose it on moral grounds, as to where the money is going.

I will quote again from page 379 of the Auditor-General's Report which clearly states the amounts paid to the State Government over the past three years. The fractions paid to the State Government in 1981-82 amounted to $1 300 000. I refer also to page 29 showing figures for the Hospitals Fund. Under the heading 'Transfer of fractions' we see the figure $977 000. That shows a difference of $26 000 on the previous year. It also refers to unclaimed dividends paid to the Hospital Fund from the T.A.B. at $461 000 yet the T.A.B. shows an amount of $442 000. Does the T.A.B. pay money to the Hospitals Fund when it is due at the end of June? There has always been a bone of contention as far as the Hospitals Fund is concerned. The money comes from the T.A.B. and racing clubs. It is not credited with any interest. I assume the money no sooner goes into the Hospitals Fund than it is transferred to general revenue. The whole thing is a misnomer. When one looks at the Auditor-General's Report, one has to marry up the figures, but that cannot be done. I am hoping that, by seeking such information (which I hope the Minister will obtain) and by raising the matter, the Minister will assure us that in future, if an amount is to be credited to a fund, it will be so credited. In my opinion these accounts must relate properly to each other, when set out in the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: The Minister mentioned an amount of $381 000 going to the racing industry. Did he mean the horse-racing industry?

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Yes.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: To follow that up, is the percentage distribution to the three codes approximately the same as I read out when speaking on the second reading? It was 66.9 per cent to horse racing, 20.5 per cent to trotting and 12.6 per cent to greyhound racing. I take this opportunity also to ask the Minister, as this money is going via the Racecourses Development Board to the South Australian Jockey Club to the country racing clubs, whether the Minister will recall that, in the term of the last Government it was necessary to get a commitment from the South Australian Jockey Club that it would apportion about 11.5 per cent of the amount available for distribution (after certain charges had been taken) to go to the country clubs? Is the Minister aware of whether that is still the case? Is that commitment being honoured? Does the Minister have any reason to believe that it will not be honoured in the future?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: First, I refer to the percentage in regard to turnover which has altered slightly from the figures quoted by the honourable member. The horse-racing code received 69 per cent, trotting about 20 per cent and dog racing about 11 per cent. There is a quarterly distribution. Significantly, in the last quarter the horse-racing share had increased somewhat. This may have been the effect of after-race pay-outs and other factors such as the Melbourne Cup, special races, and so on.

The second part of the question related to the 11.5 per cent to go to country racing clubs. There has always been a deal of controversy between the South Australian Jockey Club and the country clubs about the share of the distribution. The matter lies between the South Australian Jockey Club (which is the controlling body of racing) and the country clubs. I would expect and recommend that the additional money to the racing codes and the share to country clubs remain at 11.5 per cent. I will be advocating it to them, but it is their jurisdiction. I would expect that to be the case in regard to additional money.

Mr BLACKER: Do I understand, from the Minister's reply, that it would be expected, as a result of the increased income brought about by this Bill, that country clubs on their 11.5 per cent ratio could expect to receive a greater amount of money?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The additional funds that the Bill would provide means that with the 11.5 per cent going to country clubs (if the previous formula is adhered to) will mean a greater amount of money.

Mr BLACKER: In previous times an amount has come off the top before the distribution has been made. Unfortunately, the 11.5 per cent can be whittled away even if the figure off the top is increased.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: The Minister mentioned after-race pay-outs in talking of the percentage distribution to the three codes. He will recall that, when I announced the last amendment to the Racing Act in this House which brought in, amongst other things, after-race pay-outs, I gave an undertaking that, after a certain period had elapsed, I would order a review of the situation to see whether the other codes, namely, trotting and greyhound racing, were going to be disadvantaged by after-race pay-outs or whether the Jockey Club would be disadvantaged by after-race pay-outs. With the hours that the T.A.B. was open at that stage there was some thought that the night codes might suffer because they would not reap the benefits of after-race pay-outs. I ask the Minister to give a commitment that he will order an independent review. He has just told me that the distribution to the horse-racing codes has gone up to 69 per cent, which is an increase on the figures I had.

I accept that they may in fact vary that much every quarter: I do not know. However, I ask the Minister whether he will undertake or continue that commitment that I gave that there will be a review so that we can ascertain whether after-race pay-outs have disadvantaged any of the night codes.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The actual amount available for distribution has increased significantly through after-race pay-outs. Even though the percentage varies from three months to three months distribution, in actual fact the amount of money available to all of the codes from T.A.B. distribution has increased considerably. Therefore, even though there may be a variation in regard to the percentage, the actual amount of money available for distribution has increased quite considerably. The honourable member apparently does not want to listen.

The Hon. M.M Wilson: You speak to your Deputy Premier. He was talking to me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: I wish to address a question to the Minister on this clause which relates to pay-outs from the Totalisator Agency Board. I take up a point to which he himself referred in his second reading explanation when he referred to Databet. I would like to ask the Minister three questions on that point. Can he advise how much was the total cost to the South Australian Government of that scheme, how much is still outstanding, and how much is the Totalizator Agency Board repaying each year to clear that debt?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not have that information immediately available to me but I assure the honourable member that I will obtain that information and advise him as soon as possible.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Payment to board of percentage of moneys bet with bookmakers.'

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I seek information from the Minister. In his speech in reply he mentioned that there were a number of bookmakers fewer than there were before the removal of the flat, which I think occurred some two years ago, and that there was no bookmaking or betting on the flat. It was obvious that there would have to be a surplus of bookmakers absorbed into the derby and, of course, then onwards into the grandstand and rails. Does the Minister have any figures as to the number of bookmakers operating now compared to then in the categories he mentioned?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I can only refer to the Betting Control Board Report of 1982 which indicates that during the year the licences of two bookmakers lapsed on their deaths. Eight others ceased to be licensed and each bookmaker had services in excess of 40 years. One new licence to bet in the country zone was granted during the year and on 30 June 1982 a total of 113 persons held bookmakers' licences compared with 122 persons at June 1981.

It is relevant to note that only a decade ago there were 170 licensed bookmakers. They still operate. Of course, in addition to those are the six bookmakers who continue to operate in seven registered premises at Port Pirie and, of course, one of the premises has been conducted as an agency by one of the bookmakers. Therefore, in actual fact during the year there were permits to 123 bookmakers for 12 592 individual bookmaker operations at 746 race meetings held in South Australia. As I have said, there are different categories of licences as the member for Torrens would understand. They do not all operate in the metropolitan area. Some have country licences only. Therefore, in this report a total of 113 persons held bookmakers' licences compared with 122 at 30 June 1981.

Mr ASHENDEN: I have a series of questions for the Minister. The first is in relation to a point which I took up in the second reading debate and that is in reference to the report of the committee of inquiry into racing in 1980. In an aside to the member for Torrens, the Minister indicated this afternoon that in fact there are some bookmakers who are evidently not finding their business particularly profitable at the moment (and I notice that the Minister is nodding his head in assent). Therefore, has the Minister considered the recommendation of that report that the number of licences for bookmakers should be reduced which would, of course, in turn leave a greater income for the remaining bookmakers? I ask the Minister that because it certainly was a recommendation of that report.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Of course, the Betting Control Board has the prerogative in that regard, not the Minister. Part of that report indicates exactly what the member for Todd has mentioned, but it is preferable to do it by way of attrition. A number of them retire each year and, if that happens, the licences are not renewed or given to anybody else. It is a bit of a contentious issue, but whether a smaller number of bookmakers fielding at certain meetings really gives the public the service they require is a difficult one to assess. I do not make any judgment on it.

However, the view of the Betting Control Board is that it is far better to do it by attrition than by not renewing a particular bookmaker's licence, and I am inclined to agree with that point of view. I do not have any real control over the matter. I believe that the Betting Control Board should indicate whether we have additional bookmakers at certain meetings or otherwise as far as allocation of bookmakers is concerned.

As I said before, not all of them bet in the metropolitan area. Some of them bet in country meetings only; some of them bet at trotting and racing meetings. There is a real variety of opportunities for bookmakers to bet at different venues. However, the problem that the bookmakers have is the sharing of the amount of total turnover among fewer people. Of course, it does not mean that it would be shared equally. It could be that the rails bookmaker or the major bookmakers would still get a greater share of the turnover. Therefore, it is a bit of a Catch 22 situation. However, I believe that the demands of clubs and the public should be a consideration in the number of bookmakers available to field a particular meeting.

As I mentioned previously, the number of bookmakers has declined significantly. No doubt those numbers will readjust from time to time. The point I make is that it is better to reduce their number by attrition through the Betting Control Board than by not renewing bookmakers' licences.

Mr ASHENDEN: I spoke on this matter at length during the second reading debate. It would assist me in my line of questioning if the Minister would say what is the main reason for the Government deciding to reduce this tax by .23 per cent.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I made this clear during the second reading debate. I opposed the increase in this turnover tax on behalf of the Opposition at a previous time because I believed it was an imposition on bookmakers to increase it. I gave a variety of reasons for doing this during the second reading debate, the main reason being to restore the situation to what it was previously, which I believe was a fair and reasonable situation.

Mr BECKER: The Minister stated in his second reading speech that the reduction in bookmakers' turnover tax will reduce Government revenue by $393 000 per annum. Based on 1979-80 figures, the last year when stamp duty was collected, the 1.4 per cent turnover tax paid to clubs will not be affected. I do not mind the Government assisting bookmakers because I believe that they provide colour at race meetings and that they are probably the last bastion of free enterprise in this State. Competition is keen, but a good bookmaker will make money if he runs his book properly. However, if he gambles he is in trouble. I would like to know how the figure of $393 000 was arrived at. In the year 1979-80 duty on betting tickets paid to Treasury was $125 917; 1978-79, $136 474, the amount shown in the Betting Control Board report and at page 205 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1980.

In 1979 the commission on bets paid to Treasury by the Betting Control Board was $1 981 000; 1980, $1 925 000; 1981, $1 960 000; and 1982, $1 933 000. One can see from that that there is a fluctuation in the amount that the State has been receiving from commission on bookmakers' bets but that the figures are reasonably consistent. The amount of stamp duty paid in the last full year was $125 917, so I am wondering how the figure of $393 000 was arrived at as being the amount of revenue that the State will lose.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The 1979-80 figures are the last base figures that we can use for this calculation. Those figures include the duty on betting tickets. The honourable member mentioned a figure of $125 917. In 1979-80 turnover was $172 892 594. An 0.3 increase in tax on that figure would amount to $518 678. The stamp duty on betting tickets would be $125 917 and if that is deducted from the $518 678 it leaves an increase of $392 761, which I rounded off in the second reading explanation at $390 000. That is the basis of my calculation. I did not believe it was reasonable to reintroduce the stamp duty on betting tickets.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Application of money in fund for provision of stake-moneys'.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I wish to discuss the Racecourses Development Board under this clause. Does the Minister see any need to look at the operations of the Racecourses Development Board because of its added responsibilities? I refer particularly to what I have always believed is a fairly clumsy apparatus—the board having three statutory funds into which it must pay money so that that money can eventually reach the respective codes. There may be good reason for that happening, but it has always seemed to me to be a particularly clumsy arrangement. Has the Minister considered streamlining the functions of the Racecourses Development Board? Will the Minister tell us what is the present membership of that board and whether it has changed since the recent State elections? And, what does he anticipate will be the total amount handled by the board in one year (and I do not expect the Minister to be spot on; all I want is an intelligent estimate)?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The present membership of the board is: Mr B.J. Taylor Director of Recreation and Sports, Chairman; Hon. J.D. Corcoran, representing greyhound racing; R.K. Leal, Secretary of the Greyhound Racing Control Board; Mr R.J. Zerella, representing trotting; Mr P.A. Rehn, representing trotting; D.R. Coles, representing racing; and E.J. Haddow, representing racing. The honourable member would know that the board derives its funds from multiple totalisator betting on and off-course, receiving 1 per cent of turnover from several forms of betting. This currently amounts to about $600 000 per annum. The funds are available for distribution to the three codes in proportion to their percentage turnover. The proposed changes are estimated to add about $700 000 per annum to the Racecourses Development Board's funds. That is the total amount for the three codes.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: About $1 300 000?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes. It is a substantial increase; over double. From my limited observations as Minister, I believe that the Racecourses Development Board is working effectively. I do not contemplate any changes of significance in the near future.

Mr BECKER: Referring to the question asked by the member for Torrens, I take it that this money will be used for various Racecourses Development Fund purposes and will be split up in exactly the same proportions as now. Has the Minister a copy of the Racecourses Development Board Report? On page 308 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1982, I find that the Horse-racing Grounds Development Fund had a deficit of $54 424, so we find that that fund will be starting behind the eight ball, because during the year 1982 the total income for the Horse-racing Grounds Development Board was $547 846. There was interest on debentures, because as a statutory authority it can borrow money.

Some repayments were received from the clubs, and the grant to the clubs was $572 586. That left a deficit of $54 000. I am assuming that the Horse-racing Grounds Development Fund will receive $350 000 to $400 000 and therefore it has to make up the deficit, which does not leave a great amount for stake money. As I understand it, the money we are discussing will be allocated to the fund in order to improve the stakes in the three codes. Whilst any additional amount is better than none, what significant impact will this contribution have on stake money for, say, horse-racing, because after all there is that $54 000 deficit to overcome? Would the Minister envisage the Horse-racing Grounds Development Fund supporting such events as the Adelaide Cup? After all, that is a very important part of the horse-racing calendar. There is also the new one which started two years ago and which caused financial problems for the S.A.J.C.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That was the Australian Breeders Co-operative.

Mr BECKER: Yes, I am wondering what the position regarding stake money will be there. I am inquiring about the impact of this amount of money on the fund. Can the Minister indicate to the Committee what the S.A.J.C. proposes to do with this additional income and say which feature races will receive a substantial lift in stake money?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Each code has different needs. I would think the most effective way of using proposed additional funds would be for the Jockey Club to apply part of that money to the outstanding loan on the grandstand. In my opinion, that would be most appropriate. While there

is still a need to discuss the details, it is clear that the S.A.J.C.'s wishes are to allocate a large proportion of this money to clearing the grandstand debt.

The needs in the other codes are somewhat different. In trotting perhaps the need is to increase the stake money. In relation to trotting, for some time South Australia has been significantly lower in its stake money than any other State. The industry needs to gain sufficient impetus from increased stake money. I point out that the Racecourses Development Board and the Trotting Control Board will have the deciding say as to what is done with the additional funds. I think it is reasonable to expect that the needs of trotting, as with all codes, change from time to time. Priorities may be altered in the future in the allocation of funds and, as I said, that will depend on the Racecourses Development Board and the Trotting Control Board.

In the area of greyhound racing, there are sufficient capital needs in the foreseeable future to justify the allocation of additional funds, thereby saving money for the clubs concerned, which savings might be applied to stake money. In relation to the dog-racing industry, I believe some money would be devoted to stake money and other moneys would go to improving public and club facilities.

Mr BECKER: I am disturbed, when speaking of horse-racing, that the Minister should say that the additional funds in the Horse-racing Grounds Development Fund would go to the S.A.J.C. in order to help clear its debt at Morphettville, because in the second reading explanation, in referring to this additional sum, the Minister said:

> Finally, the Bill includes an amendment that will authorise the Race-courses Development Board, with the approval of the Minister, to pay an amount standing to the credit of the fund for any of the codes to the controlling authority for that code for the purpose of providing stake money.

As I said, I am rather disturbed about that. We can boost such events as the Adelaide Cup, the special breeders event, and possibly Oakbank at Easter, which is one of the outstanding picnic carnivals in Australia and which I believe deserves more support than it receives from the tourist and racing authorities. We ought to have in South Australia every three months a major event in order for racing to survive.

We looked with envy at the success of horse-racing in Queensland. I understand that the industry in that State is now in diabolical trouble and is worried about how it can bring people back to the racecourse. It is a known fact that, if people go through the turnstyles to attend a horse-racing meeting, that is profit. It would also be the same with other codes, so we must get people at the tracks, and they must be encouraged in this respect. Those who are interested in supporting the sport have to be brought back, because thousands of patrons have been lost over the past few years.

The only time people seem to attend racing in general in South Australia is if there is a first-class meeting, which of course is highlighted by high stake money. Good stake money attracts the horses from interstate, and the biggest body blow the racing industry suffered in South Australia was the loss of Bart Cummings. He retains his Glenelg North stables, but he is no longer here with his full team. That was partly due to the bloody-mindedness of some of the local government authorities, which would not let him exercise his horses on the beaches and would not give him an area at the back of the Patawalonga where first-class training facilities are available.

Also, there was not sufficient increase in the stake money at feature races to hold him. Colin Hayes once advised me that the best thing we could do for the horse-racing industry, as well as the horse-breeding industry, which is an important and integral part of the racing industry (for which our climatic conditions are ideal), would be to boost stake money. Quite honestly, if the South Australian Jockey Club has built a stand that it finds difficult to finance, that is its own fault, because that stand is for the benefit of members of the S.A.J.C., and not too many people get that much benefit from it. If the S.A.J.C. wants to pay off its grandstand, I believe that it must provide facilities and provide for the feature races to attract people to the course.

It is time that the club took a leaf out of the book of various racing clubs overseas, particularly in America, which holds cup carnivals spread not over a couple of days, but over a week or a fortnight, where all types of entertainment and attractions boost the numbers of people going through the turnstyles in that period. People go there every day and the carnival builds up towards the big race, which lasts only a few minutes.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I have been to one Adelaide Cup, and I will never go again. I thought that the conditions were disgraceful, although that was before the new grandstand was built. I can find better things to do than that. I found that there are better forms of entertainment in the sporting arena with which I am involved. However, I do not deny those involved the opportunity to maintain and improve an industry that is very important. I do not want to see this additional money going to the S.A.J.C. to pay off its debt. The Minister said that the money would be going towards stake money. Therefore, I make a plea to the Minister to ensure that the S.A.J.C. uses it for that purpose and conducts an outstanding event every three months or so which would ensure that people would go through the turnstyles. The gate takings would then be greater than the original sum allocated for stake money. Can the Minister give me an assurance that those funds will be used for stake money?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Clause 7 provides:

> . . . the board may, with the approval of the Minister, pay an amount standing to the credit of the fund for a form of racing to the controlling authority for that form of racing for the purpose of the provision of stake-moneys for races conducted by registered racing clubs.

That provision has not been in the Act previously, and I believed that it was important that the Racecourses Development Board have that opportunity to give the controlling body the opportunity to use part of these additional funds as it so desires, in the interests of the racing industry, for additional stake money. As I have said, no doubt the Racecourses Development Board and the controlling body, whether it be the Trotting Control Board, the Greyhound Racing Control Board or the South Australian Jockey Club, which have representation on the Racecourses Development Board, will certainly make their needs known in regard to this additional money. I think that is fair and reasonable. We should be involved with the requests of these bodies concerning purposes for which this money can be best utilised. A suggestion that I made, taken up by the member for Hanson, was that the South Australian Jockey Club, if it so desires (and this is not incorporated in any of the provisions referring only to stake money), pay off part of its outstanding capital debt on the Morphettville grandstand. Under the provisions of this clause, its prerogative is such that the money available can be used for public facilities. Club facilities are already referred to in the Act, anyway, and the Government is extending to the organisations involved the opportunity if they so desire to use part of this money for the promotion of sport by way of increased stake money.

Mr BECKER: I take the point that it is with the Minister's authority that the funds will be disbursed, but I will not support paying off a debt incurred at the Morphettville racecourse.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That is not referred to in this clause.

Mr BECKER: No, it is not, but the Minister raised the matter, and the fact that the Minister stated that the money may be used by the S.A.J.C. to pay off its grandstand leads me to believe, rightly or wrongly, that those who dominate the Racecourses Development Board, and certainly the Horse Racing Board, will ensure that that money goes towards paying off the debt at Morphettville. I know the people involved, and I know how they think and act.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I don't think you do, otherwise you wouldn't be arguing this way.

Mr BECKER: I believe that the question has been dangled: what if we give some of this money to pay off the S.A.J.C.'s stand? I believe that that question has been put to the Minister, and I am pleading with him to not give the money to that organisation. The club should be made to put the money into stake money, the most important factor of the horse-racing industry. The same applies to harness-racing, dog-racing and the breeding industry. That is where the real spin-off is. If a club wants to pay off a huge debt on any building or grandstand, it must ensure that those facilities are used more than once a week. A classic example is that of Football Park, which was the greatest luxury every provided for football in South Australia. It is used only for six months of the year, and it is not used to its full benefit: not because it has no lights, but because the Football League is too greedy, and wants too much rent. The same thing happened in regard to the Norwood Oval—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr BECKER: I am simply pointing out that I object to additional taxes being used to support a certain section of the industry, whether it be horse-racing, trotting or dog-racing. The Minister has the overall authority to approve the payment of the money. He stated in his second reading explanation that it would be used for stake money. I am appealing to the Minister to ensure that, regarding the horse-racing industry, the money goes towards stake money. The sum of $300 000 or $400 000 is involved. Certainly we could boost the Adelaide Cup by $100 000 and make it a far more attractive meeting than it is at the moment. We could boost one or two other feature races.

I would like to see a boost given to the Onkaparinga Racing Club's Easter carnival at Oakbank. These feature events provide a spin-off to other parts of the tourist industry, as the Minister would know. If we are to do something to help these clubs, this is the opportunity. Once clubs attract people through the gates and have them on the grounds, the promoters and those within the club must then look after them to ensure that they come back. This provides the spin-off and an opportunity for making profits to pay off their debts. It is high time that this message was given to the South Australian Jockey Club and any other organisation that expects financial assistance from the Government, namely, that we expect them to provide facilities and that we are giving them financial benefits to improve their support.

The only way we can boost horse-racing is to improve the stake money. The debt is there; the interest commitment is there. Let members of the club go without a few little cocktail parties or whatever. The member for Morphett knows very well the free luncheons that go on at the Morphettville headquarters, and the cocktail parties, and so on.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr BECKER: If we are going to direct taxpayers' money into a special fund for a specific purpose or industry then I want that money to go into stake money and not into paying off the debt at the Morphettville racecourse. That is the appeal I make to the Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: This clause deals with stake-money only, and there is no doubt that the member for Hanson and I are in agreement on that. The point I made previously is that it is the prerogative of the Racecourses Development Board and the controlling body, which has representatives on the Racecourses Development Board, to utilise that money if so desired right now for that purpose. I do not see anything wrong with that, if that is the demand and if that is what they feel is the most suitable thing to do. What we are discussing at the present time is the opportunity under this clause for an extension of the current Racecourses Development Board funds to be utilised for stakemoney if so desired. There is no argument—

Mr Becker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He has used up his three calls and he is out of order.

Mr MATHWIN: This clause provides:

> Notwithstanding the other provisions of this Part, the Board may, with the approval of the Minister, pay an amount standing to the credit of the Fund for a form of racing to the controlling authority for that form of racing for the purpose of the provision of stake-moneys for races conducted by registered racing clubs.

Can the Minister say why the word 'may' is used? Why should it not read '... the Board shall, with the approval of the Minister, pay an amount standing to the credit of the Fund ...'? There is quite a difference.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not think that there is a great deal of argument about this. I will repeat again that under the current legislation the Racecourses Development Board can provide moneys to clubs for the provision of both public facilities and facilities to assist the racing club. This clause gives another opportunity to extend that one step further by 'the board may'. If we had put in 'shall' it would mean that the board shall pay 'an amount standing'; it would only be for the purpose of stake money. We certainly do not want that to happen. This clause only extends the opportunity for the Racecourses Development Board to give part of the money for stake money if so desired and the rest of the money can go towards the opportunity for further facility development for the public and the club itself.

Mr MATHWIN: From the Minister's answer it is quite obvious what he has in mind. I was a little way out. I was thinking that we were dealing specifically with stake money. It is quite obvious now from the Minister's remarks to me that the fears of the member for Hanson are well founded. Indeed, it would appear to me from the answer made by the Minister that this money would be there for them to use as they see fit, that is, for improvements and paying off the debt for the grandstand at Morphettville Park. When the Minister answered the member for Hanson, he was quite definite about it—that he was talking about stake money. However, in his answer to me, the Minister changed that outlook, because he said that this is far wider than stake money. The Minister criticised the member for Hanson and said that this clause only relates to stake money. Now, as I said earlier, he has made it quite clear to me in his answer that it does not mean just stake money but it means that this money can be dispensed with however the board sees fit. He also admitted that if he did as I asked him (exchanged the word 'may' for the word 'shall') then that would mean that the board could only dispense with that in stake money.

I am surprised that the Minister has done this when he originally said in his answer to my colleague that that was not the case and in actual fact he has reversed the situation in his answer to me.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CO-OPERATIVES BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT (REPEAL) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 22 March. Page 508.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Bill to which we are addressing ourselves is a conglomerate of variations to the existing Local Government Act. One understands that it contains a number of machinery measures which would best have been left until the new Act came into effect. However, because of the time delay associated with that eventual event, action has been taken on this occasion to give the benefit to local government of a number of measures which that organisation has sought.

I am led to believe that a great number of the proposals before us were initiated by the Adelaide City Council. As a result of representations, that council is pleased to see the measures contained within the Bill. However, I have been advised of some concern by members of the Institute of Municipal Administration, who question some aspects of the terminology used or the suggested method of approaching the issues concerned. I will come to those later.

One would have to accept that the Bill is a Committee Bill. Basically it is a measure which, because of not following a single theme, would best be discussed in Committee. However, some generalisations are associated with it which should be picked up. Certainly, the Opposition appreciates the need to refine the Act which exists presently in order to overcome the difficulties which have been experienced. It is quite anomalous that a person is able to aspire to be, for example, a mayor or an alderman, their name goes forward, an election is held under the terms of the current Act and, when that election is held, if that person is the successful candidate but does not have the qualifications, the election would become null and void in essence.

By this means the opportunity exists for the full detail of the person's council experience and term to be indicated in the form of application and for the clerk or returning officer to make that decision before an expensive election is held, assuming that there is more than one candidate for the position. An even more difficult problem would arise if the person who is ineligible to take his place was the successful candidate at an election against a person who was unsuccessful in the election but who would *de facto* become the elected person because of having the qualifications. I will not follow through to the nth degree whether that set of circumstances would arise, and the defeated person would be called upon to take up the position because of the ineligibilty of the person who was the winner. It would create an interesting legal battle, because the person has not won the election to which someone might aspire to place him in the seat. I suggest that real problems would be involved.

The degree of portability (which is now a fact of life) associated with the transfer of staff from one council to another is picked up in clause 6 of the Bill and allows the council to meet its costs or the expenditure which eventually would be a charge against it during the period of time subsequent to the person resigning his position. As such, the council pays at the existing rate and is not in the position of having to pay an inflated rate which might be a charge against it at a later stage. The only question I have (and I would ask the Minister to mention it when he replies to the debate) is what happens if the person who is transferring does not conclude sufficient employment in the second or subsequent employment to qualify for long service leave? Sick leave is an ongoing qualification and therefore poses no problem. I am more interested in what happens to the council contribution at that early stage if, eventually, the officer never gets to the point of being able to collect long service leave because he opts out of local government or dies before he becomes eligible for that long service entitlement. The Opposition would not want to take anything from the council which is to be the recipient or from the person who is to be the eventual beneficiary, but it would not want, in this changed procedure, to see a council paying into the coffers of another council a sum of money which the second council was never going to expend because of a series of circumstances. I would like clarification in relation to the matter.

The next point I will pick up is that which formalises the repayments and/or the forward credit of over-paid rates but introduces interest at 10 per cent for any money held. It is a contentious matter and one which I have no doubt, before the final passage of this Bill, will receive consideration as to whether it is a form of approach deemed to be in the best interests of local government or whether it might be thought to be a scheme of arrangement which a number of other departments subsequently might follow, albeit that we are discussing the Local Government Act and taxing or rating measures under it.

Whether or not it will become projected as a method of some departments accruing sums of money is yet to be seen. They must pay interest on it but it would, in effect, be a way for the Government, through those departments accruing a reasonable sum of money in advance of a person's commitment, to make use of that money and pay interest, but still deny the individual the right to determine the destiny of his own funds. That is a philosophy which has been put to me by a number of people. They think it could be the thin edge of the wedge, and I believe it ought to be identified.

The other point which is more particularly of interest to me is the proposal in the Bill that the interest be fixed at 10 per cent. I am not averse to the council being required to pay interest; I believe that it should. However, I think that it is entirely wrong for the Bill to provide that it shall be 10 per cent. If the person who is paying the rates—and it may well be under protest because there is an appeal as

to the valuation used in the determination of the rate—is required to pay the rate in advance of the decision of the appeal, and if he will obtain only 10 per cent on his money if he is a successful appellant, he is obviously at a great disadvantage in comparison with other people who have not had to forward-pay money which is under question or under appeal. I believe (and I will put this proposition to the Minister later) that the interest rate should not be fixed, but should be tied to the then current bank interest rate.

The reverse of that position also applies. If the Bill is passed and the Act says that the interest will be paid at 10 per cent, the council is holding money of a successful appellant and is required to pay 10 per cent interest on that money, yet, hopefully in the not too distant future the money is available to the council at 7 per cent or 8 per cent (that is, that the sum of the cost of borrowing money is much less than it is today), then the council is paying to the person whose money it is holding an interest rate greater than that person can obtain in the money market. Indeed, the council is required, by the force of this measure, to pay an interest rate greater than the funds which it can borrow. With the flexibility contained in the Bill, the council may well make the decision to pay out the sum of money which is held in trust. However, I believe that it should be (as I stated in respect of the other aspect, the higher interest rate), that the council knows where it is and that neither party (that is the council or ratepayer) is at an advantage or disadvantage in respect of the sum of money relative to interest.

Under this clause there is to be no fine applicable to any money outstanding by virtue of an increase in the valuation, and the person subsequently has to pay a greater sum of money because the valuation has been increased. I am in total agreement. It is necessary that that clause be included because, under the normal terms of the Act, if the correct rate is not paid by the given time a fine shall apply.

However, progressing beyond that point, I believe that it is wrong, so far as the other ratepayers of the area are concerned, if, once the sum of money has been determined and becomes payable by a ratepayer, it is not collectable on precisely the same terms as is any other rate. Therefore, I would suggest that there is a need to add to the other clause the necessity of the 60-day rule and all the other features which apply. If the person paying the additional rate does not meet the commitment within 60 days, the fine provisions will apply. In that way, one is not discriminating for or against one constituent or one ratepayer over the other.

I am somewhat concerned about the provisions of clause 11 which relate to the alteration of the number of members of council required to vote in respect of the declaration of a differential rate. I believe that the differential rate provision, which requires a three-quarter vote (that is, a minimum 75 per cent vote), is a very useful and necessary protection for ratepayers. If there is a major divergent opinion in council, it is necessary that there be a stay of proceedings until the matter has been properly and publicly aired. To make the change which the Minister proposes, to make it a simple absolute majority vote, destroys that protection which exists for ratepayers. Whilst I acknowledge that the Local Government Act provides for several formulae for different votes taken on financial matters, I believe that the people who introduced this measure, this provision, this safeguard, when differential rating was originally before the House, were wise. I believe that it has become an expectation of the public and it certainly offsets the opportunity of a move being taken without public knowledge.

Whilst I have accepted the passage of this Bill at the second reading stage, the Opposition feels so strongly on this point that it could become a means of a complete vote against all of the measures at the third reading stage. It is a measure which exists and which is causing no difficulty. If the Minister were to say that it is difficult in that it holds up the opportunity for local government to get its rates through and to get on with the job, I would have to accept that as reality. However, I would still not move from the point of requiring that the initial vote on this measure for differential rating be on the basis which currently exists, allowing for a simple absolute majority (or an absolute majority, if we do not like the conjunction of the word 'simple' with it), at a period of six or eight weeks later. At least the public would have the opportunity of knowing what the argument was and what the problems were. It would not suddenly appear on the doorstep after the event and allow a group of councillors to offset a practice which had been favourable or to create a circumstance which was to be unfavourable to a sizeable number of ratepayers. I ask the Minister to give earnest consideration to that, not to answer it at this stage necessarily, but at least to take on board the comments that I have made that there is an in-between or a possible area of acceptance, but not as is provided in the Bill.

The area in relation to the construction and works to be undertaken on private roads is most certainly a recommendation of the Adelaide City Council. The opportunity has been given for other councils to benefit in precisely the same way. However, I refer the Minister to the second reading explanation, and more particularly to the details relative to the clause. I point out that he has grossly misled the Parliament regarding the terminology or the statement made to the House. I refer to clause 17. According to the Minister's explanation to this House clause 17 amends section 344 of the principal Act. It states:

> This section relates to the completion of council work by laying pipes, drains and channels through private lands. The proposed amendment will allow councils to agree with affected owners that the owners carry out the required work themselves, at their own cost.

From discussions with the Minister's department, I have become aware that that does not describe the action taken under clause 17. I get the distinct impression, from an analysis of this report to the House, that the completion of council work could be construed as work undertaken by the council at the council's direction, whereas it is work undertaken by the council at the request of private owners. The report by the Minister and the interpretation placed upon it outside this Parliament have caused grave concern. I am pleased to say that, when one relates the clause in the Bill to the existing Act, there are no fears as to what the ultimate end will be, but there is a concern by people that misrepresentation exists.

Another area of note relates to the late payment of expiation fees and suggestions which flow from Mr Justice Jacobs's recent decision in the Supreme Court. Councils today are approaching this matter along the lines suggested by Mr Justice Jacobs, and that is a realistic approach. It may not necessarily be a totally legal approach within the terms of the existing Local Government Act, so the provision introduced here is clearly intended to legalise or give definite grounds on which local government can act.

I am concerned that in the drafting of this measure the word 'or' fits between subclauses *(a)* and *(b)*. I believe (and I will canvass later) that the word 'and' should be used. We are creating a situation whereby there is a prescribed fee for late payment of an expiation fee. We move to a position in subclause *(b)* where the opportunity exists for the council to accept the expiation fee, plus any court costs or other costs that have been approved. However, the person who has allowed the debt to progress to that point does not have to wear the late payment fee, which the person who expiates late has to wear under other circumstances.

It is a discrimination to place the charge upon a person who acts late but before legal action has progressed, as opposed to the person who acts late and after legal action has been taken. It is a small word, a small factor, but one which excites the attention of local government because of the discriminatory aspects that it sees. In due course we will be seeking consideration of that point by the Minister.

Another matter of concern relates to problems existing for persons owning parcels of land in two adjoining councils, where relief can be obtained only if one of those councils is a municipality and the other a district council. Such relief is not available to a person who owns parcels of land in two municipal councils or two district councils. This anachronism has existed for many years and should be addressed: that is something that the Opposition totally supports. With the spate of local government boundary considerations and select committees making decisions in relation to local councils, it is possible that the Parliament will create a number of similar situations. We could not sustain an argument which rested on a simple technicality of this nature—a ratepayer getting just consideration when he happened to be in a municipality adjacent to another municipality, or in a district council adjacent to another district council. The proposal is well warranted, and I give it full support within the limitations and qualifications mentioned to the Minister relating to clause 11, which the Opposition sees as overriding all else in the passage of the Bill.

I look forward to participating in the Committee debate on this Bill on the clear understanding which has been met (and which I know will be upheld) that we will report progress, that amendments will be considered on another day, and that it may be necessary to require of the Minister (and I have his assurance that this will happen) that a clause that has been passed might be recommitted so that the process of amendment can take place. I support the second reading.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): Although in general I support this Bill, there are matters that should be brought to the attention of the Minister. As he has said, this Bill deals generally with administrative matters of councils. I turn first to the clause dealing with long service leave being transferred with an employee, which has been a problem in the past. I am pleased that this matter has been tidied up because there is no reason why council employees should not be able to transfer those advantages when transferring their employment. That is one of the better aspects of this Bill.

Clause 4 repeals section 69 of the Act dealing with nominations of mayors and aldermen. This has been a problem in some cases in the past. I wonder whether the Minister has gone too far in clause 5, which inserts new paragraph VII, as follows:

> No person shall be entitled to be nominated for the office of mayor or alderman unless by the day of the election he will have had at least one year's prior service as a councillor (whether for the same or a different council).

I cannot understand that. I think it is too much to expect a person to come into a completely different council and to take over the office of mayor in a new council or city after serving a year or more in a completely different council. I do not think the person ought to be eligible and I do not think he or she would have the experience in that particular area, be it council, city or municipality, because of the differences between areas. I believe one should give some service to a particular council before ever dreaming of elevating oneself to a position such as that of mayor. I think the situation could well be different in relation to an alderman, because one would have time, as a member of council, to gain experience in that particular part of the State, but as regards the position of mayor, one would not have the opportunity of gaining the necessary experience.

I believe that sufficient experience is paramount for a person seeking the high office of the first citizen of a city or town. Other important factors are good local knowledge and knowledge of what has been happening previously within that council and the decisions that have been made and the workings of the council, because all councils are different and all councillors and mayors act a little differently. They are not all of the same stamp. They do not all make the same decisions and they do not all have the same arguments.

Fortunately, local government generally is not involved in Party politics. I do not think local government should be delving into politics. One of the great benefits of local government is that councils are free to make their own decisions without having to go backwards and forwards to any particular Party and I do not care whether it is one of the two main Parties, or one of the lesser Parties, because that would cramp the style of local government if that were to happen.

In relation to this particular clause, I think it is most unwise that the period has been set by the Government for the person who wishes to nominate for the office of mayor to have at least one year's prior service as a councillor. That may be all right, but what is contained in brackets, whether for the same or different council, I think is completely wrong and I do not think that that is wise. The other matters I would like to refer to are in relation to clause 10, which matters the member for Light has also dealt with. I would also like to register my concern in relation to the part which provides:

> Where an assessment, on the basis of which rates have been calculated, is altered (whether upon an objection or appeal, or otherwise), a due adjustment of rates shall be made and any amount paid in excess of the amount that might lawfully have been recovered on the basis of the altered assessment shall, subject to this section, be refunded and if, on the basis of the altered assessment, a greater amount than that actually recovered might lawfully have been recovered, the difference may be recovered as arrears.

My concern is that no time limit has been placed on this. I think some indication should be given by date, because otherwise one would not know when the interest was to start. I think that local government and the public in general ought to be given the opportunity of understanding the situation. It should be laid down clearly for people to be able to assess the situation themselves. Still dealing with clause 10, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister the part which provides:

> A council may, instead of refunding an amount under this section, credit that amount to the ratepayer by whom it was paid together with interest at the rate of ten per centum per annum—

The member for Light has dealt with this matter. He referred to the fact that stipulating a particular percentage could well cause problems. There may be a situation where someone has over-paid, and could have over-paid by $1 000. All he is going to receive is the 10 per cent as laid down in this particular Act. The clause continues:

> from the date of payment and that amount (together with interest) shall be set off against future liabilities of the ratepayer for payment of rates.

As I said earlier, a ratepayer may have over-paid by $1 000 or more and he would then lose some interest. There should be some indication as to time limit, whether it be for one month or whatever. I think there needs to be a better explanation of that clause. I would like the Minister to remark on that, or perhaps consider my suggestions and, also, consider what the member for Light has said. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): Last week we heard views expressed by members opposite about the course politics should take in this State, and one could be excused for thinking that in the past 12 months they have not learned a thing. During that time the Liberal Party in Victoria, Western Australia and nationally lost government. It also lost government in South Ausatralia. One of the underlying attitudes that came through in the debate last week was the Liberal Party's attack on working conditions and wages of workers. Indeed, the member for Todd reiterated the old maxim that has been peddled by State and Federal members of the Liberal Party that one man's wage increase represents another man's job and that wage increases increase unemployment. By peddling those comments the Liberal party acted true to the standard of propagandists on the basis that if you repeat an untruth often enough people will regard it as the truth.

In the manufacturing industry, a vast change has taken place, one that members of the Liberal Party have not noticed, or if they have done so they have not been prepared to confide in the Australian public about that change. Neither have they done anything to arrest that change or to ensure that as that change was happening people employed in those changing industries were provided with employment elsewhere. One of the Liberal Party's more famous national leaders commissioned the Vernon Committee to inquire into the manufacturing industry and to bring down a report. That report was duly tabled in the national Parliament, where it lay and gatherered dust with its recommendations not considered. Vernon was Managing Director of C.S.R., and some decades later another Managing Director of C.S.R., Gordon Jackson, was commissioned to undertake a further inquiry into the manufacturing industry. His report was duly delivered to the Government but promptly ignored to the extent that the Government then ordered another inquiry into the Jackson Report by Mr Crawford, whose report was ignored.

During the past several years we have seen a culmination of unemployment created principally by structural change, not because people were receiving wage increases that were causing other people to lose their jobs. Members opposite have not taken into account the fact that during a period of structural change the jobs of people are changing, industry is changing and time are changing: no-one can arrest such changes. If members opposite were forward-looking politicians (fortunately for the Labor Party they are not), they would not be in Opposition and they would have seen what they could do to ensure that when changes took place people were assisted in finding work in other industries. I shall give a few examples of this. A lot of argument occurs concerning the high cost of junior labour on the assumption that if wages for juniors were decreased we would find thousands of junior people being employed in industry, with particular reference to the clerical industry. However, it is a falsity. Machines and equipment are being used in the clerical industry today that were simply not there 10, 15 or 20 years ago. People working in an industry will not use the old methods.

Mr Baker: How about telling all this to the union movement, Bob?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GREGORY: I remind the member for Mitcham that, if he is so concerned about unemployment of youth, he might employ a stenographer instead of using a dictating machine and perhaps he may employ a youth who is good at mathematics instead of using a calculating machine. But, of course, he will not do this because he finds those pieces of equipment more convenient, but they are doing away with people's employment prospects. It is not increased wages that has caused increased unemployment in the clerical area: there has been a structural change and a technological change in that industry. Anyone who stands here and says that it is because of wages is spreading a lie.

Mr Lewis: It is simply because the relative cost of labour is not comparable with the equal cost of the substitution of—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the conversations across the floor will cease.

Mr GREGORY: The honourable member's theory is that if we were to employ these people on work experience for no wages we would be able to employ them all the time. However, it does not work that way. One could use horse-drawn labour on farms, but people do not do that because it is not so convenient or efficient. If the honourable member is suggesting that, because of the relationship of costs, we would not have technological advances, that is a lot of baloney. It happens whether or not the costs are there.

Mr Lewis: I am not saying that at all.

Mr GREGORY: It is true; don't try to escape from it.

Mr Lewis: I am not saying that at all.

Mr GREGORY: Yes you are.

Mr Lewis: Thank you very much for telling me what I am saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members must not speak to each other across the floor, but must address the Chair.

Mr GREGORY: In regard to the situation concerning the wage pause, members opposite were continually asking the Labor Party about a wages pause as though that was the only thing that would bring economic reconstruction to this country. Fortunately, the Liberal Party is no longer in Government nationally and is no longer peddling the business of bashing people about the ears, depriving them of wages and reducing their standard of living. The national Labor Government will attempt to bring people together and provide a measure of reconstruction to the people of Australia.

When it comes to the question of who is to blame in all this, let us look at the ability of management. I am talking not about big management but about a firm that advertises every day in the press about doing something for the housewife by putting in air-conditioning. In October I asked for a quotation for installing air-conditioning in my house. A salesman came along and subsequently sent to me an offer to instal air-conditioning in my home. It was a three or four paragraph letter setting out the costs, but the costs of the electrical installation were excluded. Ten days later I rang the firm involved and indicated that I was interested in accepting its offer, but I requested in writing details of how the two air-conditioning plants were to be installed. I was asked why I wanted that information. I replied that I wanted it because the width of the machines were such that I would have to cut at least one scantling and possibly two. He asked me what they were and became a little peeved when I sarcastically reminded him that scantlings are pieces of wood that hold apart the top and bottom plates in a house, which keeps the roof off the floor. He did not even know that. Two telephone calls to the salesman and one to the acting General Manager of the company meant that I subsequently received from that company a reply on a piece of paper containing two paragraphs, one stating that in timber homes units are suspended by two straps off the eaves and that in brick homes they cut a hole in the wall and support the units by brackets.

I was amazed when I read that because all they had to do for me was send to me a photocopy of the plans of manufacture for the installation of the air-conditioner. If that is initiative, it is no wonder we are running into problems. I finished up by putting the thing in myself because I did not know what these people were going to do because they could not explain it or even send out a photocopy of a drawing. They are the people that we are depending on for our survival and yet people in this House blame workers for the problems we are in. I suggest that the real problem we have in industry in the State is to do with lack of imagination on management's behalf and lack of ability to be able to do their job.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I must say that one learns a lot of new things in this House. Some of the items raised I have been quite impressed with; others are less than impressive. My main area of concern tonight deals with an item out of this House, something which happened last Friday 25 March in the District of Goyder. It took place in relation to the Mid-North Regional Organisation in region eight, at its half-yearly meeting. That meeting took place in the large town of Mallala.

The organisation's half-yearly meeting was attended by 15 of the local councils and it was also well represented by quite a few politicians from this Parliament and also from Federal Parliament. The meeting was very impressive because of the way it was efficiently organised and in that connection I mean that matters on the agenda were adhered to very clearly and the starting and attempted finished times were something that we could learn from ourselves. If one looks back at the minutes of the previous meeting six months earlier it was noted that the finish occurred exactly at 1 o'clock, just as specified.

The meeting was also impressive because I felt it was very clear that there were no political overtones or political bias. Here, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Local Government from this House on the way he put forward his viewpoint to the meeting that day. I felt that it was an unbiased address.

Towards the end of that meeting there was a panel session which provided an opportunity for people to express various viewpoints. Because some of these local government areas had been subjected to floods and bushfires, that, of course, was a very relevant topic of conversation during the meeting. Once again, it seemed to be handled quite well without getting into the real political overtones that might have arisen. Certainly the issues were aired, our concerns put forward and I felt, as did others, that the answers were provided wherever possible.

Time went on and it was getting very close to 1 o'clock. When 1 o'clock came, the chairman was keen to see that the meeting was rounded off so that we could go to the luncheon provided. As I indicated, the chairman provided ample opportunity for discussion and deliberation. It was with some interest and perhaps surprise that at two minutes past one, when the chairman was hoping to round it off and he was about to do that, the Leader of the Democrats in this State, the Hon. Lance Milne, M.L.C.—

An honourable member: Not Benny Hill?

Mr MEIER: —this is Milne, not Hill—rose to seek permission to present what appeared to be an urgent viewpoint. Upon his progression to the microphone there followed what was an almost unbelievable situation which annoyed me greatly. As I indicated previously, no representative had entered into any political discussion, although all of those present had been given an opportunity. This included the Minister, who other than making a brief comment, did not raise any political point. Mr Milne, at two or three minutes past one, commenced by saying that it would be a non-political issue that he was bringing up and then proceeded to espouse the cause of a national natural disaster fund. Non-political? To begin with, the copious notes that he was using appeared to be the same notes that were used some two days previously in the Upper House for an Address in Reply speech. That speech certainly was political. In fact, I refer to *Hansard* (page 568) on 23 March where Mr Milne states:

> I have been recommending the introduction of a national natural disaster fund, the theory being that, if all taxpayers in Australia, with certain exemptions, paid a small levy on their income tax each year, a fund could be created which would be available immediately a disaster occurred.

For some years, he prefaced it, and suddenly, two minutes after the hour the meeting was supposed to finish, he decided that it was urgent. If that was not Party political, he goes on further in his speech (page 569) to state:

> I have conveyed this matter to the Federal Leader of my Party, Mr Don Chipp, and I would be grateful if my colleagues in this Council would convey similar sentiments to their Federal members so that legislation could be introduced quickly with some chance of success.

I was more than a little bit annoyed at this occurring in the township of Mallala, which is also in the electorate of Goyder, although I recognise that members of the Upper House can count any part of the State as their electorate. There seemed to be a blatant attempt to politicise the State's disasters, in my opinion. In that respect we can again refer to last week's *Hansard*, which states:

> The Federal Government makes a donation, the State Government makes a donation, and the Prime Minister and Premiers strut around with halos around their heads.

It goes on from there as well. Thirdly, I felt that there was real shallowness in the suggestion.

Mr Becker: Did anyone walk out?

Mr MEIER: Yes. In fact, such shallowness was exhibited that one member walked out and I have been told since that a second member also walked out during the speech.

Mr Mathwin: I would have walked out if I'd been there.

Mr MEIER: I can imagine that the member for Glenelg would have walked out. What was the hollowness of it? Mr Milne's suggestion was this:

> My suggestion would be to try to raise, say, $300 000 000 per annum which, divided amongst, say, 6 000 000 taxpayers, would be very little per annum, on a sliding scale. It could be a minimum of $1 and a maximum of $10 for those with large incomes. The levy would be negligible and certain categories such as pensioners and the unemployed, not paying income tax, could be exempt.

I wonder what sort of system it would be if we had a levy. We were confronted with the matter with no right of reply. He had it all his own way. Instead of the present system we could have specific levies for education, defence, railways, roads, welfare payments, and, maybe, we would have a levy for an overseas disaster fund.

Mr Trainer: How about a levy to stop floods?

Mr MEIER: Yes, I think that was one of his levies. As a new member of this House I was amazed to see how the Leader of a South Australian political Party could use what was a non-political meeting in my electorate to grandstand and launch a Party political speech and then have the audacity to say that it was non political. I was singularly unimpressed with the whole performance.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): As a new member, I wish to comment on the recently completed Address in Reply debate. One of the things that surprised me about the debate was the inaccuracy of some of the statements made by honourable members during the time that was allowed for that particular exercise. In particular, I refer to the speech by the member for Fisher specifically in relation

to the wage rates of 18-year-olds. The member for Fisher indicated that by Parliament allowing the age of majority to be reduced to 18 both federally and in State Parliaments, this in turn has resulted in full adult wage rates being paid to young people at that age. I quote from *Hansard* of 16 March 1983 at page 419, as follows:

> At that time I was ridiculed to a large degree by most politicians on both side of politics in this State. I said that if we lowered the age to 18 (the age I was fighting for was 20) we would put a lot of young people out of work. People can go back and read my words. I said, 'Who would employ a young person on full adult wages at 18 years of age if they could employ someone older and who had more experience?' Nobody believed that it would happen. It has happened, and it is happening around us all the time. People prefer to employ males or females of 30 or 35 years of age, who have had experience in the job, rather than take on an 18 year old who has had no experience whatsoever and pay him full adult wages.
>
> So, we find that there is a choice for the employers, and the choice is one of young people not being able to get work experience. It does not mean that there will be any more people employed: I am not suggesting that. I am suggesting that more young people would have had the opportunity to prove themselves and obtain experience by the time they were 20 if 20 was the age of majority for full adult wages.
>
> Turning to the building industry, if a 15 or 16 year old wants a job as a builder's labourer, the employer has to pay him full adult wages; it is not on. However, if there was an opportunity under that award for people to employ at a lesser amount, many of these young men—and there are some women who wish to work and do work as builder's labourers—would get some work experience and have the opportunity to prove that they could do as much as others who have had experience and who are older.

Having had the time and opportunity since that speech was made to research the wage rates of 18-year-olds in the various awards under both State jurisdiction and Federal jurisdiction, I wish to refer to them for the sake of the record. Under the Cake and Pastry Baking Trade Awards, an 18-year-old receives 75 per cent of the adult rate; under the Cafes and Restaurants Award, an 18-year-old receives 70 per cent of the full adult rate; under the Clothing Trades Award, an 18-year-old receives 69 per cent of the adult rate; under the Milk and Cheese Manufacturing Award, an 18-year-old receives 80 per cent of the adult rate; in hospitals, domestic and child care centres an 18-year-old receives 86 per cent of the adult rate; under the Shop Conciliation Committee Award, an 18-year-old receives 70 per cent of the adult rate; under the Printing Conciliation Committee Award, an 18-year-old receives 60 per cent of the adult rate; and an 18-year-old bricklayer and tuck-pointer in the mixed building industry under the State award receives $136.55 a week, while the full wage rate in the building industry is $237 a week.

Under the Federated Clerks Union award an 18-year-old receives 70 per cent of the adult rate of pay. I turn now to Federal awards. Under the County Board of South Australia officer's award an 18-year-old receives $5 711, and the first-year adult rate is $9 680.26. Gas industry salaried officers at 18 to 19 years of age receive $5 617 and the adult rate is $9 000 per annum. Chemical workers at 18 years of age receive 65 per cent of the adult rate and postal clerks are paid $7 272, compared with the adult rate of $12 477 per annum. Insurance officers at 18 or 19 years receive $7 432, as against the adult insurance officer rate of $10 062 per annum. At 18 years of age textile workers receive 69 per cent of the adult rate, locomotive engine drivers 75 per cent of the adult wage, and bank officers $7 095, as against the first-year adult rate of $10 233 per annum.

I hope that those figures dispel the false impression created by the member for Fisher and that that impression will not be perpetuated. Undoubtedly, 18 year olds in most industries, except builders labourers in the building industry (and this happens under no other award in that industry), receive substantially less than the full adult rate of pay for the work that they are doing.

I turn to the contribution of the member for Fisher to the private member's Bill introduced by the member for Hartley, when he stated that there must be some method of giving young people an opportunity of taking a job at less than the full wage if they have never had work experience in a certain area. This, he said, would be subject to somebody having some say over the wage paid. The member for Fisher said that he did not know whether this should be a local group of community leaders or some form of tribunal, but that there should be some way in which a young person could say that Joe Bloggs was prepared to employ him, that the normal wage was $240 per week, that Joe Bloggs could not afford to pay that, and that he wanted the work experience and was prepared to work for six months for less than that normal wage. I am absoutely amazed that a suggestion should be made that young people be allowed to work for less than the award wage. That would be a breach of both Federal and State Conciliation and Arbitration Acts.

Employers and employees have agreed that the minimum rates contained in their awards are the minimum rates that should be paid. I have never heard of an employer organisation, or an employee organisation, that has agreed that lower than award rates should be paid to an employee. Employer organisations have always supported the payment of award rates prescribed by the court or commission, because they know that they are in competition with other people and they would not like to see a competitor gaining an unfair advantage by paying less than the award rate. I hope that the member for Fisher will have a close look at the suggestions he has been making, because I believe that all people of all political persuasions would not like to see the end of the conciliation and arbitration system which has served this country so well, and which has a history that can be traced back as far as 1896, when the Wages Board was first set up in Victoria.

Motion carried.

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 30 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 29 March 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST DUPLEX UNITS

61. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing:

1. What number of South Australian Housing Trust duplex units have been provided with separate title for sale purposes in each of the past five financial years and in this year to date?

2. How many second sales (of the remaining unit) have been achieved and, on average, how long after the first sale?

3. What is the average cost of providing 'separate title' and what are the principal components of this cost?

4. What is the average period of time for completing all necessary formalities for separation?

5. What variations to the system of sale, or criteria used in negotiating sale, if any, have been effected in the past five years and what are the current system and criteria?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The first double unit was sold in October 1980. In the financial years 1980/81, 1981/82 and 1982/83 to date 51, 45 and 34 double units have been sold respectively. Approximately 20 of the 34 double units in this financial year are awaiting issue of separate title.

2. There have been six sales of adjoining units. These sales have ranged from a simultaneous signing of contract to two, seven, 20 and 25 months after the initial sale.

3. The average cost of providing separate title is $4 500. This cost includes the provision of separate sewerage, water, electrical and gas services, survey and transfer plan costs, and a small administration cost.

4. The average period of time for obtaining separate title is six to eight months.

5. Since the announcement was made the double units would be offered for sale, the following variations to the system for sale, or criteria used in negotiating sale, have been made:

(a) The 10 year tenancy requirement was relaxed to allow any tenant irrespective of length of occupancy to be considered.

(b) Approval may now be given in cases where a double unit is sold and the original purchaser expresses an interest in purchasing the adjoining unit on vacancy.

Currently double units are sold for cash at market value to Trust tenants, irrespective of their length of tenancy.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST PROPERTY ACQUISITION

63. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing How many properties has the South Australian Housing Trust purchased within each suburb in the City of Tea Tree Gully since 1 November 1982 and how many were—

(a) vacant land;

(b) newly-built or previously occupied homes; and

(c) flats or units?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

(a) Land purchased since 1 November 1982.

(1) Lot 82 Zoe Court, Surrey Downs (0.7 ha). This land was purchased from the Urban Land Trust on 1 November 1982 following negotiations which commenced on 4 June 1982.

(2) Part Section 2129 Surrey Downs (7.7 ha). This land was purchased from the Education Department on 3 March 1983 following negotiations which commenced on 21 December 1981.

(b) Houses purchased since 1 November 1982—seven houses have been purchased.

(c) Flats or units purchased since 1 November 1982—fifteen attached houses have been purchased as part of the Design and Construct Scheme. These houses were commenced early in 1982 and recently completed. Purchase was effectd after completion.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

64. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing: How many properties are presently owned by the South Australian Housing Trust within each suburb of the City of Tea Tree Gully in the following categories—

1. houses built specifically for the trust;
2. land which has been purchased for future development (number of building blocks);
3. houses which were not originally built for the trust but have subsequently been bought new or which were previously occupied;
4. flats or units (number of individual flats/units); and
5. other (indicating proposed or present use)?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Houses built specifically for the trust—126 single units.
2. Land purchased for future development.

Residential

(i) Lot 82 Zoe Court, Surrey Downs (0.7 ha).

(ii) Part Section 2129, Surrey Downs (7.7 ha).

This land is broadacres and will produce approximately 86 allotments.

Industrial

(i) Part Section 307 Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill (6.22 ha).

(ii) Lot 4 Jacobsen Crescent, Holden Hill (0.09 ha).

3. Twenty-seven houses have been purchased.
4. Flats/Units.

(a) Fifteen atached houses have been built under the trust's design and construct scheme.

(b) Twenty cottage flats for aged persons have been built at St Agnes.

5. The trust currently has a total rental stock of 188 units but in addition to this the trust has built 300-400 houses in the Tea Tree Gully local government area, which have been sold.

HOUSING TRUST PROPERTIES

65. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing:

1. Have officers of the South Australian Housing Trust approached any land agents or builders advising them that the trust is prepared to purchase properties within the City of Tea Tree Gully and if so, how many properties is it intended will be purchased in the next 12 months within each suburb of the City of Tea Tree Gully in the following categories—

(a) vacant land (number of building blocks);

(b) 'spec. built' houses;
(c) homes that have been previously occupied but not built orginally by or for the trust;
(d) flats or units (individual numbers of flats/units); and
(e) other (indicating proposed or present use)?

2. If such approaches have not been made, is it nevertheless intended that the trust will purchase properties as described and if so, how many in each suburb in each category?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. Trust officers have not made any specific approaches to land agents or builders, although it is widely known that the trust is seeking to purchase suitable houses and residential land throughout the central metropolitan area.

2. Houses are purchased in particular suburbs in response to specific need and often in response to applicants requiring priority housing. It is not possible to anticipate when such demands will occur.

At present in excess of 40 per cent of the applicants to the trust are seeking accommodation in the central metropolitan area. While some applicants have specific suburban location preferences, others are less particular. The trust's ability to meet these demands depends on the availability of land and houses in the central metropolitan area. As the trust does not have compulsory acquisition powers, any future house and land purchases rely upon suitable properties being offered to the trust and it is not possible to anticipate these offers, nor their locations.

TRANSPORTABLE HOUSING

66. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Transport Department, the Road Safety Board or the Highways Department party to interstate discussions to formulate a national code for width limits on transportable housing and, if so, what are the details?

2. Can the Government guarantee that there will be no reduction of existing South Australian width limits and, if not, why not?

3. What discussion has been held with the building industry or the Minister of Housing or his department to determine the effects on housing costs of any reduction in the present limits and, if none, will such discussions be instituted?

4. What are the current widths applying in each of the other mainland States and what, if any, alternative widths or conditions have been proposed or are in comtemplation and what are the details?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes the Highways Department is represented on the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities group which is currently undertaking investigations into this matter. The study is intended to promote uniformity in permit conditions throughout Australia.

2. The Road Traffic Act does not contain a specific width limit for transportable buildings. However, all vehicles must comply with the statutory width limit of 2.5 metres. There are no proposals to vary this statutory width limit.

3. See above.

4. The legislation in the other States is similar to South Australia in that the statutory width limit is 2.5 metres in all States. The Road Traffic Board does issue permits to enable 'overwidth' loads, such as transportable buildings, to be moved on public roads, subject to compliance with special conditions. In view of the damage caused to public property, such as road signs, sighter posts etc., which has an effect on road safety, consideration is being given to establishing an upper width limit on permits for transportable buildings. This approach has already been adopted by the authorities in the other States. Discussions on this matter have been held with representatives of the transportable housing industry and the Public Buildings Department and investigations are continuing.

TEACHER SALARIES

67. **The Hon. M.M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Did the President of the Primary Principals Association in a letter to the Premier dated 25 February 1983 accuse the Minister of Education of breaching assurances given to the association concerning the transfer of primary salaries to secondary schools?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes he did, and inaccurately so.

PRIMARY SCHOOL STAFF

69. **The Hon. M. M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What primary schools were notified on or about 3 March 1983 that staff numbers were to be reduced and what was the reduction in each case?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:

School	Reduction Proposed
East Adelaide P.S.	−1
West Lakes Shore P.S.	−2
Le Fevre Peninsula P.S.	−1
Allenby Gardens P.S.	−1
Mansfield Park P.S.	−1
Ridley Grove P.S.	−1
Hendon P.S.	−1
Grange P.S.	−1
Pennington P.S.	−1
Para Hills West P.S.	−1
Ceduna A.S.	−1
North Adelaide P.S.	−1
Goodwood P.S.	−1
Bridgewater P.S.	−1
Elizabeth West P.S.	−0.5
Ridgehaven P.S.	−0.8
Salisbury North P.S.	−0.8
Ingle Farm P.S.	−0.6
Coromandel Valley P.S.	−0.6
Highgate P.S.	−1
Two Wells P.S.	−0.6
Naracoorte P.S.	−1
Cummins A.S.	−1
*Hackham West P.S./J.P.S.	−1
Brown's Well A.S.	−0.6
Port Augusta P.S.	−1
Central Eastern REO (vacant salary)	−0.6

*Count as two schools

After further examination, amendments were made in some instances.

GOVERNMENT SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

70. **The Hon. M. M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What were actual enrolments for Government schools at the end of February 1983 in:
(a) pre-school;
(b) primary; and
(c) secondary?

2. What were the estimated enrolments in the above categories as at 31 January 1983?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. *(a)* 2 863 children aged four and five.

(b) 123 314 full-time equivalent students.

(c) 80 831 full-time equivalent students.

Both *(b)* and *(c)* are preliminary figures pending final checks of school returns.

2. *(a)* 2 882 (based on child/parent centre estimates).

(b) 122 800 full-time equivalent students (based on State demography).

(c) 79 500 full-time equivalent students (based on State demography).

SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAMME

71. **The Hon. M. M. WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How much of the previous Government's school building programme has been deferred or cancelled by the present Government?

2. What schools are affected and what is the value in each case?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Of those works given a priority on the 1981-82 school building programme, most have been undertaken or carried forward to ensure their completion during the 1982-83 financial year. It should be noted, however, that since 1981-82 the school projects included on projected lists of works have included options, where possible, to ensure maximum flexibility of the programme (e.g. staging and integration with capital works assistance projects). In this way variations can be made to the extent of projects undertaken and a reasonable commitment negotiated with schools and school councils in response to changing funding situations.

2. As the composition of the 1983-84 school building programme is dependent upon a funds allocation yet to be finalised and approved it is not possible at this stage to specify the schools which may be affected, or to determine the cost variations. Further information will be available at the time of the release of the 1983-84 Budget. It should be noted, however, that any variation to provisions currently anticipated for schools will be discussed with the school and its community as appropriate. This is a process of consultation which is standard procedure for project development.

BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

74. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Were the sums of $80 000 000 and $25 000 000 allocated in the Budget for increased wage and salary rates and increased prices sufficient and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The amount of $80 000 000 set aside for salary and wage increases which might occur in 1982-83 could be exceeded by at least $12 000 000. As to the amount of $25 000 000 allocated for price increases in 1982-83, the present expectation is that the call by agencies on that allowance may not exceed the above amount. However, the wide variety of items involved and the variation in price movements for items against the allowance built into agency budgets for this purpose makes assessment difficult. In many cases, over-expenditure by individual agencies reflects what could be a legitimate call on the round sum allowance but which it is not practicable to measure accurately and to verify.

These matters will be covered in a general statement on State finances, which I propose to make to Parliament when I introduce the Supplementary Estimates next month.

BUSHFIRE RELIEF FUND

75. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How much has been paid into the Premier's Bushfire Fund to date?

2. Where is the money invested and at what interest rate?

3. How much money has been allocated to bushfire victims and when is it expected that all moneys will be expended?

4. What are the criteria for payments to bushfire victims?

5. Will the fund be subject to audit by the Auditor-General, and will details of the fund be published in his annual report and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Up to and including Wednesday 23 March 1983, a total of $5 485 679.29 had been paid into the Premier's Bushfire Relief Appeal Fund. This amount included moneys received from both the Lord Mayor's Appeal and the NWS Channel 9 Appeal.

2. All donations received have been deposited in a trust account at Treasury. Temporary surpluses are invested with banks and short-term money market institutions as part of Treasury's normal large-scale investment operations. The interest earned on these investments will be credited to the trust account and used to assist bushfire victims.

3. At 22 March 1983 the allocations were as follows:

	$
Personal hardship grants	829 750.00
Funeral assistance	25 000.00
Personal injury relief advances	14 000.00
Total	$868 750.00

Approvals for payments currently being processed:

Disability payments approx.: $500 000

First payments towards losses approx.: $3 000 000

All payments will be paid at the earliest possible date, however, the final date will be dependent on the receipt of funds from donors.

4. Payments to date are not subject to any means test. The basic criteria is to have suffered a loss as a result of the fire.

5. The fund is subject to audit by the Auditor-General and, in fact, procedures for this process have been developed since the date the fund was launched. It is normal for details of such funds to be published in the Auditor-General's Annual Report to Parliament.

BUDGET PROJECTION

79. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What is the estimated Budget projection of receipts and payments for the financial year 1983-84?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: A vital factor in estimating projected receipts and payments for next financial year is the level of Commonwealth Government financial assistance which will be available for both recurrent operations and capital works. Much of this information is not usually available until the meeting in Premiers' Conference and Loan Council in about June each year. At this stage, I believe, it would be premature to make any public statement on the matter.

BUDGET DEFICIT

80. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer:

1. How is the current budget deficit being funded?

2. What impact will the additional interest have on the current budget?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. By the use of general Treasury funds.

2. The loss of interest on those funds, which would otherwise be invested, adds to the deficit on the Consolidated Account.

RENT RELIEF

81. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing:

1. What are the guidelines used in assessing applicants for rent relief?

2. How many persons are being assisted currently and for how long?

3. What is the total amount of money committed to date?

4. Will the programme be on-going?

5. What is the budget allocation this financial year and what will be the proposed amount next year?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. The following guidelines are used in assessing applicants for rent relief:

Households must be facing genuine hardship in meeting their rental payments.

Households must be in receipt of a pension or social service benefit or a salary or wage of less than $300 per week.

Households must have no other property which could be occupied or sold.

Households must be occupying accommodation suitable to their needs.

2. At 11 March 1983, 1 632 households were in receipt of rent relief assistance. The circumstances of each household in receipt of assistance are reviewed quarterly and on the basis of those reviews relief payments are increased, decreased or terminated (as appropriate) if individual circumstances have changed. It is therefore not possible to estimate how long individual households will be in receipt of assistance.

3. The total funds committed to date cannot be estimated because the length of time individual households will be in receipt of assistance is not known. The current weekly value of assistance is $28 527.

4. Commonwealth funding has been made available for three years commencing in the current financial year on the basis of a State undertaking to provide matching funds.

5. In the current financial year the State and the Commonwealth have each made available $1 760 000 for rent and mortgage relief. A maximum of 75 per cent of the available $3 520 000-$2 640 000 is available for the provision of rent relief. It is anticipated that funding will continue on this basis in 1983-84.

WOOD CHIP INDUSTRY

86. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Forests: What prospects exist or what efforts are being made to establish a wood chip industry in South Australia?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Little prospects now exist for the establishment of a traditional wood chip industry in South Australia following the disastrous bushfires of 16 February. However, the South Australian Government is actively pursuing markets in the Middle East region for forest mulch made by the chipping of fire damaged trees. Forest mulch is used in urban and domestic landscaping.

BUSHFIRE LOSSES

87. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Forests:

1. What is the estimated value of the destruction to Woods and Forests Department forestry and property caused by the recent bushfires?

2. What arrangements were made to fell timber burnt in State forests, when will this programme be completed and what is the estimated cost of felling the timber?

3. What is the estimated financial benefit to the State if the timber is milled now and what effect will this amount have on the overall estimated loss of timber caused by the bushfire?

4. Did the Public Service Board offer to double an allowance to encourage workers to end a dispute relating to handling 'dirty wood' and, if so, what was the amount of the offer made?

5. Has the dispute now been satisfactorily resolved and, if so, what are the terms of settlement and, if not, what claims are still being made and when is it expected to be resolved?

6. Has the dispute disrupted felling operations of burnt wood and, if so, to what degree?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. Preliminary estimates put the value of forests and other departmental property destroyed in the recent bushfires at $73 million.

2. The Woods and Forests Department has arranged to increase harvesting operations through a combination of direct employment and contract work for a six month period or such earlier time as deterioration of the timber might terminate salvaging activities. The cost of felling timber will be at current contract rates plus an allowance for the dirty conditions.

3. Salvaged timber will provide income during the next several years which would otherwise be foregone. In addition to recovering full costs, a surplus will be generated from these activities, the level of which is, in part, dependent upon the cost of finance from the Commonwealth or other sources. The net result is not expected to significantly reduce the overall plantation losses to be brought to account. However, this income will offset otherwise substantial clearing costs necessary before replanting can take place.

4. Dirty work allowances applicable to handling burnt timber were last reviewed in 1979. These have been brought up to 1983 levels and negotiations are proceeding with the union at present. The offer made is between $2-3 per man-day and is consistent with allowances in other awards for work of an unusually dirty nature. Very few sawmill employees are involved in directly handling burnt logs.

5. There are no matters causing disputation at present. Discussions relating to the introduction of a 38-hour week are proceeding in line with the Government's commitment to the wages pause.

6. No disruption to felling operations has occurred.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER

89. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. What is the cost to the Engineering and Water Supply Department of supplying water on Eyre Peninsula?

2. What is the amount collected from consumers on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

1. The total cost for the 1981-82 year, including maintenance and operating costs, interest and depreciation was $9 952 211.

2. The total revenue received for the 1981-82 year was $3 014 810.

HOW-TO-VOTE CARDS

146. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Does the Government intend to legislate to prohibit the use of how-to-vote cards at State elections except those displayed in voting compartments as presently allowed?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No.

BUDGET

148. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: Does the Treasurer intend to produce a balanced Budget at the next financial year and, if so, will he guarantee that loan funds will not be used to balance it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are a number of matters to be resolved before I will be in a position to indicate the structure of the 1983-84 Budget. The availability of Commonwealth funds is a major factor and this will not be clear until after the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meeting which is expected to be held in June 1983. Indeed, some Commonwealth funding may not be known until the Commonwealth Government brings down its own Budget in August 1983. I would hope to introduce the State Budget to Parliament shortly after those factors become known.