

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 May 1983

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

The **SPEAKER**: I trust that all members are in good humour, and that we can follow Standing Orders with reasonable harmony.

The **Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport)**: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the House to be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council.

The **SPEAKER**: The question is that the motion be agreed to. For the question say 'Aye'; against 'No'. I believe the Ayes have it, there being present a constitutional majority in the House at the time I made the statement.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. B.C. EASTICK**: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is it to be the practice of this House that due decorum applies in relation to the business of the House?

The **SPEAKER**: Yes.

The **Hon. B.C. EASTICK**: Or is a degree of frivolity to intrude to the point of making a mockery of true Parliamentary practice?

The **SPEAKER**: I am not quite sure what to make of that, but Standing Orders will be upheld. I thought I indicated last evening quite sternly that they will be upheld. One would hope also that humour is not out of order occasionally.

QUESTION TIME

BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr **OLSEN**: Does the Premier concede that the Government does not have a mandate to increase State taxes to reduce the entire \$79 000 000 State deficit? In his policy speech before the recent election the Premier promised that the Labor Government would not increase taxes or introduce any new taxes. On Tuesday, the *Advertiser* editorial stated that the Premier had embarked on a 'tortuous trip towards taxation increases' and that the Premier had an obsession with finding excuses before making his inevitable and now possibly substantial tax increases. The editorial continued: ... there can be no doubt that the Labor Government has contributed to its financial problems and continues to do so.

Today, the *Advertiser* editorial states that it is idle for the Premier to go on claiming that the reason for the Budget deficit was financial mismanagement of the previous Government. The editorial continues:

Those charges are not proved . . .

Yesterday, I conceded that the Government must be able to make limited tax increases on a one-off basis for a short period to pay for the drought, bushfire, and flood disasters. I believe this House has a right to know whether the Premier believes he has a mandate to increase taxes to pay for other areas of the deficit which his own financial statements show are almost entirely the responsibility of his Labor Government.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: That question would be rather like asking an employer whose business has turned down so sharply that he could no longer operate, and who must arrange to close a branch, whether he has a mandate from

his board to close his operations. We are faced with a financial situation that must be corrected and, irrespective of mandates, something must be done about it. It would not matter on what basis a Government had been elected: if a Government is faced with a factual situation, one that I believe is understood by the community and, in part at least, by members opposite, that Government must move to deal with it. The Leader has quoted selectively from the *Advertiser* editorial and it is a pity that he did not give the whole picture. I believe that that newspaper, as well as other sectors of the media and the general community, understands that if a Government is in a financial position, to do nothing would simply result in the disintegration of its services and the bankruptcy of the State. That Government has an obligation to move and it would be irresponsible to do other than that. That is a fact of life and the position in which we find ourselves. It is odd that someone who aspires to the Premiership from the Opposition benches should ask this kind of question because, whatever future Government there is either in the next decade or in the next century, if we cannot ensure that our State's financial house is kept in order and that we have the level of services that the community demands, we will simply not have Government in this State. It is therefore not a question of mandates. No Government wishes to raise taxes. The implication of the Leader's question is that we are stark raving mad and going off on a wild course that will produce our electoral rejection. Why should we do things on which we know the general public is not keen and which will impose a burden on them? The answer is: simply, because as a community we must pay our bills. That is the situation we find ourselves in, and action will be taken.

TEACHER HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr **KLUNDER**: Can the Minister of Education explain the origin of the \$434 000 to be spent by the Teacher Housing Authority on maintenance of its rental accommodation? Newspaper reports have stated that an additional \$434 000 has been allocated under the authority's 1982-83 budget for maintenance work and painting of rental accommodation in remote and other country areas. Concern has been expressed that this sum is not sufficient to meet the backlog of maintenance required in respect of the authority's accommodation.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: This matter was raised in the House last evening by the member for Light, and I shall comment on his contribution in a few moments. The Teacher Housing Authority told me last week that, in the process of reviewing its operating budget and examining the various needs within that budget, it was able to move around the funds available to it within its allocation and that that had resulted in \$434 000 being able to be added to the budgeted sum for the maintenance programme of the authority.

That is in addition to the normal maintenance programme because it was not intended to be spent on maintenance but to be used in other areas where it is now needed. It has not been a call on Government funds to find that extra amount. Last evening, the member for Light implied that, in fact, the Government, in a time of difficult financial circumstances, had suddenly whipped up another \$434 000 and handed it over to the authority, but that is not the case. It is a case of the reallocation of the authority's priorities within the funds provided in its budget.

There is still a significant backlog of maintenance that needs to be done and this \$434 000 will not eliminate that backlog. Indeed, much more is needed. The Government appreciates the reality of that state of affairs in planning for the coming financial year and for subsequent financial

years. On my appointment as Minister, the authority told me how serious, indeed critical, was the backlog: it is way over the annual allocations to the authority. The Government is closely examining ways of overcoming that backlog until we get down to the normal roll-on of the maintenance requirements of the authority.

I find statements made by the member for Davenport in his speech last evening to be particularly quaint. It indicated how much the previous Government had done to overcome maintenance backlogs in Government buildings. He must have had total myopia when it came to the problems of the Teacher Housing Authority, because there are serious maintenance problems that have deteriorated over the past three years. It is a major problem this Government has to face and it is not going to be an easy problem to resolve. We will do what we can to make sure the funds, as they become available, are directed to that area.

STATE FUEL EQUALISATION SCHEME

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Community Welfare ascertain from the Minister of Consumer Affairs whether the Government is now examining the practicalities of a State fuel equalisation scheme and, if it is, when is it expected that such a scheme will be introduced? If it is not, will the Government undertake such a feasibility study? Members would be aware that the Federal Government is funding a fuel freight equalisation scheme which ensures that the freight component of petroleum products and pricing is within the minimal variation anywhere in Australia. As there are differences of more than 3c a litre between some outlets within South Australia, and because these differences are sometimes incorrectly justified as being due to freight, it would seem that a study is justified. Upon further inquiry, I was informed that there are five possible reasons why differences could occur, and that all charges, except freight, are within the jurisdiction of the State Government.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will ask my colleague to provide a report on this matter.

FOUR-TERM SCHOOL YEAR

Mr GROOM: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government is contemplating introducing a four-term year for South Australian schools?

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, and I think the comment made by the member for Eyre is inappropriate. Visiting school communities in South Australia, I have noticed considerable interest in this topic. I have been asked at numerous places what is the Government policy on this matter, and what changes are likely to occur. I believe that it is a matter of public interest, and that some members should be interested in hearing about it.

In the pre-election period the Government indicated it would have consultations with the education community about the possibility of introducing a four-term school year for a trial period of three years. The proposition at the time was based partly on the Queensland experience (which is itself in a three-year trial period). Other States have indicated great interest: New South Wales and the Northern Territory being two other States examining this proposal, as well as Victoria.

I had a report presented to me late last week compiled by the department on the various possibilities that could be examined. I intend to have that matter canvassed more widely with the school community, and I have approved for that process to be undertaken. The Education Department

will set in train a process of consultation with the education community to consider several options.

The first proposition is that there be four equal size terms of about 10 weeks duration with a one to two week break between each of the terms, with the lengthy Christmas break still being retained. I believe there would be no support for the diminution of the Christmas break; therefore the holidays available would need to be dispersed over the three breaks.

Another proposition that has been considered, and will be put forward to the community, is whether or not the second term should be broken into two smaller periods.

So, essentially the first and third terms would remain the same size but the second term would be broken up by what would amount to an extended weekend in the middle of the second term with an additional one or two days either side of a middle weekend. I am not predisposed to any one of those options. I believe they should be open for discussion with the community to see what response comes back. There are a number of managerial and logistical factors which need to be taken into account. They will be considered by me when the final results of that consultation process have been undertaken.

I have come across considerable interest in the school community around the State in that proposition. I believe it is well worth further examination and, hopefully, if the community is accepting of the proposition, we could see something happening in 1984, starting a trial period of about three years.

ENERGY OPTIONS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy advise what policy the Government has for supplying South Australian electricity needs after 1990? The Electricity Trust has said that South Australia will have to import coal from another State or take interstate electricity to supply additional power needed by 1990. This is because of the trust's view that a plant capable of burning South Australian low-grade lignite will not be ready until well into the 1990s. If it is not possible to utilise a local source, the most preferable option for South Australia would be to use coal from another State to burn in a power station in South Australia. This would give a significant boost to our building and construction industry. It would also allow South Australia to maintain maximum possible control over our electricity supplies, which is the argument that the Trust is advancing.

The Opposition has also suggested that a site at Myponie Point on Upper Yorke Peninsula could be the most suitable option for the location of any new power station. It could be developed as a deep-sea port to allow the shipping in of coal if that is the only option available. It also has ready access to the coal deposits of Lochiel and Wakefield which could be used at a later stage. The Electricity Trust has said that it expects to make an announcement by the end of June on whether it will build a new power station or import electricity. As this decision is less than eight weeks away, and as the Government has not so far expressed any view publicly on this matter, I seek information on the Government's policy on this vital matter.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The Government's policy on the matter is that maximum effort should go into the development of the local resource if at all possible to supply electricity needed in the future at a price suitable for both the domestic consumer and industry. I assure the House that this is not a Dorothy Dix question although, coincidentally, I am issuing a press release right now which directly pertains to the matter to which the former Minister has referred. I am happy to advise the House that I am setting

up an advisory committee on future electricity generation options which will be led by Mr E.D.J. Stewart, who, for almost 15 years, was responsible for the planning and development of the S.E.C. Latrobe Valley deposit, which comprises brown coal. Mr Stewart will be assisted by a group consisting of Mr Hugh Hudson, the Chairman of SAOG and PASA; Mr Ron Barnes, the State Under Treasurer; Mr Leon Sykes, the Deputy General Manager of ETSA; and, Mr Bruce Webb, the Director-General of Mines and Energy. I would refer, before the former Minister gets too excited, to his remarks about the impending retirement of Mr Webb. He should take time to study the press release which I have just issued, and he will find that an initial report is required from this working group within six weeks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra and the Deputy Premier are out of order in interjecting.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: That six-week period is within the time span to which the honourable member referred when he raised the question. In his explanation, the Deputy Leader also correctly stated that the Government had not made any statements on this matter. I can only suggest to him that if he has a strong feeling about that he might have also curbed his own Leader a couple of weeks ago when he made an amazing series of suggestions as to how the future electricity requirements of this State could be met, including such things as the fairly loose use of an upgrading at Osborne—I think that that was one of the suggested areas which if the Leader had taken the trouble to check the type of equipment which is installed at Osborne (it would have been easily available to him), he would have found was not as simple as he suggested and was not amongst the range of options that he suggested.

In conclusion to this answer I inform the honourable member also that the kinds of requirements that he has suggested need to be taken into account in considering the supply of this State's future energy and are those comprising the terms of reference to the committee.

EDUCATION RESOURCES

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Education advise the House what moves are in place for expanding co-operation between the Education Department and the Department of Technical and Further Education so that the needs of our young people will be met in the best possible way within the resources that we have available?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. This is a vitally important area of concern. We have two very large departments: the Department of Technical and Further Education and the Education Department, both providing very important educational services to the South Australian community.

There is a very important area where those two departments interface, and that is in the 15-year old to 19-year old education age range. It is important that if the community is to get the best value for its educational resources committed that there be an appropriate level of co-operation between those two departments. There has been active co-operation of sorts over the years, but I believe that we can go further and maximise that. Indeed, the Government spelt out before the last election that that should be an area of further endeavour.

Last Friday I had an opportunity to address a conference of officers and generally interested people from both sectors about the TAFE/Ed. interface (as it is colloquially known). I indicated the concern of the Government that we should make further moves in this direction. Accordingly, I was very pleased to release on that occasion a joint statement

signed by the Directors-General of both departments indicating their willingness to proceed further along this line. I indicated that that is the starting point of the process. I want to be continually kept informed and I will accordingly keep members informed of how that co-operation goes further.

The areas that were being addressed last Friday were areas of transition education link courses between the two departments where much imaginative and innovative work has been done in South Australia. We have come to the stage that that imaginative work of the past now needs to be built into the structures of the system so that we can spread the benefits right across the State and minimise the problem areas that we have had. It is vitally important that in that process the whole community recognises that the functions of those departments are to provide an educational service to our community, and, in particular, our young people; therefore, as far as possible, structural difficulties or hurdles should be minimised. This will require an act of co-operation by officers in both departments. We have the indications from the Directors-General that that is what will be the order of the day in discussions from now on.

JOB CREATION SCHEME

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Has the Government scrapped its election promise to fund a direct job creation scheme from State revenue sources? If not, when will it commence and how much has been allocated to the programme? In Opposition, the Labor Party made constant promises about the introduction of a job creation scheme. In the economic document he released last May, the Premier said:

A Labor Government will introduce a direct job creation scheme. Labor proposes to introduce a regional training scheme through local government. Other options, involving direct short-term Government job creation, are being examined and will be announced later.

In his election policy speech on 25 October, the Premier said:

Later this week, I will announce a detailed jobs and school leavers package that will assist a further 1 000 South Australians to achieve real jobs, but more importantly, training and new skills.

There is no suggestion in any of these statements that the scheme promised would require Federal funds to implement. The Labor Party gave the electors the clear impression that such a scheme would be funded by the State Government. Yet, in the economic statement made this week by the Premier, the only reference to the establishment of a job creation programme indicates that it will be Federally funded. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether the Government has decided to abandon its pre-election commitment to use State funds for job creation schemes?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I must admit to being a little surprised by the question asked by the member for Torrens and urging us on in this area. First, my surprise comes because the previous Government (and I presume that this might mean a welcome change of attitude on the part of the Opposition) was very much opposed to job creation schemes. It denounced them as being wasteful, inefficient, not real jobs and not providing opportunities. It was very strongly against them. Secondly, my surprise comes from the fact that the Opposition has been waiting about Government expenditure in various areas and the member for Torrens was urging further specific allocation of revenue to greater expenditure. Again, I welcome that and I welcome the Opposition's assistance in the revenue measures that are recommended to raise them.

Despite my surprise and, as I say, it suggests a welcome change of attitude on the part of the Opposition because job creation is indeed none of the things that it was denounced as being by the previous Government, it certainly is not a long-term solution. It certainly does not provide full-time permanent jobs. We recognise that.

However, it is very important in a time of high unemployment and, particularly if one puts into it two elements: a training component and a project of lasting value. In fact, one gets from the job creation schemes something that is very valuable indeed. Of course, in turn, the improvement of facilities can create permanent employment. Therefore, we are very much committed to job creation elements as a part of a package of employment policies.

The member for Torrens referred to the role of the Commonwealth Government in this. Of course, we have urged constantly, as we did in Government and Opposition and are doing again, that the Commonwealth should be involved in any such schemes. The reasons for that are obvious. If the schemes are funded solely from State sources, what we are doing is taking people off unemployment benefits, and thereby saving the Commonwealth immediate outlays in terms of that benefit, and providing those people with a wage on which they pay tax. That, in turn, goes to the Commonwealth. Therefore, the Commonwealth is gaining revenue from that element and the estimate is that at least 50 per cent of the moneys expended by the State in those circumstances of no Commonwealth assistance, goes back to the Commonwealth Government.

We have always believed (we urged it on the Fraser Government to no avail) that some sort of reimbursement ought to occur and that that reimbursement should be at no net cost to the Federal Government. That is certainly an element which is involved in establishing any such scheme. Of course, since then the Fraser Government, despite the attitude that had been taken by the State Liberal Government, decided that job creation was necessary, and that something was needed to be done in this field. I know that that came as a bit of a shock to all those in this State who were somewhat out of touch with reality and who opposed these things so vigorously. Nonetheless, that was that Government's policy.

Since coming to Government we moved, in the period of the Fraser Government's occupancy, to negotiate. Indeed, my Deputy, the Minister of Labour, took a leading role at the Federal Labor Ministers Conference with the then Federal Minister of Labour (Mr MacPhee) in establishing guidelines for working out the way in which the State should cooperate in that Federally funded job creation scheme.

That scheme will continue, and we understand that it will be expanded by the new Government, and certainly South Australia will be there. That will involve some cost to us. We are playing our part in contributing to that. For instance, we are accepting all the administrative costs and we have had to expand in certain areas in order to provide for that back-up for assistance and support. Incidentally, in itself that creates jobs. Therefore, there were outlays from our Budget for that. In addition, in some areas there will be some involvement in the project, topping up of funds, or whatever, to ensure that that happens.

As part of that scheme we will be involved and State funds will be expended. In the training area we have taken on extra apprentices. That has been announced by my Deputy, and we have also done several other things in that area. All in all, a quite substantial amount has been going immediately into job creation work. We hope that that can be progressively increased in time. That being so, and coming back to the question asked by the honourable member, I can say that, 'Yes, the Government is committed to such

schemes and the State Government initiation of such schemes.'

HEALTH BENEFIT FUNDS

Mr MAYES: My question is directed to the Chief Secretary for referral to the Minister of Health in another place. Will the Minister urgently investigate the present practice of certain health benefit funds that offer different levels of reimbursement to same-day patients? Will the Minister endeavour to eliminate the discrepancies and inequalities that are occurring? It has been brought to my attention by the Chairman of the Ashford Hospital that certain practices are being undertaken by major health funds in this State that discriminate against certain patients in regard to their claims for reimbursement. In addition, through the endeavours of the member for Ascot Park the matter has been further highlighted recently in regard to a patient who had been in the Ashford Hospital.

Following a claim on a health fund, the patient was reimbursed at a lower figure than offered within the scale of rates. The situation is such that a same-day patient is defined within the regulations under the Hospitals Act, and as a consequence of a change in the regulations in June 1982, health funds now reimburse at a lower level than previously occurred. The patient to whom I referred made a claim to the health fund and was informed that only \$75 would be refunded for the full claim.

Having taken the matter up, the member for Ascot Park was successful in obtaining a full refund of \$125 for that patient. As a consequence of the discrepancy, I am informed that the hospital has been told by the health funds that as of 1 February 1983 only under exceptional circumstances will patients who are in the same day category be reimbursed either \$65 or \$75 depending on whether they are on the basic or higher table. This matter has led to much confusion, and has highlighted the inequality of the application of the methods of reimbursement through the health funds. A further complication is that Medibank does not offer a same-day reimbursement. In fact, it offers full reimbursement as opposed Mutual Hospital and National Health. Will the Minister take up the matter urgently?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: As the honourable member has raised a serious question, I will refer it to my colleague in another place for an early reply.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ENTERPRISE FUND

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when will the South Australian Enterprise Fund be established? In the election policy speech presented by the Premier he indicated that there would be a South Australian Enterprise Fund established to assist industry. The Premier said that the fund would be the Government's first step to get South Australians back to work in a productive way. As it is now exactly six months since the Government was elected, I ask what progress has been made to establish this fund, which was a key plank in the Premier's industrial policy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot give a precise date. The fund will be established by legislation: in other words, it will be a statutory entity. Legislation will have to be brought before Parliament, and there will certainly not be an opportunity for that until towards the end of this year if everything is in place by then.

Some preliminary work has been done and, as the member would realise, much needs to be done in terms of establishing the type of legislation, the powers that such a fund would have, its sources of moneys for investment, and so on, and

that work is going on. Members might recall some fuss that arose, in fact was raised by them, concerning a possible role that Mr Bakewell, the present Ombudsman, might have as an economic consultant to the Premier. The idea of Mr Bakewell moving into that position out of the Ombudsman office was, among other things, to take a leading role in the research and development for the enterprise fund. When Mr Bakewell ultimately decided that he did not wish to take up that particular position but to remain as Ombudsman, we had then to look for other ways of progressing the fund. Since then the new Director of the department, Mr Smith, has been appointed, and the reorganisation and amalgamation of the State Development Department has occurred. That has cleared the way for further work to be done on the enterprise fund. We are working to a general target to try to get the legislation in place as soon as possible, but it will not be before the end of this year.

SOUTH-EAST FIRE DAMAGE

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Water Resources say what action has been taken by the South-Eastern Drainage Board to assist in the restoration of bridges and drains in the South-East following the disastrous fires in the area on Ash Wednesday?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Government has the situation well in hand, and all necessary restoration work will be carried out by the South-Eastern Drainage Board before the expected wet months of July and August. In March I toured the areas of the South-East that were affected by the bushfires, and immediately approved an expenditure of \$122 000 to repair and replace 13 wooden bridges that were seriously damaged. It is expected that this work will be completed in the next few weeks, and owners of properties will have safe and secure access to their properties. In addition to the bridge restoration I approved earlier this week a further expenditure of \$98 000 is to be used for cleaning 50 kilometres of drains; restoration of rails, posts, and guide posts at numerous bridge and ford sites where structural safety at the crossing was not affected; restoration of about 100 access gates and sections of fencing along drainage reserves; and repairs to meters for ground water monitoring. Work on this second phase will be commenced as soon as possible and is expected to be completed by the end of June.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Chief Secretary say what is happening at present, or will happen in future, to the building that housed A Division at Yatala Labour Prison before the fire and riots that occurred six weeks ago? Much interest is being shown by the community, as the Minister might know, about the future of Yatala Labour Prison, and in particular whether or not the building referred to, which was extensively damaged in the fire, should be rebuilt. The Chief Secretary has indicated that he would like to see the building demolished. I share that opinion, but if this is to happen I should like to know from the Chief Secretary what alternatives he has to house prisoners previously held in that building.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: True, this an important question and there is considerable community concern as to what decision the Government will make in relation to A Division. I have said previously that there are various options, some of which I would not personally countenance. This matter is now the subject of inquiry by the Public Buildings Department and my department. I expect that

soon a submission will be made that I can take to Cabinet, so that we may ascertain the cost of all the alternative options available to the Government.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has work been done on the building yet?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No. It would be foolish to do any work until the Government has determined whether we will push it over or whether other options are available. My view on this matter is well known, but I believe that the honourable member should wait until the Government has determined its position.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It can't wait much longer, though.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I agree. It is necessary for the Government to decide quickly. The present situation is not good for morale in the department. We are working on this and, hopefully, within a few weeks at the outside the honourable member will have a reply. I am anxious that this matter be resolved as quickly as possible, because it fits into the overall planning for Yatala Labour Prison in terms of the Swink Report, the master plan that is now being completed, and the future accommodation for prisoners in South Australia. However, it would be wrong for me to pre-empt all the reports being prepared at this stage. Nevertheless, I appreciate the honourable member's concern and the concern in the community in relation to this question, and it will be resolved as soon as I can secure that resolution.

TECHNOLOGY PARK

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Labour say whether the Public Buildings Department has taken on extra staff to complete work on the Adelaide Technology Park project, as alleged yesterday by the member for Davenport?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Over the years I have become used to the ability of the member for Davenport not only to mislead the House but also to mislead the people of South Australia and to mislead the press knowing, without question, that he is telling an untruth. In fact, I go further and say that the honourable member has told untruths on several occasions no less than on this occasion. I think that on this occasion he did it deliberately because, after he made his allegations, I checked with no less than the Director of the department who said that, despite the allegations made by the honourable member, no extra staff, temporary or otherwise, has been employed by the P.B.D. on the project.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: By way of interjection, the member for Davenport said a moment ago that they are temporary but, temporary or otherwise, no-one has been employed by the department for that job. Hassell and Partners was appointed as project architects to work with the Public Buildings Department. The honourable member has been able to get a little information, but he has been unable to put it together properly. That has been his trouble. The real fact of the matter is that the two people whom he has seen and has described as employees put on by the department are employees of Hassell and Partners working in conjunction with the Public Buildings Department.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Here is another clear example of this member not being able to tell the truth in this House. If I was allowed to go further than that, I would call him what I think he is, but I am not permitted to do that under Standing Orders. Therefore, I merely accuse him in this House of again telling untruths. The fact of that matter is that tenders will be called from the private sector for earth

works and actual construction. This is another allegation made by the honourable member that I have proved to be incorrect.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: What about the architectural work?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The P.B.D. has done most of the design work. I do not think that the standards set by the honourable member since he came into Parliament some years ago are good enough for this House or for the people of South Australia and, if I were his Leader, I should advise him to tell the truth in this House and not make wild allegations that he cannot substantiate.

JULIA FARR CENTRE

Mr BECKER: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Health to state whether he is satisfied that the residents of the Julia Farr Centre are receiving the best humane nursing care possible?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the last time I will be warning the member for Davenport and the Deputy Premier for the cross Chamber chit chat. The member for Hanson.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: On a point of order—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will determine the procedure. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The point of order—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Tell us what is the point of order.

The SPEAKER: I take one point of order at a time.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The point of order will be explained to you but not directly to the member who interjected, who used to be the Speaker in this House, and who ought to get used to the fact that he is no longer the Speaker, and probably will never be Speaker again.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! That is out of order. That is a debate.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: My point of order is that I would agree with you in the circumstances where the member for Davenport and I were chit chatting across the Chamber, but on the occasion when you had reason to speak to us, the member for Davenport and I were not chit chatting.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry if I misunderstood the situation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry if I misunderstood the situation, but I would like all honourable members to bear in mind that whilst the Chair shows remarkable leniency in the way the House conducts its affairs, and certainly the way it has conducted itself this morning, the conversations across the House are not only out of order, but also very rude to the member who is on his feet. Now the honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: My point of order is that it is completely legitimate for any member to request of the member on his feet what the question is or what is the point of order. The Minister in seeking to make a point of order was quite obviously not making a point of order but entering into a form of debate which is against the Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, because the honourable member fell into the very error for which I reprimanded the Deputy Premier. If the honourable member looks at *Hansard* he will see that what he thought was a point of order was in actual fact a debate with the Chair. I reprimanded the Deputy Premier for that; there is no point of order.

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Health indicate whether the Government is satisfied that the residents at the Julia Farr Centre are presently receiving the best humane nursing

care and attention possible? I have received several complaints, and allegations over the past week as to the care that residents are receiving at the Julia Farr Centre (formerly the Home for Incurables). One such allegation was that the residents are there 'out of sight, out of care', for the wealthy. I cannot, from my visits to the centre, justify that statement. One family complained that their relative received pain killing medication several hours late, and that the relative suffered unnecessarily before his premature and agonising death. The latest allegation was made to me a week ago and concerned a poster that was taken from the wall in the sitting room of the 8th floor of the East Block of the centre. I will read the poster which I understand was prepared and displayed by a charge sister of that section. The poster states the name of the resident and then states:

Time	Reason
12 noon	Throwing butt over balcony—use an ashtray next time.
25.3.83	
0900	Throwing yourself into the bath and flooding the floor with water.
2.4.83	
1300	Going through sister's drawers.
5.4.83	
1800	No smoke at 6 for taking biscuits out of kitchen.
5.4.83	
1600	No smoke for using saucer as ashtray.
9.4.83	
1600	For throwing butt in toilet bowl and smoking in corridor.
14.4.83	
1430	Miss out on cigarettes for acting in an indecent manner in the dining room.
16.4.83	

That poster was displayed on the wall in the dining-room, not only for the resident to see but also for all residents and visitors to that section of the centre to see. I have received complaints that that type of action is being used to intimidate residents and does not assist in the care and attention that these people receive. I am also advised that the person involved is a subdued resident, a mild-mannered person. Staff and parents are most upset with this childish harassment of residents who, I believe, are entitled to rights and should not be held up to public ridicule.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am sure that I speak on behalf of all members of this House and all citizens of South Australia in saying that I sincerely hope the residents of the Julia Farr Centre receive the best care possible. I am disturbed about the matter which the honourable member has brought to the attention of the House. In fact, he described it as somewhat childish harassment. If the allegations are correct, it is much more than childish harassment: it is an appalling situation. If the honourable member will provide me with the poster that has been made available to him, I will give it to my colleague the Minister of Health in another place. I am certain he will pursue the matter with the same vigour as he has shown on other occasions when he has had concerns about the standard of medical services in South Australia. I thank the honourable member for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. It needs to be resolved quickly for the benefit of not only all people who have to reside at the Julia Farr Centre but also their relatives and friends, who rely on the patients getting appropriate care in that place.

RENT AND MORTGAGE RELIEF SCHEME

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Housing advise what response has been received to the Bannon Government's upgrading of rent and mortgage relief schemes? I have received many inquiries in my office from constituents seeking assistance in obtaining Housing Trust rental accommodation because of the high rent they are being forced to pay for private rental accommodation and their inability to meet the payments. It is causing considerable hardship

amongst people in my electorate. I would appreciate that information from the Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Florey for his question. Members may recall that, some 18 months ago as a result of Commonwealth initiatives by the previous Federal Government, this State's Government decided to partake in a form of mortgage and rent relief systems. I was very critical of the criteria which they set up, although I congratulated them for becoming involved. We found, upon taking office, that little of that money had been spent. As a result of my becoming Minister, I immediately broadened the guidelines so that there could be maximum support for people seeking rent or mortgage relief. I am pleased to advise the House that currently the total number of households assisted under both schemes is about 2 300 people.

Of these, about 1 300 have been approved since I broadened the guidelines of the scheme in early February. I believe that these figures support my argument in Opposition that the schemes were too restrictive in their criteria and were only token attempts on the part of the former Tonkin Government to help those householders who were in financial difficulties because of the recession. In only three months 1 300 households have taken advantage of these two schemes having been assessed as being in critical need of financial help to keep their homes together.

At the Housing Ministers' Conference to be held on Friday of next week, I will be urging the Federal Minister to continue the schemes so that those people (as suggested by the member for Florey) can seek financial assistance. I do hope that if I can convince the Minister I will gain the full support of everyone in the House on this matter.

BRIGHTON BUS SERVICE

Mr MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government intends to withdraw the present bus service which services part of Brighton, and in particular the Brighton railway station, thus taking away a service which has been enjoyed for many years by the patrons of the railway service and also the residents of Brighton? In answer to a question by the member for Mawson on Thursday 22 April (page 999 of *Hansard*), the Minister said that he had had the matter investigated and he assured the member for Mawson that the 680 bus route would be re-routed within the next few weeks to suit the needs of the people in that area. I would ask the Minister to re-assess the situation in the light of information I have given him of the effects on my constituents of removing a service which has been enjoyed by them for a number of years, and which transports workers to the Brighton railway station on their way to the Flinders Medical Centre or the Flinders University. In re-routing that service, the Minister would be making it most difficult for my constituents as well as the constituents of other members on either side of the House who work at the Flinders Medical Centre.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: It is not the intention of the State Transport Authority to reduce or take away the service that the member for Glenelg refers to. The State Transport Authority is continuing an inquiry into that service to see where it can be improved without placing in jeopardy the existing service. Our desire is to extend bus services and their routes, where possible, on the basis of need, and not to curtail any service at all. I advise the member for Mawson on the date referred to by the member for Glenelg that we were hopeful that within a few weeks after the inquiry I could advise her of an improved service. I appreciate the concern being expressed by the member for Glenelg, and I will certainly take that into account. It is definitely not the

intention of the Government to curtail or take away any service from constituents in the area. Rather, we want to extend those services where it is practicable to do so on the basis of need. I will certainly take into account the concern expressed by the member for Glenelg when this inquiry is concluded.

WHYALLA CULTURAL CENTRE

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Premier inform me whether he has had any discussions with the Eyre Peninsula Cultural Trust in respect to the possibility of altering the existing Further Education College theatre so as to enable Whyalla to have a cultural centre? I think the Premier would be aware that, unfortunately, the city of Whyalla has missed the boat in respect of the building of a suitable and completed cultural centre. Further, I understand that there is an idea in the melting pot to change the small theatre at the college of further education to provide an adequate facility for a cultural centre in Whyalla. I would be pleased to receive any information that the Premier might have.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can confirm that I have recently had a meeting with members of the Eyre Peninsula Regional Cultural Centre Trust to discuss this project, which has had a chequered history. As the member suggests, it missed the boat mainly because the Government changed in 1979 and the commitment to the establishment of a network of regional cultural centres was quite considerably downgraded by the previous Government.

The centre at Mount Gambier, which cost \$3 700 000, is now open. The Port Pirie centre cost a total of \$6 000 000. The obvious benefits of these centres in the cities and the continued contribution to the cultural, tourist and other aspects of those cities has become very clear, and there is no reason why Whyalla should be missing out.

The problem has been that, as delays have gone on, so costs have risen and the project has become more difficult to accomplish. The Government is faced with either going back to the drawing board and trying to establish a completely new and separate regional cultural centre, at one end of the scale, or, at the other end of the scale, saying, that we will have to defer it indefinitely or move into a compromise position. That is what I have discussed with the trustees. I have asked that a proposal be prepared for a pre-tender estimate on a 500-seat theatre which would include an additional auditorium as an extension to the existing Whyalla College of Technical and Further Education. It would include additional dressing rooms and shared front house areas. That means that there would be the smaller facility which already exists at the technical and further education college and the larger cultural centre trust which would enable major cultural activities, conventions, and so on, to be held in a very fine venue in Whyalla.

The fact that this proposal will represent a compromise does not mean that it need not be of the highest standard and quality. I assure the honourable member that we are reviewing our capital Budget with a view to trying to get this work under way as soon as possible, because the longer it is delayed the greater the escalation of costs. I would hope to be able to advise the honourable member in the not too distant future so that he can let his constituents know that this enterprise will be under way.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 11.33 a.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendment No. 1:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to amendment No. 2:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon this amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 3, page 1, line 18—After 'is amended' insert:

(a) by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1aa) Notwithstanding subsection (1), where the applicant for the issue of a driver's licence has previously held a licence issued under this Act or under the law of a place outside this State but not during the period of 3 years immediately preceding the date of his application, the Registrar may issue him with a licence without endorsing upon the licence the conditions required by that subsection.; and

(b)

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day: Other business No. 1 to be taken into consideration forthwith.

Mr Ashenden: I thought that you said you weren't going to do this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that honourable members will abide by my call to order.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do this not in any way to try to take away the rights of members opposite. This Bill was passed in the Upper House (the very first time that casino legislation has been passed in the South Australian Parliament)—

Mr Lewis: So what!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:—by 15 votes to four, which indicates to me and to the public of South Australia that there is an overwhelming majority in the Upper House in favour of this measure. Let me explain the position to honourable members: under Standing Orders, this Bill is not due to come before the Parliament until next Wednesday during private members' time. In those circumstances, if one observes the tradition, the person on this side of the House responsible for introducing the Bill will move and speak to the second reading, and then the responsible member opposite will move for an adjournment. Clearly, that would restrict any debate on the Bill in this session of Parliament.

Mr Ashenden: You should have sat more often.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I happen to believe, as does the Government, that such a restriction is not the wish of Parliament generally, the people of South Australia or the Legislative Council, which overwhelmingly passed the Bill. I believe that, although this is a private member's Bill, the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the opportunity is given to members of this House to speak for or against this legislation and to cast a vote during this session of Parliament. I sincerely believe that the Government would be failing in its duty if it did not give that opportunity to the House. Clearly, if we allowed the ordinary procedures of this House to dominate the position in respect of this Bill, we would simply be backing away procedurally from the matter. I am in no better position than any other member regarding the debate on this measure. I voted against it last time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is now canvassing the debate.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will return to the reason why I want this matter brought on today. All that will be done is that the private member responsible for handling the Bill in this place will give the second reading explanation, and we will then return to the normal business. The explanation will take about 15 minutes of the time of the House which at this stage is nothing in the context of the hours we are sitting. The other proposition which I put to the Deputy Leader this morning was to allow the debate to be completed next Wednesday. I have come up with two options.

Mr Mathwin: In Government time?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is warned.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yes, in Government time. It could have gone either way, Wednesday evening or whenever. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has refused even to accede to that request. It is clear to me that the only option left to the Government is to do as I am doing, and I have moved accordingly.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Nothing demonstrates to the House more clearly the absolute abysmal lack of knowledge of the Parliamentary procedure than the speech we have just heard from the Deputy Premier. The last option canvassed by the Deputy Premier is tantamount to the Government taking over the legislation.

If that is what it wants, let it do that, but we have sat for only 24 days in a period of 237 days, I would think the shortest sitting of the Parliament on record. Here we are having to sit on a Thursday morning and sitting again tomorrow, and the Deputy Premier wants to suspend Standing Orders in order to tinker with and facilitate the normal passage of private members' Bills in Parliament. If the Government wants to take this Bill over, let it do so, but it should not use a device—and that is all this is—to let this Bill proceed in the guise of being a private member's Bill by tinkering with the normal procedures involving private members' legislation.

If the Government is fair dinkum about giving priority to this matter, what about the Ramsay Trust (Order of the Day: Other business No. 9)? What priority is it giving to that matter? That is its business—a private member's item. Here is the Government, under the guise of a private member's Bill, seeking to facilitate discussion on it, whereas the way in which it has arranged the sitting of the House is such that that discussion would be prevented. Let the House come back for an extra week. Let us cut out this nonsense of sitting all night, sitting on Fridays and the suggestion of sitting on Saturday.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Be very careful, or I might do it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let them do it. Let us be honest, if the Government wants to take over this Bill: it wants to get off the hook.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Bill came in originally as a private member's Bill, and that member is now a member of the Ministry. The Government wants to get this matter off its plate, quickly and surreptitiously, without proper time being allowed for the normal Parliamentary processes to be followed so that people in the community who have a view to express can express it. Who delayed the Bill when it was before the House previously? The Labor Party got rid of it.

The SPEAKER: I have been very tolerant, but the Deputy Leader is now straying, as the Deputy Premier did.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Labor Party wants to take over this Bill, let it do so; it has charge of the

operations of the House. What nonsense about debating it next Wednesday evening. The Government can that if it wishes. It has the numbers to dictate what we do in this House and when we do it, but do not let us interfere with the normal procedures—

Mr Trainer: Things are different—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Ascot Park.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! When a member is warned, the call 'Hear, hear!' is certainly out of order, so I call the member for Light to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The sittings of this House have been a farce. Major Bills have to be completed during the next week yet here is the Government wanting to push in by subterfuge, by tinkering with Standing Orders, another major Bill, and to cut off the sitting next week. We shall be perfectly happy to come back—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Glenelg of his position at the moment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What we heard yesterday and what we have heard today are two different things. The Opposition will not go along with this device to tinker with a private member's Bill so that the Government can get rid of this legislation quickly along with other major legislation when we do not have time for mature consideration of it. If the Government wants to go ahead with this Bill, let it make it Government business and debate it in Government time.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Mr L.M.F. Arnold and Ms Lenehan. Noes—Messrs Chapman and Gunn.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 Ayes and 19 Noes, the motion passes in the affirmative, but it lapses because it lacks an absolute majority.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I want to point out to the House that I had two options this morning to deal with the Casino Bill. I could have just moved to postpone Government business until after Order of the Day: Other Business, No. 1 was completed. That is a procedural motion which is perfectly in order. I did not choose that option because the matter has generated such emotion that I thought it better to move to suspend Standing Orders to give full expression—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. I submit that what the Deputy Premier is doing is reflecting on a vote of this House. It is contrary to Standing Orders for any member to reflect on a vote of this House and it is inappropriate for the Deputy Premier to continue in the way in which he is currently addressing the House.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is correct in the sense that there must be no reflection on the vote. From now on I will get back to last night's position and insist on complete silence so that I can hear what is being said. I did not hear anything which seemed to me to reflect upon the vote. I ask the honourable Deputy Premier to continue.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I will go back to the beginning of the sentence that offended the honourable member. I did not choose that option because the matter has generated such emotion that I thought it better to move to suspend Standing Orders to give full expression of the wishes of the House. That is why I chose that course. However, as a result of the vote it is clear that a majority of members wish to proceed—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Premier is reflecting on a vote of this House, and, he is therefore out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will consider that. What we have to get clear is this: I will make a ruling accordingly and, if people disagree, they will have the opportunity to dissent. I rule, after taking advice and having a reference given to me to Erskine May, that a reflection in Parliamentary terms has a clear meaning. It is an adverse remark on a vote of the House or, in some way, an objectionable criticism or statement of such a sort, against a vote of the House. The sentence that I just heard for the first time simply referred to the vote. As far as I could see, it was neutral. It was only setting out the chronology up to that point and it was neither for nor against the vote. So, I rule against the point of order for the reasons that I have given. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: However, as a result of the vote it is clear that a majority of members wish to proceed with the matter and, indeed, except for the unfortunate absence of a number of members, the motion would have passed with an absolute majority. In view of that fact I now move:

That Government business be postponed until after Order of the Day: Other Business, No. 1.

The House divided on the motion:

While the division bells were ringing:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Todd and many members in the House who have either been warned or are on the verge of being warned: if there is any disruption while this division is being held I will take appropriate action.

Ayes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon, M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Mr L.M.F. Arnold and Ms Lenehan. Noes—Messrs Chapman and Gunn.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Mr LEWIS: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. I seek your ruling on a question about which I am uncertain, relating to the fact that the Deputy Premier sought leave of the House to make a personal explanation. During the course of that personal explanation and at its conclusion—

An honourable member: It was a Ministerial statement.

Mr LEWIS: A Ministerial statement? I apologise.

CASINO BILL

Second reading.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr Lewis: Shame!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: In moving this motion, I am mindful of the long and unsuccessful attempts to have a casino operating in South Australia. Briefly, the history of the proposal shows that attempts were made in 1973 by the then Premier (Hon. D.A. Dunstan), in 1981 by Mr Peterson (the member for Semaphore) and in 1982 by the then Minister of Recreation and Sport, the member for Torrens (Hon. Michael Wilson). Since the first attempt, casinos have been established with much success at Wrest Point in Hobart in February 1973; in Alice Springs in July 1981; in Launceston in May 1982; and I understand that the Darwin casino is to be opened shortly. Also, Queensland has approved two casinos, one in Surfers Paradise and one in Townsville.

Mr Mathwin: What does that prove?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM: For the benefit of the member for Glenelg, as he well knows, the history of these ventures is set out in the 1982 select committee's report which dealt with that Bill. That committee was chaired by the member for Torrens, the then Minister of Recreation and Sport. I have read that report and I want to pay a tribute—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the member for Glenelg will remember his position. The honourable member for Hartley.

Mr GROOM: I want to pay a tribute to that committee—

Mr MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I suggest that you are being a little hard on me. The Deputy Leader of the Government has been interjecting across the Chamber and even had a conversation and was not given his second warning. I think that you, Mr Speaker, may be a little hard on me in this situation.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that he has interjected twice now since he has been warned. I do not think that I am being too intolerant.

Mr GROOM: I want to pay a tribute to that committee's work, and that is in regard to all members of that committee. The report is a most comprehensive document and one of the most comprehensive and balanced select committee reports that I have seen. A quick glance at the States that have casinos and the time frames indicates that it has been approved more on a non-political basis, and that tourism itself has been the prime motive in each case in relation to the consequential economic benefits to those States.

Mr Lewis: What about welfare?

Mr GROOM: I will come to that question in due course for the honourable member's benefit. He will have the opportunity to debate that matter subsequently. Unquestionably, legislation of this kind produces advantages and disadvantages. My own view is that, on balance, the advantages and benefits to the State heavily outweigh the disadvantages.

I want now to deal briefly with the main arguments for and against the Bill. I do not intend this to be exhaustive, as I simply seek to illustrate the main advantages and disadvantages. If the Bill passes, a casino licence will undoubtedly be issued and South Australia will have a new facility. The economic impact will extend, presuming the need for a building to house the complex is erected, from the construction phase of such development to the eventual generation of income, employment and revenue to the State. It can reasonably be expected that during the construction phase hundreds of workers could be employed on-site and many more off-site in services and in the supply of materials.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member will get his opportunity in due course. I suggest that he be patient and listen to the arguments and seek to deal with this issue on a non-

political basis. The entertainment industry is very labour intensive, and it can be reasonably expected that several hundred staff will be employed in a casino complex. For example, Wrest Point casino employs about 600 people, and I understand from the material available that Alice Springs employs about 200 people.

Mr Lewis: All in the casino?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mallee is now called to order. I ask the member for Hartley to proceed and ignore interjections.

Mr GROOM: I will attempt to do that, Mr Speaker. The spin-off effects from such a complex would also be considerable. In its first seven years of operation Wrest Point purchased some \$24 000 000 worth of goods and services. That has obviously had a beneficial effect on local manufacturers and suppliers in that State. Besides direct spending within the complex itself, visitors attracted to the complex spend millions of dollars each year with local retailers, restaurateurs and entertainment houses.

The impact on Government revenue and the South Australian economy, if a casino complex is established in this State, in general terms, is quite obvious. The major beneficiary will be the South Australian tourist industry. It has been clearly demonstrated interstate and overseas that a casino complex is an attraction by itself, not only simply because it attracts hard-core gamblers, who would obviously visit a casino or indeed any other gambling facility, but also because it will attract tourists in general as part of a package night out, enjoying not only a meal and a floor show but also gaming tables. In other States, casinos have encouraged the development of package holidays. Consequently, tour operators and airlines alike sell in other States casino package deals which are promoted quite independently of the casinos themselves.

The addition of convention facilities would clearly accelerate the tourist industry benefits accruing from the establishment of a casino in South Australia. To illustrate this point, I refer to page 57 of the Select Committee on the Casino Bill Report last year under the heading '7.1.2 Tourism', as follows:

In Australia, tourism has been one of the motivating factors behind any decision to introduce legislation to establish a casino. The success of such a factor can be clearly seen from the Tasmanian experience. The Tasmanian Tourism Department's 1978 visitors' survey showed that the hotel-casino is one of Tasmania's most popular tourist attractions, ranking with the State's major historic sites. The survey shows that 69.2 per cent of all adult visitors to Hobart visited the Wrest Point Casino.

That very high percentage of tourists who visit Tasmania go to the casino. In many respects, their presence in Tasmania is usually part of a package tour. I suspect that a small proportion of those people, in fact an infinitesimal portion, are hard-core gamblers. The benefits to Government revenue are quite obvious, although I agree that it is not possible to calculate the precise revenue benefits to the State. However, Wrest Point has generated some \$23 000 000 for Tasmania.

There are two principal arguments against the Bill. The first is the moral argument. Some people hold the belief that gambling is of itself amoral and therefore it is wrong in all its branches. Linked with that argument is the belief that gambling produces addicts, some family disruptions and other undesirable traits and habits. There is no doubt that there is some basis for such fears. There is no doubt that there is a basis for these fears to exist and that there is some evidence to confirm such occurrences. However, page 26 of the select committee report, in relation to the extent of the problem, states:

... research suggests that about .77 per cent of the population gambles at a level where it creates a problem.

In other words, in relation to this statistical sample and survey, some 99.23 per cent of the population are clearly able to control any potential for excesses in relation to gambling.

The second major argument against the Casino Bill relates to crime. Crime is often spoken of as being associated with the operation of casinos, both in individual terms and on an organised basis. Again, for some people there is a basis for such fears. Undoubtedly, without proper safeguards and controls, the potentiality for criminal activity would increase.

In relation to the first argument, my view is that gambling is something that individuals should be reasonably able to engage in if they wish. I point out that, essentially, I am a non-gambler, but as an individualist I claim the right to gamble if I so chose, and at a casino. I respect the view of those persons who find gambling unacceptable. However, I reject any suggestion of any right or power on the part of those persons to impose that view on me, or on any other person who does not wish it to be imposed on them. All this Bill does is permit people to gamble in casinos if they so wish. People, like the honourable member for Mallee, not wishing to gamble, for whatever reason they choose are free to stay away from the casino and free to encourage other people to stay away from it, too, if they see fit.

In relation to the second argument dealing with crime, we are fortunate to have some 10 years experience in Australia with casinos. The select committee, at page 52 of its deliberations, had the following to say:

In addition, the committee finds that Australian casinos as currently operated appear to be free of any manipulation or organised crime but that unless adequate controls and surveillance is maintained that it is an open invitation to be penetrated at any time and at any level of the casino/hotel operations.

There are two emphases in that passage. The first emphasis is that Australian casinos are free from organised crime. It is very important that honourable members take note of that fact.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I suspect that the honourable member who just interjected has read the select committee report, and I suggest that he go over it and re-examine this area. The fact remains that Australian casinos are relatively free of organised crime. Indeed, the select committee used the term 'are free of organised crime'.

The second emphasis in the passage I have just read from the select committee's report deals with adequate controls and surveillance. In relation to the latter, the Bill imposes very strict and tight controls which regulate and prevent any tendency towards opening the door to organised crime. With regard to individual crime such as larceny, cheating or skimming, proper supervision and security will minimise such crimes.

All economic ventures are vulnerable to these types of individual crimes. Supermarkets, for example, have by their very nature increased the risk in relation to shop thefts, but who now would advocate the closing of supermarkets simply because statistics show that there has been some increase in shop-lifting offences as a result of the establishment of supermarkets?

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am talking about individual crime, not organised crime. The component of crime is on two levels, for the honourable member's benefit: it is on the level of organised crime (I have already quoted from the select committee deliberations in relation to that matter), and there is another area of individual crime.

I am really stressing that individual crimes such as larceny, cheating and skimming are quite easily controlled and that any economic venture is vulnerable to those types of individual crimes. However, with casinos they can be minimised,

not only by the rigid controls that are imposed by the Bill but also by surveillance devices. People who are handling money in casinos are under camera surveillance, so those individual crimes can be tightened up on and controlled to a far greater extent than they can be in supermarkets. I use the illustration of supermarkets simply because those economic ventures did increase, or had the tendency to increase, some shop theft offences, but they have been controlled.

Another concern in dealing with crime involves money laundering. It is often alleged that there is an ever present potential to launder black money through a casino. However, organised crime deals in millions of dollars, and I dare say that the sums gambled in Australia are simply too small for organised crime to use the casinos to launder money. I suggest that any gambler in Adelaide who seeks to gamble more than a couple of thousand dollars would become the object of clear attention and would stick out, as a member said in another place, like a sore thumb. Such a person would certainly be the centre of attention. In any event, the select committee at page 76 of its deliberations, in relation to administration and control, stated:

Subject to Parliament's decision on the passage of the Casino Bill 1982 it will be essential that the administrative controls be of the highest possible levels to ensure integrity of operation so as to maintain public confidence at all times.

Consequently, with those factors in mind, there is no reason, also bearing in mind the experience of other States over 10 years, why a properly controlled and regulated casino complex in South Australia cannot mirror the trouble-free operation of complexes in other States. Before concluding, I refer to public opinion, which has clearly changed from that prevailing view in 1973, at the time of the first attempt to introduce casino legislation. Page 23 of the select committee report states:

An Australian Gallup poll survey taken in January 1972 indicated a high degree of community approval for various forms of gambling, ranging from 80 per cent for State lotteries to 21 per cent for casinos. Polls taken since that time have shown an increase in the approval of casinos.

Thus, one sees that 21 per cent of the population was in favour of casinos. From the report, the Morgan Gallup polls conducted in June 1980 and March 1981 produced the following results:

The majority of people in Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia were in favour of a casino in their State. The Morgan Gallup poll found people in the other States are divided on this issue.

In South Australia at that time, polls in regard to a casino showed that 45 per cent of the population was in favour of a casino, 40 per cent was against a casino, and 15 per cent was undecided. A further Morgan Gallup poll conducted in March 1982 found that the majority of people in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania were in favour of a casino in their State. The report states:

People in South Australia and Western Australia are divided on this issue. Nationally, support for casinos is 51 per cent, up 5 per cent since the middle of last year. . .

Again, a continuing trend in favour of a casino was indicated. The select committee report sets out those statistical tables at page 23. In relation to a further poll taken in June 1982, and set out at page 24 of the report, it was stated:

Recent polls published by Peter Gardener and Associates have produced a similar result. In fact, a recent report in the *Adelaide Advertiser* on Monday, 3 June 1982 stated that a total of 53.3 per cent of a survey group supported the casino proposal.

A recent *Advertiser* article dealing with polls taken in April 1983 indicated a 61 per cent approval rate for casinos in Australia—36 per cent disapproved, and 3 per cent were undecided. In relation to South Australia, the approval rate for casinos was 52 per cent, 44 per cent disapproved and 4 per cent were undecided. Those figures are in marked contrast

to polls in relation to poker machines, which show an overwhelming rejection.

In some ways, a significant degree of consensus and acceptability in the community is required for a measure of this kind to pass into law. Public opinion has clearly changed significantly over the past 10 years, and I believe that we in South Australia have reached that necessary stage of community consensus and acceptability for this Bill to pass into law. I pay a tribute to the efforts of former Premier Dunstan in 1973 the member for Semaphore in 1981; and the member for Torrens in 1982: those members were instrumental in providing some guidance to the community. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Honourable members: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

Mr GROOM: Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 contains definitions required for the purposes of the proposed new Act. Clause 5 establishes the Casino Supervisory Authority. Clause 6 deals with the membership of the authority. It is to consist of three members of whom one (the Chairman) is to be a legal practitioner or a person who has been a judge. The clause also requires that one member of the authority should be a person with qualifications and experience in accounting.

Clause 7 is a standard saving provisions. Clause 8 provides for payment of allowances and expenses to members of the authority. Clause 9 provides for the appointment of the secretary to the authority. Clause 10 sets out the functions of the authority. Clause 11 confers certain procedural powers on the authority. Clause 12 requires the authority to hold a public inquiry to determine the premises in which a casino may be established and the terms and conditions to which the licence for the casino is to be subject. All interested persons have a right to be heard and to be represented by counsel at the inquiry.

Clause 13 provides that, upon the completion of an inquiry by the authority, the Governor may grant a licence to the commission on terms and conditions recommended by the Authority. The Governor may add to or vary the terms and conditions of a licence where, in his opinion, it is necessary to do so in the public interest. Clause 14 deals with investigation of proposed modifications of the terms and conditions of the licence by the authority. The Governor is empowered to alter the terms and conditions of a licence in accordance with a recommendation from the authority. Clause 15 provides that there shall be no more than one licence in force under the Act and that the licence is not transferable.

Clause 16 provides that it shall be lawful for the commission to establish and operate a casino but only through the agency of a suitable person who has been approved by the authority. Clause 17 prevents the admission of persons under the age of 18 years to the licensed casino. Clause 18 empowers the Minister to order the exclusion of undesirable persons from the casino. A right of appeal against such an order lies to the authority. Clause 19 provides for the keeping and auditing of accounts. Subclause (5) requires that moneys accruing to the commission by virtue of the operation of the casino must be paid into the Hospitals Fund.

Clause 20 makes the Superintendent responsible for scrutiny of the operation of the casino. Clause 21 provides for the inspection necessary to ensure the proper and fair operation of the casino. Clause 22 empowers the authority to give directions to the commission as to the management, supervision, and control of the casino. Clause 23 requires the authority to prepare an annual report as to the operation of the casino. The report must be laid before both Houses of Parliament. Clause 24 prohibits possession of poker

machines (either in the casino or elsewhere). Clause 25 provides for summary disposal of offences. Clause 26 is a regulation-making power.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, I seek clarification as to whether the casino legislation has now taken precedence of the Government Supply Bill.

The SPEAKER: That is correct.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: So, in the order of importance of Government business—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader will resume his seat. I will repeat the ruling I have given. It is not for me to comment on the dealings of the House.

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

That the debate be now adjourned.

I make the point that, obviously—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no need for anyone to rise. The Deputy Leader has two choices: he can move the adjournment—

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Which he has done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader can move the adjournment, or he can, in exercising his rights, speak to the Bill. He moved the adjournment and then, in the Australian vernacular, tried to have two-bob the other way. I have an adjournment motion before the Chair. Is it seconded?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: What you, Mr Speaker, are saying is that you are giving a ruling that precludes me from speaking to the adjournment motion. If that is the case, I would appreciate it being put clearly rather than aspersions being made as to my behaviour in the Parliament, which is quite unbecoming to the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Have I understood the honourable member to take offence at my remarks about the Australian vernacular?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I would accept it if you had said that Standing Orders preclude my speaking to the adjournment motion, and I would have understood the point. You, Mr Speaker, would have been explaining to the House that it is not competent for a member to speak to the adjournment motion.

You, Sir, did not seek to do that. You sought to cast some reflection on the fact that I was seeking to debate the adjournment motion, which I found strange. I do not think that I could put it as strong as saying I found it offensive, but I found it unusual. It is not what one normally sees as the role of the Speaker to comment on the motives of a member seeking to exercise a right in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The whole incident began when the honourable member himself asked me to comment on the dealings of the House. In so far as he is offended in any way by my use of the Australian vernacular, I apologise to him. But in fact he has moved the adjournment.

Motion carried.

Mr GROOM: I move:

That this matter be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next.

Question—'That this matter be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next'—declared carried.

Mr LEWIS: Divide.

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr LEWIS: I understand that my call for a division is in fact in opposition to the motion that the debate be adjourned rather than to the time of the adjournment. That being so, I wish to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: As I understood the honourable member, the effect of his call was that he was opposing the time of the adjournment. If he wishes to withdraw his call, that will be the effect of it. The adjournment motion will place the matter as the member for Hartley wanted it. Is that how

the honourable member for Mallee understands it? I do not want him to withdraw his call under any false pretences.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the motion that the debate be adjourned, or that it be on Wednesday next?

The SPEAKER: That the debate be on Wednesday next.

Mr LEWIS: My proposition to divide, therefore, stands.

The SPEAKER: There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare the motion carried.

Mr MATHWIN: On a point of order, I seek your assistance, Sir, in relation to the present situation of the Casino Bill. Is it still a private member's Bill, or has it now become Government legislation?

The SPEAKER: I think that it is quite clear that it is private member's legislation. That is what the House has ruled.

Mr MATHWIN: Then it finishes at 6 o'clock?

The SPEAKER: That is in the hands of the House.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

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

That the Library Committee has leave to sit as a joint committee with the Library Committee of the Legislative Council during the sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 May. Page 1214.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Thank you, Mr Speaker for the call; I never thought that the opportunity would arise. I was getting very worried because it appeared that the matter of the casino took precedence over the finances of the State and, when that happens, I think that we are in real trouble. To me, this Appropriation Bill is nothing but a gigantic fraud. It is an absolute waste of time. In all the years that I have been in the House I do not think that I have had to be treated with such contempt.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Coles is quite correct: let me make it quite clear from the outset that I do not agree that the Premier should also be the Treasurer. I think that it is time that we looked at altering the system and I think that we should have a separate Treasurer.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Are you nominating?

Mr BECKER: I would not like to sort out your financial affairs. I think that appointing a separate person as Treasurer is something that members of the Government ought to look at because I think that this is an extremely difficult and complex situation at present.

In stating that this document is a gigantic fraud, I want to make it very clear to members of the House that I see the document as presented, containing an error. Since the Budget was brought down, there has been on average a short-fall between \$25 000 000 and \$50 000 000 per month in the current account. The State Treasury has had to provide somewhere between \$25 000 000 and \$50 000 000. In other words, it has either had to borrow extra money or use money from the various trust accounts. In doing so, the State has either lost or incurred an additional interest bill of somewhere between \$6 000 000 and \$8 000 000. Nowhere in the document is this pointed out. Nowhere in the document has any allocation been made to cover this loss in interest.

The taxpayers of South Australia are up for at least another \$6 000 000 to \$8 000 000 in interest. Furthermore, the Premier (as Treasurer) has not been honest. As I understand it, he has not been honest with anybody in saying where he will go or what taxes he will increase. The Government will increase taxes. The Government cannot survive unless it is prepared to take strict and stern measures to contain the cost of operating the bureaucracy in this State. Because it will not do that (which the Premier has already said), because the Labor Party is committed to a policy of increasing taxes rather than cutting expenditure, it must necessarily increase taxes. Of course, that will mean that, if the Government wants to pick up somewhere in the vicinity of \$70 000 000, it can do so by a 12 per cent increase in taxes across the board. In other words, all State taxes and charges could be increased by 12 per cent and I believe that that is what the Government will do. It will do that and say that that will be the inflationary rate for the next 12 months, and it will get away with increasing all the taxes.

Therefore, we will find that property taxes, gambling taxes (upon which we seem to place more emphasis than anything else), motor vehicles, pay-roll taxes, stamp duty, business franchise, fees for regulatory services will all increase. However, the one that really hurts the property owners is water and sewerage rates. It is fair to assume that water and sewerage rates will be increased by 12 per cent as from 1 July and that the water allocation for property owners will be reduced by 12 per cent.

Therefore, the unfortunate property owners in the metropolitan area at least will cop another 24 per cent effective increase in the price of water. This will mean that more and more residents each year who own properties will incur excess water charges. The document had already stated that the Government had picked up something like \$5 000 000 additional water rate income, because that is the real profit as far as the Engineering and Water Supply Department is concerned. Even if it increases the rates by 50 per cent, the E. & W.S. Department will not make a profit, because the interest costs on their capital works programmes account for about 51 or 52 per cent of its operating expenditure. Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having being formed:

Mr BECKER: If the House is going to sit for additional hours in order to subject Government legislation to intense scrutiny, I insist that there be a quorum present in this House at all times. I think the behaviour of members has been absolutely disgraceful during the last 48 hours because there have been continual reminders from the Chair that it is necessary that a quorum be present. I will keep on paying regard to this matter as long as I am here to ensure that everyone is attending to their duties in a proper manner—after all, members are well paid. A few members might laugh, but they are well paid in view of the sittings of the House that we have had—18 days in the past six months. If we are concerned with State finances and if members of the Government want to denigrate the previous Government and make all sorts of unsubstantiated allegations I think it is about time that the whole Parliament acted responsibly as far as costs to the taxpayer are concerned. It would not be a bad idea if the Public Accounts Committee investigated the operations of Parliament House—I think they would be in for a hell of a shock. In introducing the Bill the Premier said:

It is clear to my Government that the Budget presented in August 1982 was both incomplete and dishonest and that it was never intended to meet its planned target of a balance on Consolidated Account.

No proof has been presented to the House or outside the House as to whether it was an incomplete and dishonest

document. The Premier and other members of his Party while in Opposition had the opportunity during the Budget Estimates Committees to investigate the Budget to ascertain whether it was a fair and reasonable document, and they had the opportunity to question the various Ministers as to whether or not they were telling the truth. Such wide sweeping statements really annoy me. There was a further statement made accompanying the Revenue Account balance sheet for February 1983. When the February figures were issued the statement was made:

The Premier and Treasurer, Mr Bannon, announced today that the financial result for the eight months to the end of February 1983 was an excess of payments over receipts of \$55 300 000 on the Government's Consolidated Account. This result was due to an excess of payments over receipts on recurrent operations of \$83 500 000 and an excess of receipts over payments on capital works of \$28 200 000. This result compares with an excess of receipts over payments of \$8 400 000 on the Consolidated Account for the corresponding period last financial year.

I think it is about time that our Treasury officers started to prepare these statements in language that can be understood by the public. Let us get down to simple facts. There is a Revenue Account and a Loan Account and the recurrent account expenditure is really the Revenue Account; it is a cash account, it is cash in and cash out. It is as simple as that. It is the same operation as the average housewife uses in relation to her housekeeping money.

On that account there was a deficit of \$83 500 000 in the first eight months of the current financial year. On the capital works, the Loan programme, there was a surplus at the end of February of \$28 200 000. At the end of February the State was \$55 300 000 in the red. Unfortunately, these are the latest figures I have and I am unable to know what the present situation is because the figures for March and April have not been made available to me or as far as I know to the Opposition. There is proof that the State was then \$55 000 000 in deficit, it was a short-fall in cash that had to be made up, money that had to be borrowed from trusts and other accounts or borrowed on the short-term money market.

I am quite concerned early in the career of this Government because I placed some questions on notice to ascertain how the finances of the State were going. The first question and answer appear on page 818 of *Hansard* of 29 and 30 March 1983. They are as follows:

BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

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—

I believe that has now been exceeded by some \$14 000 000—

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—

I will guarantee it will now—

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.

That did not happen because I cannot see in the Premier's speech any further explanation in answer to my question on Budget allocations. There is a \$14 000 000 over-run so that wage and salary increases have cost the State \$94 000 000. The \$25 000 000 that has been allocated for price increases could be exceeded (we do not know, we are buying a pig in a poke). I also asked a Question on Notice

about Budget projection. That question and answer also appear on page 818 of *Hansard*, as follows:

BUDGET PROJECTION

Mr BECKER (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What is the estimated Budget proportion 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.

When we go further into the Treasurer's speech, we find that the Treasury has estimated that by 1986 the State Budget could blow out to \$400 000 000. Therefore, by not answering my question the Treasurer has again been dishonest and evasive, because he knows what the financial situation will be at June 1984. The Treasurer could tell us now what is needed to balance the Budget in the next financial year without any great projections for inflation. Treasury officials must know, otherwise how could they prepare their approach to the Premiers' Conference when seeking financial assistance for the State, even if it only kept pace with inflation? The Treasurer has been working to a shrewd pattern of trying to convince South Australians that all is not well with the finances of the State and that taxes must therefore be increased, whereas during the election campaign last year he said that he would not increase taxes. The Liberal Party also said it would not increase taxes. At page 819 of *Hansard*, I asked the Treasurer the following Question on Notice:

1. How is the current Budget deficit being funded?

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

The Premier replied:

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.

That reply supports my earlier statement that the Supply Bill is a fraud, because the documents that have been provided are not sufficient to answer all the questions we asked as to the true situation of the State's finances. I believe that between \$6 000 000 and \$8 000 000 will have to be paid out in additional interest, yet there is no provision in the document to cover that charge. Why has the Treasurer not told Parliament about that charge?

The whole thing is a fraud, because the Treasurer has not said what taxes he will increase. However, the Statement of Consolidated Account for the month of February 1983 shows the following receipts:

Particulars	Budget	Receipts
	Estimate for Year 1982-83	for eight months ended 28 Febru- ary 1983
	\$ '000	\$ '000
Taxation—		
Property	23 800	20 500
Gambling	29 965	19 046
Motor Vehicles	54 000	36 007
Pay-roll Tax	231 000	149 473

It appears that there is a lag in receipts from the gambling tax. Pay-roll tax is the tax yielding the highest receipts from a total of \$552 370. When pay-roll tax was handed over to State Governments by the McMahon Federal Liberal Government, it was predicted that it would be an inflationary growth tax, and that prediction was not wrong. The States have amended the formula for the tax so that its incidence

has been reduced. This tax costs jobs and there is competition between the States to attract development and to increase employment prospects. It is interesting to note that the *Journal of Industry*, in its edition of 22 February 1983, shows the real cost in respect of an employee by three key occupational groups and states:

These tables detail the actual cost of the employment of three occupational classifications, based on awards and charges existing on 18 November 1982.

It should be remembered, of course, that even this detail does not include the many other benefits which the employee receives, but which are not provided either on a universal or regular basis. These additional benefits often include:

Superannuation—provided by the employer at a cost of between 7-34 per cent of employee's salary.

We will not go into the Public Service Superannuation Fund, which eventually will be one of the highest payments out of Treasury allocations and which, by the year 2020, when I think it peaks, it will cost about \$74 000 000. Where we will get those funds no-one knows, but if the current rate of inflation carries on that figure could well be in the vicinity of \$1 billion. There is also reference to the shorter working week, less than 100 per cent productive time, special leave (for example, bereavement, house shifting, etc.), depreciation of items for employee comfort, etc., and any other 'non-award' benefits. If employers do not provide air-conditioners today, or refrigeration and lounge facilities in staff rooms, they are in trouble. The report further states:

The 'additional' labour costs in the occupational groups following are:

	Per cent
Clerks	27.9
Fitters	39.1
Builders labourers	45.4

Referring to occupational groups, the report states:

1. OCCUPATIONAL GROUP—CLERKS (1st Year Adult Service—Group 3):

Item	Weekly cost \$
Weekly award wage	225.00
Pay-roll tax (5 per cent)	11.25
Workers compensation (0.545 per cent)	1.23
Long service leave provision	5.63
Annual leave provision	18.75
17½ per cent leave loading	3.28
Sick leave provision (10 days)	10.76
Public holidays (11 days)	11.79

There are 11 public holidays, and I know that some Government members wish to have May day thrown in as well.

So, for a group 3 clerk, first year adult service, on a weekly wage of \$225, the cost to the employer is a minimum of \$287.69 (27.9 per cent additional cost). That additional \$62.69 is costing someone part of a job. It is 27 per cent, so for every four clerks one full-time job is lost. The next table states:

2. OCCUPATIONAL GROUP—BUILDERS LABOURERS (AWU Construction and Maintenance Award Part 1, General, Group 1):

Item	Weekly cost \$
Weekly award wage	211.40
Pay-roll tax (5 per cent)	10.57
Workers' compensation (17.3 per cent)	36.57
Long service leave provision	5.29
Annual leave provision	17.62
17½ per cent leave loading	3.08
Sick leave provision (10 days)	10.93
Public holidays (11 days)	11.98
Total	\$307.44
Additional cost to employer (\$)	96.04
Additional cost to employer (per cent)	(45.43%)

For the purposes of workers compensation, it is unfair to compare a clerk with a builders labourer, because of the high risk, but even so one would expect builders labourers

to be more careful. There is quite a racket with workers compensation, as we have been told.

The additional cost to the employer is 45.43 per cent. In other words, for every two builders labourers the additional cost to the employer is the equivalent of one job. I bet that they never think about that! The table continues:

3. OCCUPATIONAL GROUP—FITTERS (Metal Industry (S.A.) Award Classification G10)

Item	Weekly Cost \$
Weekly award wage	255.70
Pay-roll tax (5 per cent)	12.79
Workers Compensation (11.8 per cent)	30.17
Long service leave provision	6.39
Annual leave provision	21.31
17½ per cent leave loading	3.73
Sick leave provision (10 days)	12.23
Public holidays (11 days)	13.40

The all-up cost to the employer for one fitter is \$355.72 per week; the additional cost to the employer is \$100.02, or 39.1 per cent. So, for every three fitters one job is lost. It is high time that those who advocate increasing the number of employees without increasing productivity realise that the increases in award rates and in benefits cost another person's job. That rings home very clearly in that document, and I hope that all members will retain it.

Pay-roll tax, of course, is a tax that the Government has said that it would like to see abolished. I have not the foggiest idea what it will replace it with. I cannot see us replacing \$231 000 000. If we cannot balance the Budget at present and if we cannot handle a \$70 000 000 deficit, I cannot see how we will abolish \$231 000 000. That is absolutely pie-in-the-sky bally-hoo.

For stamp duties, \$119 000 000 was the Budget estimate, and we have received \$74 900 000. For business franchises the Budget estimate was \$63 500 000; for the first eight months of the financial year to the end of February 1983 we have received \$43 900 000. For gift and succession duties there was no Budget estimate. It is interesting to note that in eight months we have received \$38 000, but that in February there was a debit of \$11 000; so, somebody has had to give a refund for an overpayment, and I did not think that we were allowed to do it. For fees for regulatory services the Budget estimate was \$4 500 000 and the State has already received \$3 000 000.

For statutory corporation contributions the Budget estimate was \$26 500 000 for 1982-83 and the Budget receipt for the eight months was \$13 200 000. No money was received for the month of February on that line. That area of statutory corporation contributions is the only other real area in which the Government can move to improve our Revenue Account. I believe, and have said before when my Party was in Government, that not enough effort is being made to ensure that statutory authorities are financially sound, well managed, or attempt to make a reasonable contribution to the State Treasury. I believe that the Government should not be so concerned about its Budget Review Committee, but that we should set up a Legislative Analysis Committee. We should have a budgetary committee of the Parliament to look at the State's finances on a continuing basis, not just at Budget time, such as the Budget Estimates Committee does. That should be handled by the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee.

Statutory corporations that make substantial contributions include the Electricity Trust. The State Bank shares half of its profit; last financial year that was \$3 800 000. The S.G.I.C has yet to make a contribution to the Treasury. The Public Trustee hardly makes a profit, and makes no contribution. Nor does the State Travel Centre (the Tourist Bureau); we run our interstate offices at a shocking loss—some \$250 000. I do not object to the Government's being involved in such

things as the State Clothing Factory, but I cannot understand why that factory has not been built up and given so many orders for uniforms and so on. Each statutory authority should make a contribution to Treasury.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

Mr BECKER: I believe that statutory authorities could make worthwhile contributions to the State.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): In opening my remarks on this Appropriation Bill I want to say at the outset that I find extraordinary the tactics we saw this morning when the Government attempted to delay the debate on this Bill (indeed, it was a successful attempt), to enable the second reading of a private member's Bill. Some members on this side of the House have said that the Government's motives in doing that were deceitful, although I do not necessarily agree with that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to get back to the debate before the House.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am explaining the reasons for the delay in resuming this debate on the Appropriation Bill. It is about time that the Government got itself into gear. If it is so keen on this particular private member's legislation it ought to take it over as a Government Bill, and then we and the public would know where the Government stood.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: That is all I am going to say on that matter, Mr Speaker. I thought I should just make that point. I want to draw the attention of the House, as has already been done by the member for Davenport, the member for Todd and other members, to the Premier's statement concerning the delay in the implementation of the north-east busway. This is a very serious decision by the Government, and I think it would be an advantage to the House to go back a little into history so that we can put this matter into perspective. I want to refer to some remarks made by the Minister of Transport on Tuesday in answer to a question, when he said:

If the Liberal Government had proceeded with the light rail option immediately it came into power in 1979, the projected delays may not have been necessary and the north-east suburbs would have been a lot closer to getting an efficient public transport service that they so obviously deserve.

I hope that the Premier has taken note of that phrase 'that they so obviously deserve', because I am fearful that the way things are going the people concerned will not get the rapid transit system that they so obviously deserve. Before 1979 the former Government set up an intensive study called the NEAPTR study (North-East Area Public Transport Review), and all members know about that study, because it went on for some 2½ years and cost \$1 000 000 of the taxpayers' funds. That study made certain recommendations, of which the two most important were that there should be a light rail transit system or a conventional busway. There was little to choose between those two recommendations, and when I became Minister of Transport I was aware of certain submissions on that matter to the then Government by transport professionals who were recommending that there should be a conventional busway and not a light rapid transit (l.r.t.) system. Be that as it may, the then Government decided that it would go for an l.r.t. system, and before the 1979 election it promised that that system would be built by and running in 1986.

Before the 1979 election the Liberal Party came out with its guided busway system solution for the north-east suburbs and promised that in office it would build the O'Bahn system and it would be running no later than when the l.r.t. was supposed to commence operating, in 1986. All the

preliminary design and construction of the north-east busway, while the Liberal Party was in power, was right on schedule. In fact, at one stage there was a chance that it could be completed in 1985—

Mr Ashenden: That's right.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:—as the member for Todd is well aware. Let us have no more nonsense from the Premier and the Minister of Transport that, if the Labor Party had won the 1979 election, the l.r.t. would have been running before 1986—in other words, now. That is absolutely ridiculous. The Premier and the Minister of Transport lose credibility by saying that, because at no stage would it have been possible to have the l.r.t. running by 1986.

I suggest to the member for Gilles, who has been trying to interject, that I would know better than he, because I took over in the preliminary design stages of the l.r.t. and it would have been impossible to have the l.r.t. in operation before 1986. The other point I want to make involves the cost, because the costs of the l.r.t. and the O'Bahn system have been compared in this debate. The cost of the O'Bahn system in 1981 dollars was \$58 500 000, and that was inflated, as it has to be, to 1986 when the busway would have been completed. By the normal inflation index applied to these projects, the final cost in 1986 would be \$95 000 000.

Let us have a look at the cost of the l.r.t. system because this has been mentioned in the debate: the cost of the l.r.t. in approximately 1979 dollars was \$115 000 000 (at least that was the figure that was bandied about) for the so-called upgraded l.r.t., which was the system put before the people by the Labor Party in 1979 and which included the tunnel under King William Street. In fact, the cost was nearer \$140 000 000 in 1980 dollars, and I invite members opposite to inflate that figure to 1986 dollars. I suggest that they would be lucky to have any change out of \$300 000 000.

The Premier has said, I think by way of interjection over the past two days, that we have to take into account the fact that rolling stock for the l.r.t. would last for 50 years, whereas buses last for only 15 years. He is quite true on the latter point: buses do last for only 15 years; that is the depreciated time for the replacement of buses, but l.r.t. rolling stock does not last for 50 years.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: About 30 years.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you. I draw the attention of the House to the interjection by the Minister of Recreation and Sport: it is 30 years—he is quite correct—and he disagrees with his Leader, who said 50 years. The Premier was using the example of the Glenelg trams, some of which are 50 years old but which have been refurbished time and time again. That is a costly exercise but one that I would support, because the last thing I would want to see, as a former Minister interested in tourism—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And a taxpayer.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:—(and a taxpayer) would be the removal of the Glenelg trams. The other point that the House ought to realise is that, in 1979 when I became Minister, the cost of the l.r.t. rolling stock at that time was almost \$1 000 000 per car (I think it was a Boeing car). I hope that that puts into perspective the remarks made by members opposite, because the decision made by this Government to defer completion of the north-east busway puts the entire project in jeopardy. Despite the fact that the Minister says that the Government will complete the busway (and I hope that his Cabinet colleagues remember that statement), the project is in grave danger of not being completed. If it is not completed and the track is laid for only the first two-thirds of the distance (between Park Terrace and Darley Road), it has been a gross waste of taxpayers' money, because the cost benefits—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Todd to order.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It'll go down in history as Wilson's folly.

The SPEAKER: I call the Minister of Recreation and Sport to order.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Thank you, Sir, for that protection. The cost benefits of the whole operation will be destroyed and the community will have spent \$70 000 000 or \$80 000 000 on a project which will not bring to the community the benefits for which it was originally designed. We will be in the same position as that of the people in San Francisco as regards the BART system, where it has been proved since that the benefits are not there for the population. In fact, the ridership of the BART system, after the beginning of operation, was half that estimated, because those benefits were not apparent.

If the busway is opened between Park Terrace and Darley Road (and I accept that that can be done as a first stage, because that is part of the flexibility of the O'Bahn system; the busway from Park Terrace to Darley Road can be used while the third section is being completed, but if that is all that is completed) then all it is doing is continuing the very serious traffic congestion on North-East Road, about which the member for Todd can tell the House at some length, and not achieving any benefits. The only benefits being achieved are for the people living in the vicinity of the Darley Road terminus. Despite the fact that buses will travel on to the busway at Darley Road coming from points farther north and north-east, the fact remains that the savings in journey time will not be commensurate with the cost of installing the system.

I believe that, if the Government is not prepared to finish that system by 1986 and it then decides (in 1986) to go on with it, the cost escalation in the project would amount to about \$20 000 000-odd, which in this State's financial situation is an extremely valuable amount. Such a sum, which could be spent on other public works, including new schools, hospitals, and the like, would have to be allocated to the north-east busway, because the present Government cannot make up its mind whether or not it will complete it on time.

What really concerns me is that, by delaying the decision on the third section, the inflated costs of the project will make it impossible for the Government to complete it. I can give an assurance that if the present Government does not complete the system we will complete it when we assume office after the next State election. I hope that that puts into perspective the remarks made on that project, and I congratulate the members for Davenport and Todd for their contributions on this subject.

The other matter I wish to canvass at this stage is the reference in the schedule of the Appropriation Bill to education, involving an increase in expenditure of \$2 900 000. This figure represents an increase in teacher numbers that the Labor Government has put into effect since it came into office. As there has been an increase in teachers, there has also been an increase in ancillary staff. It is representative of the Labor Party's promise before the last State election that it would return to the 1979 formula for ancillary staff, costing a total of \$2 900 000 for the implementation of this Government's election promises. The Labor Government has carried out its promise, and, therefore, I give it credit for doing so, because if it had not done so I would have wanted to know why. The Government continually criticises this Opposition for the present Budget deficit when its own election promises have caused the main blowout in the Budget.

Mr Ashenden: And its incompetence in control.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed; we see a blowout of \$26 000 000 over the limits of departmental expenditure. When an Opposition goes to an election, it should be responsible. If it is going to make promises that it knows it cannot keep (and I will prove that in a moment) that is irresponsible and a gross imposition on the people of this State. Although the Government has increased the number of teachers (it is not 231 as the Minister claims: it is in the order of 160 or perhaps at least 140—but I will not canvass that at this stage), and although it has therefore increased the number of ancillary staff, the Government in its promises before the last election said that it would increase the number of teachers by 950 over its three-year term. In my Address in Reply speech, members will recall that I costed the total of Labor's education promises at \$24 000 000 in one year in 1982 dollars. The Government has to find 950 teachers over and above what would have applied with a Liberal Government. That was the promise it made.

The Hon. H. Allison: Irrespective of the number of students.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes; that was the Government's promise. The costing for 952 teachers in 1982 figures is \$20 000 000, let alone the necessary extra ancillary staff that that would involve. The Minister says that he has provided 231 of those staff but has in fact provided only 160, because of the increase in enrolments in secondary schools. If the Opposition had still been in Government, those extra teachers would have been supplied because of the formula.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: As the member for Mount Gambier reminds me, we were going to provide 100 extra teachers, anyway, because of the post-Budget grant announced by the Tonkin Government that there would be an extra \$1 000 000 in this area. If the Minister has supplied only 160 extra teachers he still has 800 to go, and he has a little over two years in which to find the money for those teachers. It is the duty of this Opposition to hold the Government to its promises.

It is also the duty of this Opposition to cost the Government's promises. I am saying to the people of this State that it will be impossible in the present budgetary situation for the Government to honour its promises in education and, indeed, in other areas as well.

Now we get back to the real nub of the question: this was not only a commitment to the people of South Australia by the present Government but a commitment to the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I forecast a very dissatisfied Institute of Teachers when the Minister is not able to deliver that which he promised before the last State election. I make this point, because the public should be aware of the cost of implementing these promises. There is no question but that the provision of extra teachers in schools is a measure popular with the public. However, the Premier has already said in this debate that Governments have to be responsible and they cannot always take popular decisions. It is important that we all realise that.

Finally, I wish to refer to the answer given by the Minister of Education to a question asked by the member for Hanson about what would be the blowout in the education budget this year. The Minister stated (and, indeed, this is quite correct) that the budget for the Education Department in the August budget was \$465 373 000, and he estimated that the blowout would increase the budget amount to \$497 000 000 by 30 June this year, leaving an actual blowout of \$31 627 000. Of that amount, 90 per cent is for salaries and 10 per cent (that is, \$3 160 000) will be for contingencies.

The proportion of 90 per cent for salaries has been well known in this House, and it is extremely alarming that, of this massive amount of money that is paid for education

in this State, 90 per cent is for salaries, leaving only 10 per cent for contingencies and for other important initiatives in education which need to be taken. It makes it very difficult for education planning when there is such a high salaries component. Nevertheless, that is the figure, and I thought that it was important that I comment on the answer to that question from the member for Hanson.

The fact remains that the Budget is blowing out through Government departments, and it is blowing out in the Education Department because of promises made before the 1979 election by the then shadow Minister. They are promises which, in the event, he will be unable to keep over the next two years, and the Premier's Financial Statement has done nothing but prove that point.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated the Governor's assent to the following Bills:

Alsatian Dogs Act Repeal,
Death (Definition),
South Australian Oil and Gas (Capital Reconstruction),
Transplantation and Anatomy.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): It is certainly very disturbing to see that the time-honoured phrase 'broken promises' is again evident in this Appropriation Bill. It would seem that it just could not be possible this time, because before the last State election there had been a clear incident in Victoria where the now Cain Government made promises, including a promise of no raising of taxes, and then immediately went about raising taxes.

Certainly, the former Liberal Government in this State warned the public of South Australia that this would occur if the Labor Party were elected to Government. However, it seems that our warning went unheeded. Since then, we have seen that the situation resulting from the Federal election may produce similar results. Again, the Hawke Government promised no real tax increases and made other promises. It now seems that it will have to go back on those promises. What are the people of South Australia and, indeed, the people of Australia supposed to believe when Parties make statements with the apparent clear intention of contradicting those statements and breaking promises as soon as they are elected to office? What is it making of honesty in our society?

I think that we have to look to the Liberal Party here to see some of the statements it made during the election campaign, and I refer here to both the State and Federal bodies. In respect of the State election campaign, it was clearly stated that economic conditions would be tough, that we could not increase expenditure to any great extent but that we would still keep taxes down.

The public considered our policy and weighed it up with that of the Labor Party which espoused that the Labor Party intended to spend on this, that, and the other while stopping any tax increases. Of course, the result of the election was fairly obvious: who wouldn't vote for a Party that maintained that it would give people a lot more but that it would not increase taxes? Therefore, on that occasion honesty did not pay off. However, I wonder what the situation will be at a time less than three years from now when the public has seen the truth: when they have realised the truth and have hopefully recognised which Party it is that keeps it promises.

If one considers a brief history of our economic development in South Australia one can probably refer back to the Playford era when manufacturing began to get a footing in South Australia. Before that time rural industry had provided the main basis for our economic growth, but it was clear that we could not rely on that at all times because of the uncertainty of world prices of certain rural products and because of the uncertainty of seasons. Full credit must be given to the then Government of Sir Thomas Playford for encouraging manufacturing, because the only way that we could ever have services offered to us without the encouragement of the manufacturing industry would have been by way of raising taxes to a greater or lesser extent from the general public's pocket. That option was not taken: manufacturing was pushed and established, and we can still see the results of that in South Australia.

In the Premier's presentation of the Bill it is disturbing to note that he blames the past three years of the Liberal Government's administration for many of the current economic problems. However, it would seem blatantly clear that it was during the previous decade of the Labor administration when the economic problems began to surface, and these were becoming serious by the time its administration ended. It was clear that that was a major reason why the Labor Party was thrown out of office and the Liberal Party put in. During the Labor Party's term of office much less emphasis has been given to the manufacturing industry, the rural industry, small business, and commerce in general. Rather, we saw a massive expansion of the Public Service and a massive expansion of most, if not all, Government departments.

While I would be the first to admit that some increase in the Public Service was undoubtedly necessary, I point out that the Government was putting money into a non-productive area. When a Government continues to put more and more money into a non-productive area, it must get that money from somewhere or from someone. The Government was not encouraging the manufacturing sector but rather it was hitting the every-day person through increased taxes. So, we saw a deterioration of the position at the time of the Playford era when manufacturing and associated industries provided the basis for much of our economy together with the rural industry, to a time when it was still providing much of the economy but the money was being sapped away from it and put into the non-productive Public Service sector.

Obviously, the slide that occurred during the Dunstan era could not be stopped instantly. In fact, the Liberal Government of the past three years had no pretensions about being able to stop that slide overnight. In fact, it was much worse than was first thought. It is unfortunate when one looks back to find that, although it was obvious that the slide had commenced before the Liberal Government came to power, the Labor Opposition during the three years of the Liberal Government did nothing to help stop that slide: rather, it seemed to have taken a very negative attitude. It continually attacked the Government, and had no concept of what the word consensus was all about. It simply wanted to revert to the slide that had been evident for the previous 10 years.

In the past few weeks it was quite amusing to hear the Government saying that it is looking for consensus when for the past three years it had no intention of offering a consensus approach. A similar observation could be made with respect to the Federal Government: the Labor Party was continually attacking. I remember the now Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, saying in the late 1970s when he was President of the A.C.T.U., that under the Fraser Government unemployment would exceed 1 000 000 people by the end of a certain year. In fact, since that time it still has not exceeded 1 000 000 people, according to the official statistics.

What happened to make the unemployment situation remain relatively stable for a considerable period? It certainly did worsen to some extent, until recent years when it further worsened.

It will be interesting to see whether the person who made the statement that unemployment would exceed 1 000 000 will himself be able to stop that from occurring. I believe that the Prime Minister had promised the creation of about 500 000 jobs: I must compliment him on that, and I look forward to those jobs being created which, hopefully, will add to the real economy. If this occurs I will applaud it, but I have grave reservations about whether it will be able to happen in the next year or two.

The Premier, when introducing the Bill, attacked the former Liberal Government for the mistakes of the past three years, even though it was clear that those errors had been made during the past decade, and not during the past three years. Then we found that he brought in extra factors (and probably quite rightly so) in considering that there is now a deficit that is beyond the anticipation of the former Government and of the present Government. So, the Premier stated in his introduction of the Bill that three major factors have occurred in addition to any other causes for the Budget deficit: the Ash Wednesday bush fires with the tragic loss of life and devastation of private and public property, and then the recent flooding, particularly in the Barossa Valley area. Although he did not refer to it at that time, the drought had been previously mentioned.

It is fully recognised by members of the Opposition that these factors have contributed to a worsening economic situation. It is interesting to note that the Opposition has been particularly supportive of the Government's handling of the matters arising from these natural disasters. In fact, we have sympathised with the Government in its undertakings. One could compare these events to the bush fires of the earlier Ash Wednesday when the then Liberal Government was in power. If my memory serves me correctly, many attacks were made by the then Labor Opposition about how the former Liberal Government was administering its obligations, and yet in truth they were being administered in the same way as the present Government is administering the drought and bush fires appeals and relief work.

So that, when it calls for consensus and co-operation, it is a pity that the Government does not look at a few examples where this Opposition has shown co-operation to reach consensus, and members opposite may compare their own lack of co-operation of earlier years with the present state of affairs.

The Treasurer also referred to the greater review by the Treasury and to a review of a capital works programme. However, it was obvious from listening to the Treasurer's explanation of the Appropriation Bill that he was preparing the ground to break his election promises, not only because of recent developments, but the ground was being prepared as far back as December last year. As has been pointed out earlier, the estimated costs to the Budget of disasters is about \$23 000 000, which is only 30 per cent of the accumulated deficit estimated by the Treasurer. Most of the remainder of this deficit is therefore not the responsibility of the former Liberal Government.

The Treasurer pointed out how \$14 000 000 of the deficit was accounted for by increases in salaries and wages. Again, it has been disappointing to note the reluctance of the Treasurer and his Government to agree to a wage pause some months ago. Indeed, it seemed that we would not have a wage pause until it appeared that public opinion was against the Government, and the Treasurer and his Ministers were forced into accepting a wage pause. The \$14 000 000 for increases in salaries and wages is clear evidence that, in the absence of a wage pause, that figure could have been

tripled or even quadrupled. The Treasurer can thank the former Federal Liberal Government, under Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, as well as this Opposition, for keeping the pressure on him to see that a wage pause did occur.

Mr Baker: He hasn't adhered to it in all cases.

Mr MEIER: No, and I pointed out that the \$14 000 000 has been added to the deficit, as outlined in the Bill before us. The spill-overs in departmental expenditure and advances account for \$26 000 000, which is over half the deficit of \$50 000 000 not attributable to natural disasters, and this line of expenditure has tripled since December, as has been pointed out by previous speakers. It therefore seems that the Government cannot look after its own departments. It is now six months since it was elected, and surely it would have made every effort in the first place to avoid over-runs of expenditure in Government departments.

The Treasurer said that \$8 000 000 had to be spent on pumping water because of the drought, and this is readily acknowledged. With respect to water supplies, the Government must look much more closely at the whole problem. In this connection it is disturbing to hear that the National Water Resources Development programme is at present under a cloud, and I hope that, for the sake of South Australia in general and the District of Goyder in particular, this programme will not only go ahead but be given a higher priority than it enjoys at present. The quality of water in most parts of my district is poor.

First, I refer to Hamley Bridge, where the local publican, when he first took over the hotel, could not clean the glasses because of the dirty smear left on them by the local water. Obviously, his clients thought that the glasses had not been washed properly, but that was not so. The publican has had to install a filtration plant of his own to ensure that the glasses are up to an acceptable hygienic standard after they are washed. He showed me how dirty the unfiltered water was. For this reason a high priority must be given to the filtration of water throughout the State.

Secondly, we have heard from members pleading for an extension of the water supply to certain areas, and in this connection I refer to two areas in my district: Moorowie on Southern Yorke Peninsula and the area south of the township, as well as the area of Watervale near the Clare valley. These areas have no reticulated water supply at present. At Moorowie, unfortunately, the wells on which the residents have relied since Europeans first settled in the district are drying up. In fact, since the recent heavy rains another well has dried up, and this means that the primary producers in the area will find it more and more difficult to operate as they have operated over past years.

The State Government should, as a matter of urgency, probably in association with the Federal Government, extend water supplies to those areas which do not have a supply but which, given a supply, would benefit agriculturally. It is disappointing to hear the argument from the Minister of Water Resources that these things cost much money and therefore cannot be afforded, because the net result of an extension of the water supply to these areas would result in a significant increase in production over ensuing years which would more than make up for the cost of extending water supplies to such places as Moorowie.

Likewise, because of lack of water supply Watervale is losing out as a township. Members who have been there would appreciate its ideal setting. It is picturesque and an excellent place for retirement or settlement. However, more people are going to one of the surrounding towns, rather than settling at Watervale, because of the Government's failure to provide a water supply for that township. If we could encourage more settlement by providing water supply, the total revenue from the area would increase, especially in relation to vine-growing and grape production, from

which the economy of South Australia could benefit even more from an adequate supply in the Watervale area. I will fight as hard as I possibly can to get a water supply as soon as possible for the areas to which I have referred.

The situation on the Virginia Plains has reached critical proportions because of lack of an adequate water supply. Some people living in ordinary houses on house blocks at Virginia have no water supply, even though the area is often classed as part of the Adelaide metropolitan area. In this connection there is discrimination between householders in cases where one householder has no water supply but another householder living nearby has such a supply. I hope that this state of affairs can be rectified as soon as possible. The annoying thing in that area is that there was an unlimited water supply when the Highways Department was constructing the new road.

Although no requests have come in for household supplies, the argument seems to be that there is not enough water available. The same argument applies in the Beaufort, Port Wakefield, and Balaklava areas which had unlimited water supplies when the railways were putting through the new standard gauge, but some of the small block owners were unable to get water, because no water was available.

Although the Minister said that there would be no incentives (I think I am correct in citing what was stated some weeks ago) for people to put fresh water tanks on their properties, this matter needs to be further considered, because the water situation in South Australia is critical and it will worsen. Therefore, fresh water tanks, and in the rural areas, the encouragement of dams, can only help: it will not solve the situation, but it will help.

Desalination plants are also another matter that needs to be considered in future. I wonder whether the Government is actively encouraging any technology at Technology Park to look into the desalination process. South Australia would seem to be well situated with respect to the amount of solar energy available and the amount of sea water that extends well inland through the two gulfs.

I note that the contents of the Appropriation Bill seem to cry poverty, and yet we find that the Minister of Mines and Energy, in a statement on 22 March 1983, stating that Cabinet had taken a decision not to grant a production licence to Mines Administration Pty Ltd for its project at the Honeymoon uranium deposit. Various reasons were cited, and the first I refer to is that the Government's policy was based on its concern that many of the economic, social, biological, genetic, safety, and environmental problems associated with a nuclear industry are unresolved. I wonder how many of the environmental aspects associated with coal mining are resolved today? It would not be hard to look into the health factors of many coal miners and find that there would be many areas that needed upgrading, but there is no way one would advocate the closing down of coal mines or the many other mines that we have with a high dust content and perhaps poor environmental conditions.

It was stated that the so-called responsible position of the Government had been endorsed by a wide range of community groups. A survey conducted one week before the Federal election by Ian McGregor Marketing Pty Ltd found that 58 per cent of the people of South Australia wanted the Honeymoon uranium project to continue. It is interesting to note that amongst A.L.P. voters 52.2 per cent of the people wanted to see it continue and only 34.3 per cent wanted to see it stopped, and two-thirds of unemployed persons supported the Honeymoon uranium project. I wonder what consideration is being given to those unemployed persons when we find such projects being canned.

It was stated that there would not be much economic benefit from the Honeymoon mine, but let us consider the

facts: the company had already spent more than \$10 000 000 in South Australia and it would seem that that money had been wasted and the jobs intended to be created were not needed. Honeymoon, as has been stated earlier, is possibly the first domino to fall, and others may well fall. At Beverley construction costs were \$50 000 000, annual operating costs \$15 000 000 and a total expenditure over the life of the project of more than \$500 000 000, but it seems that these figures are of little or no real consequence to the Government, which is more intent on raising taxes from the everyday person to pay for any new Government initiatives or any deficits that may have occurred. It is a crying shame to see operations such as Honeymoon and Beverley go down the drain, because of a Government that seems to be too proud to offer employment opportunities to the unemployed people of South Australia.

It is clear that the Government is trying to make as many excuses as possible for the deficit, but the real excuse can only be put down to mismanagement by the Government, after six months of being in office, in failing to appreciate the necessary economic projects that should go ahead in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Victoria.

The Hon. W.A. RODDA (Victoria): I will have a quiet word to say about this harrowing experience we are facing of being poor and penniless. I don't think we are: we have a great State full of resources, and we, along with the Government, have the task in front of us of getting our house in order.

I was interested to hear the Treasurer in his address say that the Government had an over-run of \$73 000 000; that was the sum which was booked up to the Government at the bank and for which the Government was responsible. I have been in the business of farming for many years: as a matter of fact I was born into it. I did not have much say in the management of that business and, when the Second World War intervened, I found myself smartly eased out of those worries. Those figures were pretty minimal, but in their time they were relevant to the present situation. In my farming enterprise I have been faced with this type of hazard, and I think the first thing to be done is for the family to tighten the belt a couple of inches, do a bit more, and perhaps take a bit less.

It is very fine to say that. The Government is given the task of getting on with the job. We have a great State, full of assets with which to work. I am disappointed, and I do not want to bash the Premier over the head with this, as I know he has problems from people who believe that way, but we have to develop our mining industry. We have to understand some of the difficulties, whichever side of the argument we favour, which face the Minister. The Premier referred to the destructive effects of the natural disasters, and listed the cost at about \$58 000 000.

The additional cost of pumping water will be about \$8 000 000 and that is something caused by the devastating drought. The round-sum allowance provided in the Budget for new salary and wage awards will be exceeded by about \$14 000 000. The establishment of a job creation programme has cost \$5 000 000. After the Budget was presented, the previous Government granted a remission of the gas levy, which cost \$4 000 000. Two election promises, holding teachers in primary and secondary schools and the concession for pensioners for electricity accounts, are estimated to cost between \$3 000 000 and \$4 000 000. Departmental over-spending amounts to about \$26 000 000. In relation to recurrent operations there has been a deterioration of about \$73 000 000 on the original Budget. That is where the problem lies.

The solution to these problems will call for some good housekeeping on the part of the Government and some understanding by the community. I received an Electricity Trust account today for \$55 which normally had been about \$25. Attached to that account was a notice saying that the trust apologised for the increase, 80 per cent of which was caused by an increase in the cost of gas from the Cooper Basin. I suggest that that will annoy many people but it does not annoy me because it is a contribution I have to make towards developing our resources. I will gladly pay my \$55 but perhaps other people will have problems in paying such an amount and that is taken up by the subsidy that is now being granted to pensioners. In his second reading speech the Premier said:

It is clear to my Government that the Budget presented in August 1982 was both incomplete and dishonest, and that it was never intended to meet its planned target of a balance on Consolidated Account. As the review by Treasury showed, that claimed balance had in just three months deteriorated to a likely deficit on recurrent operations of between \$72 000 000 and \$97 000 000.

I suppose there is a certain amount of bafflegab in that when we analyse the dot points. The former Premier, David Tonkin, has been held up to ridicule. However, David Tonkin was an honest man and he was a damned hard Treasurer. He was a good Treasurer but a hard one and he demanded from his Ministers a weekly account of how the expenditure in their departments was going. I would like to pay tribute to three officers in my department, Bob Henry, Kel Bertram and Robert Lucas. Those three gentlemen kept me advised on how expenditure was going. As I have been a hard farmer I did not see much difference between that approach and the way I ran my farm, except in the magnitude of it. We kept within 'hail'. I think it was a bit rough on the former Premier to be quoting him from a confidential document and heaven knows whether it is the Hon. Mr Payne or the Premier or whoever has to go once a year to the Federal Government to ask for more money. Whoever it is, he has to go there and put up the best argument possible and that is what the former Premier was doing.

Although we will all have to pay a bit more for our goods and services it is something we will have to face up to as a community and as part of the great Australian nation. I am sure that when the Premier has further discussions with the Prime Minister he will get some balances and he might have to resort to some of the capital funding to get his house in order, but in the long term it will balance out.

That brings us to the new discussions we have had in Canberra recently. I pay tribute to Bob Hawke for the National Summit he held there. Some of the business people who attended that Summit were Sir Roderick Carnegie, the late Sir Keith Campbell, our own Alex Carmichael. They are all people above reproach and they run sound businesses. Charlie Fitzgibbon, whom I got to know in the shipping industry, is a real gentleman and a person who knew where he was going. I was pleased to hear the Prime Minister say on Tuesday when he was speaking to Parliament that he did not want his plans to be mucked around by perhaps mavericks in the trade union organisations. That is what we have to face up to.

We have to have a responsible approach. We must be prepared to put something back in order to get the State moving again. We have to be able to sell our products on world markets at a competitive price; that is what it boils down to. We are an exporting nation and our own economy is growing all the time. We all depend on selling a good article at a competitive price on the world market, and that is not the easiest thing to do. I do not think it is terribly practical to stand up here and abuse the Government. I

know that is the body politic; I think that is understood by people in here but it does irk people outside.

I spent a couple of days last week in the district of Wannoon where there is a campaign on nationalism being carried out. Talking to a cross-section of people from Hamilton, through to Apsley and up to Edenhope I gained the impression that they did recognise that perhaps the politicians are at each other's throats too much; that is what is being said outside. I think we have a responsibility to show a good example (and perhaps no one more than I, because I am now the father of the House). It would not be a good example if I took a stance other than I am taking. I have sympathy for the Premier and the problems he has. However, I do not think it does him any good to blame a former Premier for matters that are his responsibility and I know he gladly accepts it because I remember him saying on election night, 'Well, we've made it, fellows.' That was his acknowledgement of his responsibility.

I am prepared to give him a hand to get on with the job. He has the responsibility of leading our State for the next three years and that is a big job. However, I do want to say that chiding and trying to heap some blame on to David Tonkin's shoulders is quite unfair. He was a hard Treasurer and, to put it nicely, he demanded to know how the money was being spent by each Minister.

The police greys were mentioned in the press yesterday and they are not only State and nationally renowned but they are world renowned. The headline seemed rather encompassing but I note that, although it was not spelt out, the Echunga breeding centre is going to be reconstructed. That centre may be costly in these hard times. However, it is obvious that the horses that are required for maintaining that public equanimity on big occasions are available from other sources. Nevertheless, the warm-blooded horses that are bred at that centre are very docile, very good in crowds and are something to be proud of. The police greys play a very real role in maintaining law and order in our community on ceremonial occasions. They do have some recognition from a tourist viewpoint. I notice that in today's press there is reference to this matter and the Acting Commissioner has made some comments that the police are looking at the question of the police ceasing to breed these animals at Echunga and purchasing them from other sources.

I think that the police greys could almost be declared on the national heritage list. The horses that are used in States like Western Australia, New South Wales and Victoria (they are the only ones that I have personally seen) are bays and blacks. They do not have the temperament or presence of the wonderful animals that we have in this State. I want to put in a good word for the police greys—and I see that some members opposite are taking notice of what I say because we have had discussions at some length over the years on these matters before.

Another matter dealing with the police which is also reported in the press today, concerns a departmental committee to investigate complaints. I appreciate the Acting Commissioner's comments that he would like to see a senior police officer on that committee. I have no argument about a magistrate or the Chief of the Police Association and somebody from the civil liberties organisation being representatives on that committee, but I do think it would be amiss without having a senior officer on it because one finds in the administration of the Police Force that there are always people who are prepared to criticise the police—and perhaps unfairly. In saying that, I am also aware that there have been cases where some policemen have overstepped the mark. There is a need for this committee but I think that it wants to be well balanced. I think South Australia is very fortunate to have the Police Force that it

has. We are dealing with human beings and if one runs off the track then that is only human nature at its worst.

I refer now to the devastating bushfires which occurred in my electorate. Some 700 people were affected in my district and I pay tribute to the honourable Mr Crafter and his Department of Community Welfare for setting up the regiment of assistance headed by Barry Greer. He went down to that area each week, met with people at various points: Kalangadoo, Furner, Tarpeena, and took personal interest in the people who had great suffering. Barry has won the respect of those people for the care and attention which he gave to them. Likewise, we had wonderful assistance from the Department of Agriculture, the Police Force and from women's groups, such as the Red Cross. The Red Cross were there with soup kitchens and clothing depots, and gave great assistance to those people who had lost their homes. In those first two weeks of trauma they saw that everybody had a feed, was clothed and had somewhere to lay their heads.

The fencing of properties has been an almost military operation because whilst hundreds of head of stock were destroyed by the fires, there were also hundreds of head of stock running willy-nilly in mobs which wrought havoc on the roads. That stock had to be mustered. Last Friday, I travelled through Penola, Kalangadoo, Furner, Tarpeena, and Mount Burr, across to Millicent and other areas of the South-East, and it was surprising to see the miles and miles of fencing that have been constructed. It was also pleasing to see that because the drought season has broken in most cases the pastures are better than they have ever been. However, there are some areas where the soil has an affinity to peat. Where the top surface had been burnt out they are making fairly poor progress as far as pasture recuperation is concerned. That probably will cause some problems in those areas, but I do not think it will be a major problem.

Regarding the bushfire research committee, there are a number of graziers who are taking certain action against the Electricity Trust. The trust has got to look at perhaps ensuring that the herbage and trees that grow alongside the power lines are trimmed away from those lines. In the farming areas the graziers will have to ensure that they use judicious growing of trees around their farmsteads and that they remove the debris, especially in the late spring. Graziers will have to ensure that there is an efficient fire break around their farms.

Adequate fire breaks in the South-East are very difficult to maintain because of the wet season. A grazier can plough his land to make fire breaks but the plough tends to get bogged during the winter and spring. The grazier has then to wait until the end of November or around Christmas time or even into January for the ground to dry out. He may then find that the ground dries out too quickly, is too hard and will not accept a plough. Heavy stocking around the farmsteads will materially assist and I think there has to be some expert advice given to the farmers with regard to tree planting. The destruction of pines, of course, was a hideous and heinous loss to the State. While it did affect the graziers, the loss of those pine trees was an immense capital loss to the State of South Australia.

Another area of concern to the graziers is the Kingston coal mine. I have not looked at the environmental impact statement which is available, but as a practising grazier in the area I know that water moves in the soil laterally very slowly, but it does move. If one is going to pump a lot of water out to sea so as to remove the water from the coal, other water is going to come in just as quickly. This is something on which I do not think the graziers are going to accept advice by geologists and hydrologists.

It is becoming an extremely hot potato and, having lived there and seen the strange movement of water over many

years, I am on the side of the graziers on this, as I would hope that the Government and the Minister's court are. However, I am sure that if there are other areas that have coal deposits we could very well remove a very high producing area unless we know all about the effects of what a coal mine may do at Kingston. I am sure that that will not fall on deaf ears and, as I say, I have not looked at the e.i.s. However, I am sure that the e.i.s. could be subject to a lot of trial and error if one starts digging holes and starts to dewater that coal body that is down there.

Mr Lewis: It is shot through with inconsistencies.

Mr RODDA: As my colleague says, it is shot through with inconsistencies. I have not read it, so I have to take his word for it. However, I know that if a big excavation is made and a pump is set on it, there will be a lot of water that will fill up the cavities very quickly. It is not a 24-hour a day job to dewater.

Last week I spent a couple of days with people in the wheat industry in my district. I had some leave to go and do that. Whilst finality has not been reached on this, I think that it is becoming generally agreed the port of destination with grain growing in close proximity to it, irrespective of State boundaries, should be the closest one. I think that we have gone a long way down the track in reaching some agreement and understanding on this. In doing so, as a South Australian, I do not want to see freights going from our ports and our infrastructure which has cost so much to put there. I think that it will be a *quid pro quo*. Without saying anything before a decision, I think that in relation to the grain from the South-East (which is a lot of grain but is not perhaps a terribly big percentage of the South Australian wheat crop in a good year, and that is what we are looking at), we will see perhaps more hard wheats from northern Victoria coming through to the port of Adelaide. I am sure that it will gladden the Minister's heart to have that hard wheat coming here. The other thing will be that the freight from those areas of Frances, Penola, and Millicent will be based on the deep sea port at Portland.

Last year there was much gnashing of teeth and there were very unhappy people because section 92 was used to cart grain across the border. Of course, the worst thing was that we did not see our own silos being used and the bulk handling company spent a lot of money on constructing these silos. When we see them not being used, it is time for the authorities on both sides of the border to get together and have a round-table discussion about it. This we did. The Chairman of the Grain Elevators Board from Melbourne, the South Australian Manager of the Australian Wheat Board, the heads of U.F. and S. and the Australian National, have had a very fruitful discussion with the local bodies in the South-East and I am sure that the final solution will be a very good one for South Australia.

So, the pleasing note on which to end my remarks is that 1983 is starting out to be a good season. Although we are in the month of May, the pastures are getting away to a fine start. These are early days yet. However, there is a tremendous pasture bottom taking on. Stock prices will be good. Of course, stock numbers have been lessened by the drought. However, what we want is a good spring.

I understand that the hallowed area of Eyre Peninsula is getting right into the stride of what looks to be a bumper wheat crop and when Eyre Peninsula has a good wheat crop, then the State has a very happy Treasury. If that takes on, it will be a very helpful thing for the problem in which the Premier finds himself. Therefore, I am sure that the farmers and the grazing people in this State (the primary producer) will not let the show down. It has all the aspects not only in this State but in southern Australia to be a very good season. As I have said, stock prices are very good for the

producer at the moment. That bodes exceedingly well for the coffers and the Treasury of the State.

The devastation that we have seen in the Adelaide Hills and the Mid-North will be picked up. There were things that were lost that will never be replaced. However, I am sure that there has been a lesson for us in what has happened. We have to take heed of that and it gives us some heart to face the problems that we have in balancing the State's accounts. With those remarks, I support the Bill before the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. Given the capacity of the member for Eyre to express views relevant to this matter, I wonder whether we should not draw your attention, Mr Speaker, to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity of saying a few words in this debate, even though I am getting near the end of the list of speakers from this side of the House. It is interesting to note that at this stage we have not had any contribution from members opposite and I recall a few months ago—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: If you are so anxious about it what about letting me have a go.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member can follow me when I have finished. I recall having to put up with a charade of nonsense coming from the now Minister of Housing (the then member for Napier) and other members making completely inaccurate and false accusations about their member and supporters of the Government not being permitted to speak.

The next matter about which I wish to speak is that some time ago during a previous debate in this House I made some comments which you, Mr Acting Speaker, appeared to take very strong exception to. The only problem with my remarks on that occasion was that I had inadvertently referred to the wrong member who got shifted sideways from the committee. If I made any reflection upon you, Mr Acting Speaker, as the member for Price when you were a member of the Public Accounts Committee I am sorry and I would certainly retract it. It was no attempt to reflect in any way upon you at all.

In relation to the document which we have been asked to consider over the last week or so (there has been a considerable build-up of documents), we were told by the Premier that he would lay details of the economic situation facing South Australia before the Parliament, and all the options which were open to the Government. I was waiting with bated breath for this document.

It appears to be merely a direct lift-out from the Dunstan era. The Premier very quickly has adopted many of those methods used by former Premier Dunstan to hide the facts from the public. Whenever members of the Opposition suggest that there ought to be some trimming of the Budget, we have immediately thrown back at us the comment that we are going to start sacking public servants or close down hospitals, or some such thing. To my knowledge, the only Government that started sacking people was the Wran Labor Government in New South Wales. Further, the only Government that for some time failed to bring into operation hospital beds was the previous Labor Government when it did not commission sections of the Flinders Medical Centre.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Or Modbury.

Mr GUNN: And at Modbury, as the member for Light said. The Premier should get his facts straight. Under the Tonkin Government not one public servant was dismissed: reductions occurred, because the people who left were not replaced. If members opposite think that a bigger Public Service will improve the economic climate of South Aus-

tralia, they obviously have no knowledge of how the commercial market place operates.

I want to refer briefly to a number of matters before coming to the substance of this debate. The first matter concerns the Minister of Local Government's reply to a question (a Dorothy Dix question from one of the Government back-benchers, because after the member asked the question he was walking around the Chamber, having no interest whatever in the subject) about the Waste Management Authority. In reply, the Minister blamed the previous Minister for what had occurred. I point out to the Minister of Local Government that I was one of the people involved in having discussions on this matter and I made very strong representations to the Hon. Murray Hill in relation to the Waste Management Authority at the time the Tonkin Government came to office. After that organisation was set up it showed all the hallmarks of becoming a bureaucratic monster.

The regulations that were about to take effect were the most ridiculous that I had ever had the duty to read. They were going to inflict upon country councils the necessity to build weighbridges and to have people counting the loads of rubbish coming in to those small tips. They were going to inflict on local communities huge costs, which were neither necessary nor desirable.

If the Minister of Local Government is so short-sighted that he proposes to allow certain people in the Waste Management Authority to proceed along those lines again, then he is more foolish than I thought he was. He should give his very close attention to matters pertaining to that organisation, and he should not allow empire builders within it to get their way, because all he would be doing for this State would be to bring about increases in charges, and he would have the wrath of local government coming down on his head. I understand that the Minister has already put himself right offside with local government. I suggest that, as he is not a particularly bright fellow, he should give this matter lengthy consideration before he bungles himself into a corner.

I make no apology for my involvement in having those regulations drastically amended. If the Minister looks back through the correspondence received by the former Minister of Local Government from councils around this State, he will soon see why the nonsense proposed soon came to an end. If he is advocating the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars, without having given the matter proper consideration, then he is being most unwise. Who the jolly dickens wants to build weighbridges at these small country rubbish tips around the State? That is the sort of nonsense that is being proposed, the sort of ludicrous proposals being put by unrealistic people. I know who they are and I could name them, but I will not take up that option today. I point out though that if councils in my electorate are again served with the sort of nonsense that they got in late 1979, I will have no hesitation in bringing to the attention of the House who the empire builders are.

The Premier has been particularly silent in relation to a programme of deregulation which was commenced under the Tonkin Government. I would be most interested to know whether the unit that was set up still exists within the Premier's Department, because it was doing an excellent job in drawing up a list of the legislation that was no longer required and which should be repealed, getting rid of unnecessary regulations, looking at how red tape could be cut back, and carrying out various other measures to streamline Government operations. It is an area in which the Government could save considerable money. It is not only money that could be saved but it could save a great deal of manpower, and most people involved could be put to work in more important areas of Government administration. It would also represent a great saving to the general public. It

is my view that the general public is sick and tired of red tape and bureaucracy. In many cases bureaucracies are simply getting in the way of people who are trying to get on with the job of making a living or in the way of businesses trying to employ people and create some wealth for the overall benefit of people in this State. I believe that it is an urgent task, and I hope that the Premier will be in a position to give some information about that in the near future. If I had been given the call at Question Time today I would have raised that matter with the Premier.

I refer to what appears to be written in the campaign book of the Labor Party which all members opposite appear to be using at present (I might say used with some success—I make no apology for saying that). The democratic process normally goes in cycles. Having regard to recent political trends overseas, one notices that, where there has been a social democratic government in power for a while, with the onset of a difficult economic period it is tossed out. That is the normal political cycle that takes place. No doubt within a few years' time we will see the same thing happen here.

Mr Ashenden: Next election.

Mr GUNN: Yes, at the next election. The tack has been to make a number of promises without giving a great deal of detail: when elected to Government the Party maintains that it did not know that things were so bad; it did not think that things could possibly be that bad. However, they had been told what the financial situation was. There is a simple solution to that problem: at the time that the writs are issued, the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer could issue a Financial Statement concerning the affairs of the Commonwealth or State Treasury. That would be a very simple solution; there could then be no argument, and the details could be published in the local media. That might not suit the Government of the day, but it would put an end to the sort of nonsense put forward about being unaware of the financial situation. It is an easy excuse to fall back on, but in my view not a very credible one, because a person can promise what he likes without having any intention of putting it into practice.

I am pleased that the Minister of Mines and Energy is in the House, because I want to make one or two comments about the policy that the Government has adopted in relation to uranium mining. Fortunately, the Roxby Downs project cannot be tampered with. I am aware that, if a Government wanted to be very foolish and bloody-minded, it could make life difficult for those involved (everyone knows that), but I do not believe that the Labor Party would be so foolish.

But the other two projects that have received a great deal of publicity are Honeymoon and Beverley. A fortnight ago I had the pleasure of having a look at the Beverley site, and I made some inquiries when I arrived back in Adelaide. I was advised that the company involved was prepared to spend up to \$2 000 000 in developing a pilot plant to have a look at the situation. It appears to me that it would be absolute economic madness not to allow those people to proceed. The decision made about Honeymoon, is beyond my comprehension: I cannot understand why any Government would be so foolish as to stop the operation of an organisation that had all the equipment, the manpower assembled, particularly at a time when we have such high unemployment (which I believe we are all concerned with, even though we have different attitudes on how we should solve the problem). That project was ready to go into operation and yet, for some unknown reason, the Government would not allow the operation to be put into effect.

It will be interesting to see what is the eventual outcome of this matter. It should be made clear to these companies that, on the election of a future Liberal Government, they will be given the green light to proceed with their projects.

After all, the current decision cannot be justified on any reasonable grounds, especially when we read in the press comments of the Central Electric Generating Board, in the United Kingdom. When I was in the U.K. in 1981, I had discussions with authorities there and they said that, even though adequate supplies of uranium were obtainable in the short term, most of their supplies were coming from Africa, a politically unstable area, and they wanted to enter into long-term contracts with Australia so that they would not be dependent on only one supplier.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: There's more than one supplier.

Mr GUNN: Possibly, but if the people want to buy the product and we have it, we would be fools to leave it in the ground. Our decision will have no effect on the nuclear fuel cycle, and the only ones to miss out will be the people of this State and of Australia. The Minister knows that South Australia's decision will have no effect whatsoever on the building and operation of power stations, because the producer countries will get their supplies elsewhere. However, if we are involved in industry, we could at least have an influence on the situation. If the Government, because of some ideological or other hiccup, wants to adopt a short-sighted policy, that is the Government's decision, but it should look further ahead and not set out to create unemployment in my district.

The other problem that I foresee is that the Government's short-sighted and foolish decision will indicate to other mining companies that we, in South Australia, do not want them to invest money here and develop our resources. I am concerned that the people who invested \$20 000 000 at Honeymoon may be left high and dry, and I hope that the Government will at least have the good grace to compensate them for its arbitrary decision because, when they came here, they were told that there would be no problem in their continuing. I do not know why the Minister has allowed himself to be placed in that position. Of course, as a reasonable man he may be all for uranium mining and it may be his Ministerial colleagues who made the decision by which, on the doctrine of collective responsibility, he must stand. Be that as it may, the decision is a most unfortunate one.

I wish to refer to some other matters. Obviously, some of the funds to be provided by this Bill will help the Department of Environment and Planning. For some time the member for Flinders and I have been most concerned about the attitude of certain people in that department. Indeed, I believe that some of them have lost touch with reality and common sense. Some of the decisions made immediately after last year's State election were rushed in to the Minister in an effort to snow him because those decisions were both stupid and disastrous. As an example, I have a letter sent by the department to a person at Kyan-cutta, which states:

Reference is made to the road reserve contained within Pin-kawillinie Conservation Park and marked in red on the accompanying plan. It is proposed that this road will be closed under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act and added to the park. This is not to say the road will be physically closed and inaccessible, but only that its status will be changed from a public road to a private road under the control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. In order that this closure can proceed, it would be appreciated if you could advise whether you have any objections to the proposal.

That letter is most ludicrous. Indeed, the person responsible for writing it must be a crank, because this road has been a public thoroughfare for a long time. Only a small part of the road is relevant to the park and I ask whether, if that section becomes a private road, the district council will spend its hard-earned revenue in maintaining it. I would expect that sooner or later some of the foolish greenies who

seem to have such an influence on the Minister will want the road closed altogether.

As it was the Property Officer in the department who had the audacity to send that nonsense to my constituent, I wonder who is in charge of the department. The Minister should immediately rescind this nonsense and give the people there a fair go. After all, they only want to make a living without being harassed by all this twaddle being rammed down their throats. The person who received this letter was speechless when he received it. The member for Mallee has certain problems in this regard. Other constituents have had problems with their tennis courts, and what took place at Coffin Bay was a disgrace. I could cite other such instances, but I shall deal with them another time.

This year, the Treasurer seems not too keen to face Parliament. I cannot understand why we have to cram so much Parliamentary business into this fortnight's session. Why cannot we come back in June for a few weeks? Heaven help us: we have not sat very often since the State election of last year but, of course, sitting times are up to the Government. I think that sitting in the evening until midnight is fair enough and that no-one can object to that, but having to go through the charade of sitting until all hours of the morning I find amazing. Why intelligent people who are responsible for the administration of the State cannot arrive at a consensus and organise the sittings of Parliament in a reasonable and rational fashion is beyond me. I believe that, if a little more notice had been given to members regarding tomorrow's sitting, they could have rearranged their programme. It does not do the institution of Parliament any good for us to sit here until 3 a.m., resume at 10.30 a.m. on the same day, and then sit on Friday. There has even been discussion about sitting on Saturday.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been reasonable in its handling of the debate on this Bill, but there have been too many personalities referred to that have nothing to do with the Bill. The current remark of the honourable member for Eyre has nothing to do with the Bill before us and I ask him to come back to the Bill.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have been careful not to make personal comments about other members and I realise that you have been most reasonable in allowing us to canvass a wide area of subjects. I do not want to say anything more on that subject because I think I have made my point. The member for Victoria spoke about the state of the current rural season and the effect it will have on the State's finances. I am happy to say that a large section of my district has received good opening rains, and there is every indication that we will have a good agricultural year. I sincerely hope that that is the case because the past couple of years have drained the resources of many parts of the rural community. There are areas in my district that may need further assistance from the Rural Assistance Branch. When speaking to some constituents a few days ago, I was told that the cut-off date announced by the former Minister of Agriculture should not apply in certain pastoral areas of the State. I therefore ask the new Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins), who I realise is probably flat out familiarising himself with the various aspects of his portfolio, to look at this suggestion and extend the period. Some people have complained to me that the limit of \$40 000 applying to the loans for rural reconstruction carry-on finance is too low, especially where two or three brothers work as a partnership.

If they were working separately, each would qualify for up to \$40 000, but if they are working in a partnership that partnership would qualify for only \$40 000, whereas two adjoining neighbours could each receive \$40 000. That appears to be an anomaly. I took up this matter with the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry, which

was not keen to consider any changes. Although I understand that financial considerations are involved, these are only loans which do have to be paid back.

I think everyone recognises that it is important to the welfare of this State that we get all of our industries operating as quickly as possible and that every effort is made to maximise the returns. People must have finance if they are going to sow, spray and harvest their crops and deliver the grain. I sincerely hope that when the Premier brings down the Budget we will get a far more detailed statement than the present document. I look forward to having the opportunity during Budget Committees to pursue some of these areas in more detail. I am hopeful that we will then be able to get a true statement of the exact position regarding the finances of this State.

Mr Lewis: This lot was going to abolish those Committees.

Mr GUNN: I sincerely hope that they are not abolished, as they provide for the average member of Parliament an opportunity to gain some knowledge of the working of Government departments. One of the things that has frustrated me since I have been a member of Parliament is the fact that the average back-bencher gets little opportunity to become involved and to know what is happening in Government departments.

Further, I believe that in drawing up the current Budget the Government should make provision to institute a statutory review committee so that all statutory authorities in this State can then come under Parliamentary scrutiny. A large number of them could be abolished, amalgamated or altered, so that they would then be carrying out the functions more suitable to today's requirements. I believe that we have too many authorities, many of which are costly and have no real value to the community. I believe that, by establishing a statutory review committee, which would involve members of Parliament, those members would be making a real contribution towards the administration of this State in carrying out the proper role of Parliament, that is, to supervise the Executive and the manner in which the Government is operating.

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition's comments and his reply to the Premier not only were responsible but put forward some clear alternatives which would be acceptable to the public. I am most concerned about any cut-backs in the salinity control programmes in the Murray River areas. Areas in my electorate depend on the Murray River for their water supply, and I am most perturbed about that matter. As I said yesterday, I am also concerned about the decision to review other financial assistance to the State funds for which originally the Commonwealth Government intended to provide immediately. I hope that the Premier, when drawing up the Budget and the accompanying Loan works programme, will set aside adequate funds to develop some of those uneconomic water schemes to which I referred yesterday, as I believe that many people in this State are absolutely sick and tired of being given the run-around over such a long period.

I therefore support the Bill, but I am unhappy about a number of matters, which appear to have been included more for the purpose of obtaining political kudos, with little regard to properly informing the House or to explaining to the public the real reasons for their inclusion.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I wish to express my disappointment with recent events concerning the purposes for which the Government seeks the appropriation of funds. The first matter comes under the umbrella of tourism and relates to the particularly eloquent contribution made earlier by the member for Coles. A report appears in today's newspaper, headed 'Millionaire jumps in to defend koala'. Naturally enough, the defence of the koala is seen as necessary in the

light of the unseemly, inappropriate and ill advised attack made upon that animal by the Federal Minister for Tourism. In this case, the Queensland millionaire, Jim Kennedy, has taken the trouble to get a koala and to make the point that 'koalas piddle on politicians—something that many of us may wish to do'.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I take a point of order. The honourable member is talking about koalas and politicians and about piddling on politicians, and he has said that he would like to do so. Having examined the Bill, I cannot find anything about koalas, politicians or piddling.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): I uphold the point of order, and I ask the honourable member for Mallee to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr LEWIS: I had, I thought, Sir, and in deference to your ruling I will do so in a more direct way. I am talking about the appropriation for the promotion of tourism and about the damage that has been done to the effectiveness of that programme by the ill advised remarks made by the Federal Minister for Tourism and recently drawn to the attention of this House by the honourable member for Coles. I thought I made that plain at the outset but, if I did not make it plain to the Deputy Premier, let me make it plain to him now. In an article in today's *News* Mr Jim Kennedy is quoted as saying, referring to koalas piddling on politicians, that it is 'something many of us would like to do'. My comment is also relevant in the context of this debate because funds from the appropriations will be used for the purpose of meeting the cost of running this institution.

I think it is regrettable that the public generally perceive politicians in such a poor light, increasingly so, and this is largely because of the behaviour of people like the Deputy Premier and the frivolity he attempts to bring to matters that I regard as very serious. It is in no small measure of consequence of the behaviour of Governments of the day in using their numbers in a reprehensible fashion and, on this occasion, rearranging the business of the House in an unprecedented way.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member is quite clearly reflecting on a decision of the House in a most disgraceful way by describing it as reprehensible. That is clearly outside the Standing Orders, and I ask you to direct him to withdraw that remark.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Will the member for Mallee withdraw?

Mr LEWIS: In the belief that I have transgressed no Standing Order, no. Unless you can demonstrate to me by quoting the Standing Order, Mr Acting Speaker, I am disinclined to do so. I was not referring to a decision of the House but the way in which the Government did it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: What you were talking about was the Casino Bill, and that is not within the Appropriation Bill.

Mr LEWIS: I never mentioned that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Back to my point then. I have drawn the attention of the House to what I see as being a lamentable reputation that politicians are getting and I resent the fact that I am lumped along with the rest of them by the public in that category. It is a kind of behaviour to which I have referred, and I will now further illustrate the point I wanted to make about that. It may be recalled that on 31 August last year in a debate of much the same nature as this we were assailed by remarks made by the member for Albert Park. It is relevant in the context of this debate. I could be saying this myself if I were that way inclined. He said:

I have sat in this place today and listened to my colleagues. After the dinner adjournment I was hoping to hear from a Government member. I would have thought that one of the Government backbenchers—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Mr Acting Speaker, I would like to know what the comments that the member for Albert Park made and now being repeated by the member for Mallee have to do with the Appropriation Bill. For the life of me I cannot see it. He is deviating completely away from the subject. I ask you to ask him to get back to the Bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have already asked him to get back to the Bill. I am waiting for him to link up his remarks. If he does not link up his remarks he will be sat down.

Mr LEWIS: In the context of the debate that was being conducted on the same substance at that time the remarks were not ruled out of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! They will be this time. If you do not behave yourself you will be sat down. The member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Then I take it you disagree with the opinions expressed, and that it is your direction that those nine members were out of order last August?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Just take your seat. I have asked you to come back to the terms of the Bill. If you do that you will be okay, but if you do not you will be in trouble.

Mr LEWIS: They were lamenting, as I understand it, the fact that no Government member was taking the opportunity to represent his constituents' interest by speaking on a money Bill and refused to do so.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Resume your seat. I want to be very tolerant, but I ask you to come back to the terms of the Bill and not refer to some other matter. Perhaps you referred to a transgression last year, but that does not concern me. I am asking you not to transgress now.

Mr LEWIS: I point out to the House simply that on this occasion not one Government member has spoken. What concern has been expressed by any member of the Government for any matters that are undoubtedly of concern to their constituents relating to the way in which the Government will spend the funds so appropriated by this measure? What concern have we heard in this place? I remind the House that the way in which that debate was conducted in no small measure contributed to the kind of public opinion that has been expressed by Mr Kennedy about members of this place and of other Parliaments. We are not using the money that we appropriate: this Government is not using the money it appropriates in an effective way in so far as it has appropriated it for purposes related to the conduct of business in this institution, and Government members have failed in their responsibility to their constituents.

I am reminding them of what they said in precisely the same debate on page 857 of *Hansard* on 31 August 1982 and was thought by all those members to be in order and found by the Speaker to be in order at the time and questioned by no members in this Parliament. The member for Albert Park pointed out to us:

Those who have spoken already, including my Leader, the member for Playford, the member for Baudin, the member for Salisbury, the member for Gilles (who made a good speech I might add), the member for Ascot Park and the member for Price. I would have thought that we might see interspersed some speakers from the Government side.

I offer it to him in his teeth now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. Throughout this long debate, I, the Deputy Speaker, and the Acting Speakers have shown tremendous tolerance, I believe, in what has been permitted. What I am now ruling is that the honourable member is straying completely from the ruling of relevance. What he is doing is indulging in a general grievance debate, and that is simply not permissible. He must direct his attention to the Bill before the House. He has a wide ambit and that has been

acknowledged by the Chair, but it is not to become on his part or on the part of anyone else a grievance debate. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: In deference to your high office, but without understanding how I am out of order, I will respect your ruling and accordingly refer to those matters that illustrate some of the other reasons why I think politicians today are increasingly held in contempt by members of the public and the way in which—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry, the honourable member must resume his seat. As I understand his preliminary remarks, the honourable member is about to deal with, I hope, some aspects of the Bill before the House which may tend to bring politicians into disrepute. If he is going to do that, it is in order, but what he cannot do (and I thought I put it as clearly as I could), is simply to debate the standing of politicians in the community. That is all I am saying to the honourable gentleman. If he would concentrate his attention on the Bill he can speak as widely as he likes on each component part, but he cannot then go to a whole different topic without linking it in some way. Have I made myself clear on that?

Mr LEWIS: I draw your attention to the state of the House, Mr Speaker.

A quorum having been formed:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want any interjections.

Mr LEWIS: In the remarks made by the Premier at the time that he introduced this measure (and I am unable to find the precise place in *Hansard* but in his statement to the House it was on page 4), he said that for gross payments the increase is as a result of a number of factors and he is talking about the amount that the Government has to pay out. I do not understand how he came to make these calculations, but he said that it is because of the destructive effect of natural disasters which have beset this State in recent times. No-one could dispute that. He also said that South Australia has never before had to cope with three major disasters: drought, fire, and flood, in one year. That may be so.

He went on to say that whilst there is some difficulty in accurately assessing the extent of the need for carry-on finance and the other relief measures for both the bushfires and the floods, the present expectation for payment for drought, flood, and fire relief and restoration of public assets under the natural disasters programme are likely to cost a total of \$81 000 000. On the basis of present sharing arrangements, the Commonwealth will contribute \$58 000 000 to that expenditure.

This is inconsistent with my understanding of the formula by which the Commonwealth subsidises natural disasters. It is also inconsistent with the information given to the House on the same matter at other times in recent days. I understood that the amount that was to be spent in the immediate past and to the present has been and is expected to be about \$33 000 000. It is a matter of public record that when we consider the \$33 000 000 that \$10 500 000 has been given as an untied grant to the State to meet the cost it has had to incur as a result of it suffering the consequences of those disasters.

We all agree that it is tragic when they occur on the ground for the individual. I do not question the fact that the Government needs to support individuals, industries, enterprises and communities in such a fashion to enable them to come back to full productivity as quickly as possible, otherwise common welfare is adversely affected. However, we know that out of every \$4 spent on such disasters only \$1 is spent by the State. We also know that before that formula begins to apply a trigger point has to be reached and that is \$3 000 000. The State has suffered three disasters,

and therefore \$3 000 000 will have to be multiplied by three, which gives a total of around \$9 000 000. That is the trigger point. Whereas the State has to make that expenditure before it can begin to receive the 3:1 subsidy, we need to recognise that the State has already recently been given \$10 500 000 (which is in excess of the \$9 000 000 trigger point), so the State is not really out of pocket on that calculation: it is \$1 500 000 in front. The State has not had to incur any expense whatsoever to attract for every dollar it spends, the subsidy of 3:1 from the Commonwealth.

Earlier, I said that after the assessment of \$33 000 000 is made, and if one takes away \$10 500 000, then one is left with \$22 500 000. If we want to know how much the State has to find to meet the burden of that expenditure and also to find what the State's contribution is, then one simply divides \$22 500 000 by four—it is a quarter. The total will be just over \$5 600 000. I ask myself, my constituents ask me, and I ask the Premier where does he get this figure which he has not substantiated in any way, shape or form, of \$145 000 000, or \$73 000 000, or 70 whatever million dollars. He has used that many figures, I am confused. I think that he has smudged and fudged the issue to the extent that the public has become bored. He has effectively distracted attention from the real reason for the over-run and the deficit.

My Leader and others of my colleagues have made outstanding contributions on that matter in the way in which they have attempted to analyse the insufficient information given in support of the figures the Premier has used to justify the position in which he now finds himself. I do not see any need for me to further canvass that issue.

One aspect that annoys me is that the Government's decision to cut public works has not been taken with compassion or sensible regard for the welfare of people, or for the earning capacity of the State in the short and long term. One illustration of that is the deletion of the proposal to build a sewage treatment works at Finger Point. The ultimate result of that is that it places (as other members have said) in jeopardy the southern rock lobster fishery export industry to the United States and elsewhere. There only has to be one rock lobster tail contaminated with bacteria or a virus and which can be directly traced to its source, the raw sewage which enters the sea in the middle of that fishery at Finger Point, and we will lose the whole of that market and entire communities will lose their livelihoods.

If that is what this Government regards as a reasonable and responsible way to proceed, then I believe that it deserves to have done to it in return what it is doing to the fishermen who rely on that fishery that is so polluted. They are literally tipping raw sewage over those fishermen. I would not be surprised if the fishermen felt like doing the same in return. A good four-letter word describes that: dung.

I am further annoyed with the double standards that the Government has exercised in making a decision of that nature when at the same time it is prepared to spend money buying further tracts of land for its national parks and wildlife areas, which it can ill afford to manage now. There is such a contradiction in values. The Government's concern for the wet environment adjacent to the coastline is miniscule or non-existent. The Government is prepared to pollute not only the seagrass meadows and the waters on which those meadows depend, but also the prospects of commercial viability for those two important industries: the abalone fishery, and the southern rock lobster fishery.

I do not know whether any members have ever taken the trouble to see the preparation of southern rock lobster and abalone for export. If they want to, I can arrange for them to visit the SELF factory at Beachport. They will be able to see there the effects that that pollution has on the abalone,

in particular. Abalone quickly becomes soft and sludgy, even though there is no trace of bacterial contamination, if it has been in contact with raw sewage from the outfall at Finger Point it will deteriorate even quicker. If one flies over the outfall one can see the extent to which the marine biology is being increasingly affected and the area so affected is spreading.

That is of concern to me as an environmentalist, and also as a member of this House representing people who depend on that locality in some part for their living and who depend on the industry that is being placed in jeopardy, if by some chance or misadventure a polluted rock lobster tail ends up in the United States.

We know, as a matter of record, the awful problem there was to try and solve when the United States reacted to the positive identification of beef substitutes in packaged frozen beef in the form of horse meat, goat meat, and kangaroo meat.

Do we want to run the risk, and does this Government want to run the risk, of seeing a repetition of that, knowing the sensitivity of the United States to Australia's credibility in regard to packaging of meat protein? I would not have thought so, but the Government obviously does. It is on its head if it ever happens, and I will make sure that my constituents understand that, even after having drawn it to the attention of Minister's of the previous Government (who are my colleagues and who put this programme into effect to build that sewage treatment works), it was this Government that took it off the programme quite irresponsibly.

It prefers to spend the dollars not on such important programmes but on buying up more parks, of which it has too many and to which they cannot give competent or effective management at present from the expenditure available to it, or filtering Adelaide's water or water from somewhere else, knowing full well that it will not increase the freedom of that water from any disease. I think that they are shocking values and I think that they are short-run, ill-advised, opportunist and they smack of hypocrisy.

I am also annoyed by this Government's decision to ignore the ways in which it could have raised revenue aside from those ways that it obviously now must canvass. I refer to the decision taken by the Government to forego the mining royalties by refusing permission for the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium mines to proceed. I put that point not only on the grounds that it is irresponsible in that it would have made a direct contribution to the Treasury of South Australia, but also without costing the taxpayers of South Australia a cent.

What we need to do in these instances to bring the matter into perspective, is to sometimes look at factors of the kind to which the member for Eyre referred and some others. They are, that nuclear energy anywhere in the world is efficient as a source of power and is safe, and that is well documented. Even if we refuse to mine our uranium, which can be mined as some of the cheapest in the world and sold competitively and profitably at today's prices, it will not change the nuclear industry around the world one iota. I believe that there is every benefit to be derived by mining it.

I would challenge those members who opposed the proposition to mine uranium to tell me where on earth their logic is when it comes to an assessment of the fact that the Liddell power station in New South Wales which uses three million tonnes of coal a year, put 7.5 tonnes (that is seven and a half thousand kilograms) of uranium oxide (U308) into the atmosphere. If only .1 per cent of that was U238 (the radio-active isotope), that means that seven and a half kilograms of radio-active uranium disappears from that power station every year, and it is unaccounted for. It is

spread out over the surrounding countryside, and I put it to members opposite such as the members for Unley and Elizabeth, in view of the stupidity of the positions they take on that matter, that if seven and a half kilograms of radio-active U238 disappeared from a power station somewhere in Australia they would be up in arms and organising demonstrations about the matter.

Yet, it happens every year, year in year out at Liddell alone, and they do nothing: they let it happen. They are happy to let it happen. I do not understand that sort of logic: it just does not make sense to me. I think that it is regrettable that we have had to forego that revenue which would have relieved this State of a considerable tax burden.

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

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I speak on this Bill which appropriates money for the Government to operate this State and to meet the commitments therein. I know that there are some feelings that Opposition members should not take the opportunity of speaking, which is a right they have for a period of time which is allocated to them, and that people should think more of a Party system than the individual system. The cost of running the Parliament is one that the State has to bear.

The election of members is one that the State has to bear, and the cost of doing those things is expensive. However, the democratic system is there for the individual to express a viewpoint that he may have, even though it may be within the confines of a philosophy of a political Party or at times may not. If there are concerns that we suddenly found a fortnight or so ago that we did not have enough business to effectively use the Parliament and the moneys allocated for the operation of Parliament, then we find that we have a clutter up of business through bad management because of the Government's inability to manage the House, that is not the Opposition's fault, and I am sure that the Government realises that.

I accept that the manager of the House at the time was unwell for part of that time, and I think that that could be part of the problem. However, that is again not the Opposition's fault.

There is no reason why Parliament cannot sit tonight to use effectively the money that we are appropriating to run the Parliament on behalf of the State. It is a night on which we often sit if there is urgent business to be done. We sit on Thursday nights in lieu of sitting on Friday or any other time outside of normal hours when Parliament is operating, or sit an extra week. Therefore, I believe that it is unfair to start to become excited because the Opposition is using the same right that has been used in the past, and not for the maximum time that has been used on other occasions.

Those who are here know that over the years many of the rights and privileges of the individual member in speaking in this place have decreased. It was argued at the time that the decreases were to take place to improve and speed up operations. However, all it has done, regardless of who is in Government, is put more power in the hands of the executive, less in the hands of the individual elected member, and decrease the opportunity for individual commitment, comment, or contribution.

With that background, I now merely express some views that I have about the position in which we find ourselves in this State as regards finances. No doubt South Australia and, I suppose, Australia, finds itself in the worst financial

position in which we have been in decades, or in fact for a period of time as far back as most of us can remember. We have not been in the sort of position in which we are now: it is really a disastrous situation.

It is not only the State Government that have themselves in a huge financial debt and facing massive deficiencies or deficits: it is the Commonwealth, local government, and community organisations operating under those bodies that suddenly find the commitments they have accepted in relation to giving service or providing facilities, are beyond the pale as far as the contributor can meet the contributions.

Yet we live in a country with magnificent resources and an abundance of raw materials. In many cases we cannot take control of those raw materials, however, and make use of them on local and, more importantly, international markets to produce a profit. There must be something wrong when other competitors can undercut us with raw materials that they take from our land to theirs; they produce articles and bring them back here to under-sell the articles that we produce. It really means that in some areas within our society our expectations of gain are beyond the ability of our customers to pay the bill.

In saying that, I accept that some sections of society are not in that category: their expectations may be there, but there is no gain. The expectations of persons who are unemployed or who cannot contribute to the work force, even if jobs were available, may be there, but they are not in the position of deriving the benefits gained by a large percentage of Australians.

When the Government of the day tells us that we are facing a deficit over the next few years of \$400 000 000, that sort of figure cannot be accepted, and I think that all sections of society understand that. Many members have spoken on the matter of the bushfire, flood and drought disasters. However, I point out that this is not the first time that the State has faced such disasters. If members did some reading, they would find that it was not the first time that it all happened in one year or in succeeding years, in which case the end result is just as big a debt for the State over a three-year Parliamentary term.

The State has had to face these things before, and there are problems when we come to help people by means of compensation or to meet the debt imposed on the State because of the loss of Government and local government facilities. Most of our system tends to penalise those who are frugal and take the necessary precautions to minimise the possibility of future losses. In the case of the drought, the frugal farmer when he has a good year puts something aside by way of fodder or something in monetary terms or makes some provision for the inevitable drought that one knows will occur.

We have known for centuries about when droughts are likely to affect this country and we know about the areas where they are most likely to occur. That is on record and people living in drought-prone areas know that as do people living in other areas. Further, areas prone to flooding are known, but the ability to be prepared to minimise the extent of flooding is much more difficult. It is probably the most difficult of all disasters to control.

There is no doubt that attitudes of people in the community have brought about the potential for greater damage from bush fires. There is no doubt that those who work the land do not work as intensely in the fringe areas of their properties as their predecessors did. Those farmers or market gardeners now find that the cost of labour is too high, as do many other organisations that have moved towards more sophisticated technology in the way of tractors and modern machinery. The result is that parts of the land easily accessible are worked by the machinery, but the difficult corners, headlands and narrow strips are quite often left to become

infested with noxious weeds and/or highly flammable material which provides extra fuel for fires. I have no doubt that that is one of the lessons that has been learnt in recent years.

The other contributing factor is that we are attempting to preserve our roadside verges. In the past, trees were preserved on the road verges, but they did not worry so much about low bush: in fact, at times stock was used to graze those areas, or the vegetation was removed because of council obligations on the property owner to keep noxious weeds off the area between the owner's boundary fence and the middle-of-the-road reserve. The easiest way over that was to take away all the low bush and grass, if one could get at it with some form of equipment, and this minimised the potential for bush fires spreading quickly from those areas.

However, in recent years we have tended to preserve such areas and have set about planting various other shrubs and bushes, thus increasing the fuel potential. Reparation places a huge burden on the State. The Leader of the Opposition expressed the view that we should look at fire shelters so that people could at least hide in those when the fire arrives and venture out immediately afterwards to try to save their homes.

Recently I read that in 1915 there was a fire in the Mount Lofty summit and Crafers area. It was bad fire on a very bad day, and 500 volunteers fought that fire. There were no pumps, rakes, shovels or bags, etc. There were no rain-water tanks and only one or two bores. They had to apply their minds as to how they could cope. How 500 people were able to congregate in an area like that in those times, considering the overall size of the population of the State and particularly of that area, was remarkable. When that fire occurred, many of the properties in the area were summer residences of people who were able to afford them. These were large homes with large gardens, and those people probably employed several gardeners and chauffeurs, and so on.

Also, every property worked on a commercial basis had many people working on it because they did not have sophisticated machinery. Very few people living in those areas went to the city to work. The train was some distance away on the other side of Stirling. Therefore, everyone was local and they were accustomed to physical work and to using their hands. When a fire did arrive, they were able to fight it more efficiently because of the skills they had developed over their working lives.

Also, if there was a large patch of bushland in the path of the fire they did not try to save it, but someone rode around on a horse and lit the edges and burnt the area back to the oncoming fire. This was done because people considered that there was nothing in there to save, and if it was the home of a kangaroo, a wallaby, a curlew, bandicoot, etc., they did not care, but they burnt it back in an attempt to stop the fire. I am simply drawing a comparison with the situation with a fire in the Hills today. The vast majority of people work in the city and there are more men working than women. So that increases the burden on those who are left.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr EVANS: The vast majority of South Australians and Australians know that our present contribution by effort and other means is not sufficient to maintain our present lifestyle. However, it is fair to say that no Government, local government body, group of individuals or individual really knows how to handle the situation and to change the path that we have followed. It is not possible for an individual to say suddenly, 'I can use only one motor car.' Another indication is that, when assessing the cost of living

in this country, we include the cost of alcohol and cigarettes, whereas some other countries might think it strange that we include the cost of such items in the cost of living: indeed, they would think it a joke.

Recently, there was a newspaper report about the larger proportion of Asian students than locally born students in our universities. It is not that the Asian students are more intelligent: it is merely that they have a tougher background, can knuckle down and try harder. This is not the fault of our own young people: after all, they do not understand that it is the result of the lifestyle to which they have been accustomed. I do not believe that we know the answer. The position may be improved if we have tougher times, but I hope that that never happens.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): In view of the considerable time taken in this debate by members who have spoken on many issues, as is always appropriate when dealing with such legislation, I do not believe that much is to be gained by my going, chapter and verse, through the points and responding in detail. At one stage I felt inclined to do so, but all members want this measure passed as quickly as possible and there is other urgent business to come before the House. Therefore, in summarising the debate I merely say that there seems to be a failure on the part of Opposition members not to recognise the State's difficult financial position but to address themselves comprehensively and constructively to the solution of the problems facing the Government.

Much of the debate has centred around who is to blame for the present position: the former Liberal Government or the present Government. I have introduced certain material which I believe comprehensively demonstrates that a large part of our financial problems relates to the period of the former Government, especially to the final six months or so of that Government when things were simply allowed to drift for reasons which only members opposite know but are not prepared to explain because they have point blank rejected the notion that it happened. The facts and figures are set out in my second reading explanation.

Members opposite have talked about departmental over-runs and have said that this is the area in which the new Government is responsible. However, we have shown that over-expenditure was incurred during the period commencing July last year and that indeed by December there was sheer evidence that the position had deteriorated. In fact, I will say (and this is not something for which the previous Government can be held responsible, except that the Budget document should have allowed for it) that a large part of the over-run in the Health Commission area simply related to the fact that we had been unable to collect from the various health institutions the fees due for the services provided. This is a major problem that we share with other State Governments and it is not in the power of the Government to control it easily or readily. It is a simple fact of life and all possible steps have been taken to try to solve it.

Concerning other features of the Budget, had more honest estimates been made of the expenses likely to be incurred, we would have had a more accurate financial picture that might have equated more closely what we have today. The Leader of the Opposition and other speakers from the Opposition have been confused about how one arrives at a deficit of about \$400 000 000 over three or four years, but it is the result of simple arithmetical progression. If one commences with a nil deficit and one ends the year with a deficit of, say, \$20 000 000, and if nothing is done to remedy the position, whatever happens in relation to the Budget next year that deficit is carried through to the next year and, if no action is taken in the second year, another \$20 000 000

will be added to produce a deficit of \$40 000 000. If nothing is done about that in the third year, there will be a deficit of \$60 000 000 at the end of that year.

In addition, of course, all the time interest is being paid on the debt raised to service the deficit, so one is left with a large deficit because of its recurrent nature. It is the reverse of one of the root causes of the problems we have experienced: tax concessions made rationally by the former Government. In fact, in one year such concessions were computable and containable but, when continued for three years, the total was not \$30 000 000 but about \$90 000 000, which is being carried.

That sort of revenue is hard to make up in terms of the deficit. One needs only to work this out on paper to see how such figures can be arrived at. I believe that it is accepted that that sort of situation is intolerable and that action must be taken to remedy it, but the fundamental difference between the approach of the Opposition and that of the Government is that we on this side believe that such action must to the greatest extent possible not include a reduction in employment or in services, whereas the Opposition is prepared to contemplate it and to argue for it.

I simply repeat that, if one analyses the services being provided in the community at present, one will see that in the current economic climate we have reached the bottom line and there are not many directions in which we must go. One cannot find schools with many surplus teachers or hospitals that are over-staffed. There are certain areas, such as roadworks, which have great needs. One can go through the various programmes of each Ministry and there are great demands in some areas such as the tourist industry. Those demands are increasing and there is not the surplus capacity which was talked about so much in the 1970s but which proved to be illusory. It simply does not exist but, even if some areas could be identified, the funds are not available. That is the real difference between the approach of the Government and that of the Opposition in respect of our financial situation.

We do not see as a solution the slashing of services and the cutting of employment. If members looked at the needs of their own electorates and they felt that that was sustainable, then the Government could grasp it, but that is not possible. I think that point should be remembered throughout the course of any further discussions in this Parliament on the State's financial situation.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Last night I put before this House a strategy for coming to grips with the Budget position the Government has outlined. I said it was a responsible strategy—a manageable strategy. I addressed the problems we face in a constructive manner. I put forward positive alternatives. I said the Government must immediately appoint a Budget review committee to keep firm control on all Government spending, to prevent the over-runs in departmental expenditure which have trebled since the Under Treasurer first warned about them in December.

I said the Government must scrap other promises which will significantly increase spending and which the Labor Party well knew, when it made them, that they could not be implemented without much higher taxes and charges. I said the Government must go on reducing the size of the public sector, cutting out spare manpower, the existence of which the Premier has admitted. I said there must be no halt to capital works programmes already approved, which

will provide work for the building and construction industry and vital projects for South Australia.

I did not ignore the cost to the Budget of the three natural disasters we have experienced in the past year. I said that if the Government did decide to raise revenue to cover the cost of natural disasters, this must be on a one-off basis, so that the revenue raising measures are removed once the cost is recovered. And let us put into perspective the amount of revenue which would be needed to recover the amount the Premier has estimated these disasters will cost the Budget this financial year. That amount is \$23 000 000. It is 1 per cent of the total Government recurrent and capital receipts estimated for this financial year.

As a community, we must find the means to recover this cost to help farmers affected by drought and fires, householders affected by fires and floods, and to assist in the replacement of State assets which have been damaged or destroyed. I refuse to play politics with these disasters. I have been prepared to face the hard options.

Had the Government been more prudent managers, had it cut back on departmental overspending, had it recognised the Budget difficulties and not increased Public Service employment, it may well have been an option for the cost of these disasters to be absorbed over the next three years. Realistically, however, that is not now an option because of this mismanagement and over-spending in other areas. Therefore, alternatives have to be found.

An alternative to revenue raising to cover this cost would be a reduction in capital works. But the Opposition rejects any curtailment in capital works projects already committed. They are providing jobs to the building and construction industry, an industry which has been on its knees. They are keeping people in work, and off the unemployment queues. They are providing vital projects to communities throughout the State.

The Opposition rejects the Government's decision to stop work on the Finger Point sewage treatment plant, the Cobdogla irrigation rehabilitation scheme and a major portion of the O'Bahn busway. The Finger Point plant is needed to eliminate local health problems and, importantly, to safeguard our lobster export industry, not to mention, of course, the benefits that flow to the tourist industry in the South-East of South Australia, and to boost that industry to ensure that it continues to grow.

The Cobdogla project is part of the fight to save the Murray—our vital lifeline, and the O'Bahn busway is needed to provide the residents of the north-east suburbs with better public transport. Those projects must proceed. The Government must change its mind.

This morning, when I asked the Premier about the deficit, he attempted in his reply to absolve himself from his undertaking not to increase taxes to pay for election promises. He said that now he was in Government he had to be responsible. I suggest to him that credibility is established by being responsible at all times and not merely after switching from one side of the House to the other.

I also make it clear to him that he has no green light from the Opposition to break the most fundamental election promise—his most often repeated election promise—not to raise taxes to pay for Labor Party policies which have nothing to do with the disasters. The Opposition will oppose him all the way on that because he has no mandate to proceed on that basis.

The avoidable red ink is the Premier's responsibility, and he must face it in a way which will not add to the cost of Government, and to the taxes that South Australians pay, as he promised before the election. The Premier has made out no case for wholesale tax increases. He has revealed Treasury documents with gay abandon. He has suggested that, if the Treasury advises, Governments must act without

question. He has overlooked that Treasury officers are not responsible to the people: Governments are. Governments must make the hard decisions, something the Premier seems incapable of.

I make one more point to the Premier about his use of Treasury's projections for future financial years. He has suggested that forecasts given to the former Government on future budget deficits confirmed that our Budget strategy was in disarray. He has suggested that this justified his breaking election promises. But what does the Premier say when he is faced with forecasts given to him—one forecast, in particular, which puts the deficit at \$400 000 000 by 1986—five times the deficit that Treasury is estimating for the end of this financial year? The Premier said this in reply to a question that I asked yesterday:

Forward projections are always chancy because such projections have to be based on assumptions about the rate of inflation over time, the revenue of the State (whether it is rising or falling, which in turn relates to economic activity), the effects of inflation on interest bills, that is, interest rates over time [it is really not a true accountant's point of view, I might add] and the public debt that has to be repaid.

So much for the posturing of the Premier on Treasury's future forecasts; when things are different, they are certainly not the same! He has presented forecasts given to the former Government as if they were inevitable; yet faced with forecasts of his own, they are merely chancy. He cannot have it both ways. Clearly, the Premier has adopted double standards in debate about our financial position. He deceived the public before the election.

Only the Liberal Party has been consistent. We said before the election that finances were tight, but the Premier, in his grab for power, behaved as if there were no purse strings. In Opposition, our policies remain consistent and realistic. The alternatives that I have put forward recognise the difficulties and the alternatives to ensure that the promise of no tax increases to pay for election promises is kept. That is a role that a responsible Opposition must exercise: to be constructively critical and to offer realistic alternatives.

I now place before the House for its consideration several other examples of proposals we have put forward for a better South Australia. In my Address in Reply speech to the House, I advocated a merger of the Government owned banks in this State, and I now want to reinforce that suggestion. Interestingly enough I note that, following that contribution in my Address in Reply speech, the Premier called the Chairman of the Savings Bank and the Chairman of the State Bank into his office on the following Friday to discuss the merger alluded to in my Address in Reply speech. I do not mind the Premier taking up suggestions made by the Opposition, particularly positive suggestions, as he indeed has now acknowledged.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He tried to imply in the press that it was well and truly under way.

Mr OLSEN: The first meeting that the Premier had with the two Chairmen was the Friday after the Address in Reply speech. It is interesting to keep in mind that he has accepted some of the policies put forward by this Opposition—the alternative Government in South Australia to a Government here which has only 1 041 days to go.

There are distinct advantages for the people of South Australia that would flow from the merging of the operations of the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank, to form a South Australian Banking Corporation. There is no longer a bank with its head office in Adelaide that offers a range of services in complete sympathy with the local scene.

The merged bank would have a charter to provide a full range of banking and related services for the people of South

Australia. Decisions on the financial requirements of some of the larger employers of South Australians would be expedited in Adelaide by decision-makers well versed on the local scene, not in the boardroom of an eastern State's administered financial institution.

Because of the geographical spread of the two banks these services would be readily accessible to all South Australians. In particular, the opportunity exists for a more aggressive approach to capture a greater share of seasonal grain proceeds from time to time at rural branches, with an eventual spin-off for the benefit of all South Australians, and in times of rural hardship to assist our rural producers and rural small business operators with carry-on finance. Over the past 12 to 18 months immense pressure has been applied to those small business operators. A merger will be complementary to all sectors.

A South Australian Banking Corporation will have two functions as I see it: to operate as a full service trading and savings bank ensuring that the bank remains extremely competitive in the markets available to the bank; and to carry out certain Government agency functions.

It is important that the bank's ability to complete for deposits is not impaired by subsidisation of special Government programmes. To this end it is most important that the Act be structured to preclude such a situation occurring.

The Act must also give the management of the bank all the powers needed to fulfil its role without retarding the ability to adapt to changing markets. I am aware that the merger of any two institutions can produce staff and career casualties. This was initially evident with the A.N.Z. Banking Group Limited takeover of the Bank of Adelaide, but after a short period of retraining, officers have been promoted, in most instances, to more satisfying and challenging positions. Certainly a merger of the State-owned banks would open up career opportunities for most career-minded staff. Because of the wider range of lending facilities that would be available at former Savings Bank branches (or possibly new area branches), additional career orientated positions would be created.

There is no doubt that the opportunities for attaining higher skill levels and consequential job satisfaction would be substantial. There are, of course, some differences in fringe benefits, plus the differences in retirement benefits, but the Opposition will ensure that these issues are resolved in consultation with the Bank Employees Union.

I trust that the Government will proceed with the establishment of the South Australian Banking Corporation for the benefits that will obviously be generated for South Australians. It would bring the rationalisation of resources of both banks with a scale of ultimate savings to its shareholders, which are basically the people of South Australia. I now refer to one or two other issues, the first being unemployment.

In my opening remarks I referred to the fact that the Liberal Opposition does not accept that the capital works programme should be further pruned by the estimated \$70 000 000 enunciated by the Government. I have already given a range of reasons why we do not believe that it is appropriate to cut back on public works projects.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: We were trying to increase it.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, we were trying to increase it because we recognised, particularly in the private industry and the construction industry, that they have been but on their knees, and any curtailment of funding flowing to those areas will not only put those business houses in jeopardy but will also sacrifice the jobs of those currently employed. By slicing \$70 000 000 from that area, we are unfortunately creating further opportunities for people to be added to unemployment queues.

If there is anything that the Government should be doing in making assessments, it is to reign in those opportunities, that is, to create the most viable economic climate in which industry can operate, bearing in mind that 75 per cent of the work force is employed by the private sector, so that jobs currently there are maintained, as well as expanding that market.

One measure that should be considered is the introduction of permanent part-time work and job sharing. Permanent part-time work is, as most members would recognise, employment on a regular basis as distinct from work on a casual basis. Job sharing is an extension of the concept of one full-time job being shared by two or more people. With permanent part-time work, the important distinction is that the employee receives remuneration and other benefits calculated as a proportion of hours worked relative to conditions prevailing if the employee had elected to work for the full week. In other words, permanent part-time workers retain all the rights and entitlements of the full-time employed, whereas casual workers do not.

Employment arranged in that way will benefit many groups within the community, particularly married women, single parents, young people seeking their first job and disabled people unable to undertake full-time work. It will provide job opportunities for women and will allow them more flexibility in arranging their family responsibilities. Women can then continue to make the best use of their skills and expertise which need not be lost to the community.

Men will also benefit. Men in dual career families may want to extend their leisure time or pursue further education opportunities. Single parents would be provided with more scope to fulfil their obligations and obtain personal goals, the attainment of which, because of the restricted nature of their current employment opportunities, is presently not achievable. There are others, including the disabled and other older citizens, who are unable to undertake full-time work.

Job sharing would provide more opportunity to participate in the work force; it would also increase employment opportunities for the young. Some work is preferable to no work at all. Of course, there are considerations which may be seen by some to detract from the concept, such as inadequate income, increased costs to management, additional training and supervision, and possible tension between full-time and part-time employees.

I stress that I am not promoting permanent part-time work and job sharing as a substitute for full-time work. It is to allow more people to be employed. I believe that there may be a greater demand for employment of this type if it is more widely available and if more people are made aware of how it can benefit individual needs and circumstances. The potential benefits are considerable and merit further investigation.

To that end, I repeat the call that I made on Sunday: the State Government should establish an inquiry into permanent part-time employment and job sharing. Such an inquiry should have three members: a commissioner from the State Industrial Commission as chairman, and one representative each of employers and trade unions. There are a whole range of issues that the inquiry should address, including the demand amongst the South Australian force for permanent part-time work and job sharing, its application to the needs of particular groups, including young people seeking their first job, married women, single parents, the aged and disabled, the range of jobs which could be adapted to this form of employment, benefits, costs and impediments, and to what extent the current criteria for welfare payments may preclude certain groups, particularly the aged, from participating in such opportunities.

Such an inquiry will promote greater public understanding and awareness of the alternatives to full-time employment. The South Australian Public Service was a pioneer in this field. Since 1977 State public servants have had the opportunity to opt for permanent part-time work. The latest Public Service Board report indicates that 639 public servants—61 of them males—are now working on a permanent part-time basis. The board reports that this arrangement has been generally sound and workable. In the private sector, the banking industry has had permanent part-time work since 1974.

If the inquiry does establish greater demand for job sharing (and I hope the Government takes up the challenge to establish an inquiry), the State Government, using the Public Service model, could also consider the establishment of a job sharing bureau to advise on the matching of people to share jobs and also to assist the private sector to identify people willing and able to participate. Some limited research on this concept has been carried out in the eastern States. It has been estimated that up to a quarter of the work force would consider the option (and it is an option) of taking permanent part-time employment or job sharing to suit their own personal requirements, thus leaving the way for other people to have some limited involvement in the work force. At least limited involvement is better than no involvement at all, particularly for young people. Applying that criteria, a quarter of our work force (110 000 people) might be interested in opting for a programme such as this. This could enable thousands of people at present out of a job to at least enter and participate in the work force in some way.

I repeat that I think it is particularly important that the Government addresses itself with haste to the energy resources and power supplies of this State. I pointed out in my Address in Reply speech earlier that time is marching on and decisions must be made. It is with some concern that we hear the Minister announce yet another committee of inquiry to look into this area. I suggest that there is no need for another committee of inquiry. The detail and the information are available within the department to enable it to make those decisions now. Those decisions must be made now to protect South Australia's position in future years and in future decades in relation to our power supplies.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do you think the Government has costed them out yet?

Mr OLSEN: If it has costed them out, it is about the only thing that this Government has costed out since it took over the Treasury benches.

The document presented to Parliament in relation to the State's finances is very broad in its terms. It will be the Opposition's task (and it will take it up with enthusiasm) to try and get behind the general figures that the Premier has related to the House. For example, yesterday in reply to a question about the \$81 000 000 as the cost of the natural disasters, the Premier was not prepared to indicate, or at least he did not know, the breakdown of that \$81 000 000. Despite the questions, and despite being warned several weeks ago that the Opposition would ask that question, because we were told several weeks ago to wait for a statement (and we have waited for that statement), the Premier still does not know the answer to that question.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Like a bucket with a hole in it.

Mr OLSEN: A bucket without a bottom in it is a better description of the Premier and his economic management. I give notice to the Premier that, when we go into Committee, we will be seeking answers to these questions. We expect detailed, accurate, concise answers to those questions to fill out and put a little bit of flesh on the skeleton that the Premier has brought into this House in terms of an economic statement. I look forward to the Committee stages so that the Opposition can become better apprised through the

answers that we hope that the Premier will at least concede that he has a responsibility to provide—at least in the same way that he now accepts that, as Premier, he has that responsibility. When he was in Opposition the Premier could make statements without accepting any responsibility. I repeat that there is no doubt in my mind that, to establish credibility, one must be responsible at all times and not merely after switching from one side of the House to the other.

I also make it clear to him and I repeat, that he has no green light from the Opposition to break the most fundamental election promise (his most often repeated election promise) not to raise taxes to pay for Labor Party policies which have nothing to do with the disasters.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference:

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

In so moving I extend my thanks to the honourable members of the conference for their co-operation. The amendments agreed to satisfied the managers of both Houses, and I appreciate the very amicable manner in which the decisions were made. Basically, the amendments now overcome the problem for those persons who, through forgetfulness or due to absence overseas, have failed to renew their drivers licence. The amendments provide that persons in this category, most of whom are experienced drivers, will be required to do the theory and practical tests, with the Registrar having the power to exempt that person from the probationary conditions. I ask the Committee to accept the recommendations of the conference which have been agreed to in another place.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Before talking about the recommendations of the conference, I would like to comment on the performance of the Chairman of the conference (the Minister). Having sat on a great number of deadlocked conferences, mainly with the Deputy Premier as Chairman, I found it very refreshing to have a Chairman who was conciliatory, understanding, very articulate and very reasonable at this deadlock conference.

An honourable member: Is that the Minister of Transport?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That is the Minister of Transport.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is not dealing with the motion. The Chair is allowing some latitude, but it hopes that the honourable member comes back to the amendment.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I appreciate that latitude.

The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is fine for the member for Elizabeth to try to turn the thing into a joke. However, I say that quite seriously. It was refreshing to have a different type of chairmanship at a deadlock conference compared to what I had experienced previously under the Deputy Premier, a man who has shown no flexibility and no reason at all. I do not think the man understands what the word 'reasonable' means.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must pull up the honourable member. The Chair has been lenient and will accept a passing remark. However, the performance of the Chairman of the conference is not in the motion. I would ask the honourable member to come back to the motion.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Mr Chairman, I appreciate your point. I will certainly try to do that. I am merely saying that the Minister of Transport is a reasonable man.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will please come back to the amendment.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I thought that the outcome of the conference was a very reasonable one.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: There was a reasonable man in charge.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: As the Opposition, we have put forward certain arguments, and I think that those arguments were valid. I appreciated the way in which the Minister went off and talked to his senior public servants about this matter, understood the points raised and strove, in conjunction with his senior public servants, to reach some sort of accommodation which took into account the valid arguments raised and the inconvenience caused, perhaps only to a small number of people, but a valid inconvenience to those people. I appreciate the way the Minister came back after stating the case for the Lower House so well and then was very reasonable in trying to reach a solution with the Upper House.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He should go to the top of the class.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I wish that this Minister would give the Deputy Premier a lesson or two in how to chair a deadlock conference. It was totally refreshing (having previously been involved for nine years in the industrial area where little, if anything, was ever achieved at a deadlock conference) to see a deadlock conference that worked and followed the whole objective of deadlock conferences. I support the amendments as they have come from the Upper House and compliment the Minister on the way that he performed this morning.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (IRRIGATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES REPEAL (AGRICULTURE) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Debate on motion resumed.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy (Kavel): I wish to get on the record an article which appeared in the teachers journal last week under the heading 'Pipelines Chairman replies over price of gas', as follows:

In your journal of 9 March 1983 you published a statement by the President of the Consumers' Association of South Australia (J. Ruler) under the headline 'Consumers Association Leads Attack on Gas Price Increase'.

As Mr Ruler's statement is grossly inaccurate in a number of important respects (and, therefore, likely to mislead your members) I feel obliged to point out where he is in error. My qualifications for doing so rest on the fact that I was Chairman of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia (PASA) from the date of its establishment in 1967 until the end of last year; and that during this period I was considerably and continuously involved in the negotiations and arrangements which preceded the determination of annual natural gas prices (including the price which is the subject of Mr Ruler's comments).

It is misleading for Mr Ruler to say that 'on 12 October Mr Goldsworthy, the previous Minister for Mines and Energy, increased the price paid to the Cooper Basin Producers (by) 80 per cent'.

What Mr Ruler has overlooked is that the annual natural gas price is determined, not by a Minister's decision (as he says) but in accordance with the provisions of a Gas Sales Contract, freely entered into by PASA and the producers in 1975.

It is therefore not within the province of a Minister, or the Parliament for that matter, to disregard the rights and obligations of the parties under that contract—unless the Parliament were prepared to take the unprecedented step of repudiating the contract—a step which Mr Ruler would seem to be advocating.

Under the contract each year, either PASA or the producers could call for a review of the existing price.

If agreement could not be reached (and over the years, PASA has resisted price increases with all the technical and professional skills it could muster), then the question of what price should be paid was referred to an independent and suitably qualified arbitrator whose decision bound the parties. This is a normal and well understood commercial procedure for dealing with such questions.

For several years now the natural gas price has been increased following yearly arbitrations—by different amounts, according to the individual arbitrator's interpretation and assessment of the relevant factors at the time. Mr Ruler's statement:

that the 1982 price increase 'was contrary to the spirit, intent and purpose of the Cooper Basin (Ratification) Act, 1975'; and . . .

that by virtue of the provisions of 'section 10 (2) of that Act' the price increase 'was illegal'; and . . .

that having regard to 'section 10 (2)' the price increase awarded by the arbitrator 'should have compensated mainly for inflation which was approximately 13 per cent' . . .

is entirely irrelevant. Clause 10 (2) of the Indenture appended to the Act (which Mr Ruler mistakenly refers to as section 10 (2)) does not apply to the present gas sales contract.

What Mr Ruler has overlooked is that the natural gas price is not fixed by reference to the Cooper Basin (Ratification) Act, but, as earlier pointed out, by reference to the specific provisions of a gas sales contract which do not limit the scope for awarding price increases to inflationary considerations (cost increases) as he claims.

The 1982 natural gas price was fixed by the arbitrator, Mr G.A.G. Lucas, a recently retired judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland.

Proceedings before the arbitrator were conducted by both PASA and the producers with a full realisation of the importance of the outcome. A great deal of evidence and argument were put to the arbitrator by the parties. PASA's case was most ably presented by a Queen's Counsel. In the event, the arbitrator reached the conclusion that the natural gas price from 1 January 1982 should be \$1.10 per gigajoule—against a 1981 price of 61 cents per gigajoule.

This was an unexpectedly large increase (80 per cent) compared with the increases granted in previous years (in the range of 14 per cent to 19 per cent), so to obtain time to consider its full implications, PASA applied to the Supreme Court to review or set aside the arbitrator's decision.

Mr Ruler confidently claims that 'had the 80 per cent increase been challenged in the Supreme Court and in higher courts, if necessary, the increase could have been reduced to less than 20 per cent which is what the producers were entitled to'.

Mr Ruler thus experiences no difficulty in substituting his view on this complex question for the conclusion of a highly qualified arbitrator, trained in the law, who has been required to evaluate all relevant factors.

He also speaks without understanding when he invests the Supreme Court with the power to fix a lower gas price than that determined by an arbitrator under arbitration proceedings. At best the court, after hearing argument on questions of law, could have directed the arbitrator to review his award, or have ordered a fresh arbitration, but only if the court had first formed the view that the arbitrator, in determining his award, had made an error on a point of law.

Having carefully considered the uncertain outcome of proceeding with the application to the Supreme Court, PASA and the Minister for Mines and Energy [that was me at that time] decided to seek an agreement with the producers that would introduce a measure of price stability that would have longer-term benefits for the State.

This agreement was concluded on the basis:

that the price increase to apply from 1 January 1982 to 9 September 1982 would be only 50 per cent of that awarded by the arbitrator [which saved the public of South Australia \$60 000 000];

that the price from 10 September 1982 to 31 December 1983 would be \$1.10 (the arbitrator's 1982 price) [which would also apply to 1983];

that the price for 1984 would be \$1.33 and for 1985 would be \$1.62 (to allow for increased costs, but still considerably below the world prices for natural gas and the current prices of alternative sources of energy);

that over the next three years the producers would spend an additional \$55 000 000 on gas exploration.

Incidentally, Mr Ruler's dismissal of the importance and value of requiring the producers to commit to this exploration programme on the grounds that 'additional gas discoveries are exceeding South Australian consumption and there is every indication that adequate reserves will be found' would find no support whatsoever from those responsible persons who have knowledge and experience with respect to these questions. In fact the uncertainty of future gas supplies as a feedstock for the State's two energy utilities (Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Gas Company) after 1987, has been and remains, a matter of major public concern.

Now Mr Ruler wants the Government to repudiate the legally binding agreement entered into by PASA and the producers in the circumstances that I have described and he urges your members to support a campaign 'to have the gas price agreement revoked and a lower, reasonable and justified price established'—presumably by unilateral action on the Government's part. He offers no criteria for establishing a price that he would consider to be 'reasonable and justifiable'.

Members should note the following:

In his enthusiasm to replace the rule of law (the sanctity of the contract) by the rule of anarchy (repudiation) Mr Ruler not only fails to get his facts straight but conveniently overlooks the benefits that were secured to the State by the agreement reached after the 1982 gas price had been fixed by an independent arbitrator.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Your reading the article is wasting time.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not a waste: it is very pertinent to the public. It continues:

These were—

the retrospective impact of the 1982 price was considerably lessened;

the 1983 price did not have to be arbitrated and was fixed at the arbitrator's 1982 price;

the price structure was established on a firm basis for three years which was judged to be of considerable importance by ETSA, the Gas Company and PASA's other customers;

the exploration commitment accepted by the producers represented a valuable and practical contribution towards solving the worrying problem of the State's inadequate reserves of natural gas.

(Signed) Norman Young

The Premier and the Deputy Premier think that this is a matter of no import. This is probably the most important matter facing the State at present.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Do some research.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have done some research in relation to this matter. A scurrilous article appeared in the teachers journal which again put forward allegations which I refuted in editions of the journal last year. The editor of the journal (and I telephoned him) stated

that he had resigned because he was sick of political interference in regard to material he inserted in the journal. To see this bob up again in the teachers journal with all these fallacies (which, by the way, are being promoted by members of the Government, including the Minister), that I awarded an 80 per cent increase, is quite amazing. The fallacious statement that has been made in this House is refuted in full by Sir Norman Young.

I make no apology whatsoever for reading that document into *Hansard*, because it would do the Premier, the Deputy Premier and others who deprecate what I am doing (certainly the Minister of Mines and Energy) a world of good to study that article, which puts the proper context on the contracts and the position in which we find ourselves in relation to gas supplies in South Australia. For currency to be given, in what purports to be a respectable journal, to material which is scurrilously inaccurate (and deliberately inaccurate, I believe) and which is also promoted by members of the Government, who seem quite incapable of coming to grips with the enormity of this problem, is incredible. I do not believe that the State is facing a bigger problem at present than that relating to securing satisfactory energy supplies after 1987.

If the Premier and his Deputy cannot grasp the importance, indeed the enormity, of that problem, Lord help this State. I put that on the record. I urge the Premier to read that document, because it illustrates the present situation and the situation last year. The Premier may then be able to restrain his Minister.

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

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): In this place on Tuesday it became apparent that there was a good deal of misunderstanding as to the attitude of the universities in regard to the formation of the new Senior Secondary Assessment Board. I believe it is important to try to correct that misunderstanding, and I have been fortunate enough to receive a letter in the interim since the conclusion of that debate from one of the professors of the University of Adelaide. It behoves me to read this letter into the record, because it gives a real indication of the true attitude of the universities, and I will say more about that later. The letter is addressed to me and it states:

Parliament will shortly be debating the Bill for the restructuring of the year 12 assessment system. I have been quoted (correctly) in the media, at some length, on some of the concerns of the university about the new Bill, as have the Vice-Chancellors. I am moved to write to you in your capacity as shadow Minister of Education, because there seems to be widespread misunderstanding what the university is concerned about.

May I, by way of further introduction, comment that in 1981 I completed a nine-year term as a member of the P.E.B., which was longer than any member of the board then serving, with the exception of the Chairman (Profession Mills) and Dr Tobin and, I think, longer than any other University of Adelaide member. It is also of some relevance that before returning to Adelaide in 1971 I taught university physics in two Canadian provinces for 15 years and have been a Chief Examiner in Physics in both British Columbia and in South Australia. I think I may fairly claim to have a broad enough base of experience to be able to make some informed and, I trust, helpful comment. The misunderstanding to which I referred earlier is that the university is opposed to the creation of the new assessment board or that it seeks to control it. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The university attitude towards the general question (and with which I fully agree) is embodied in the enclosed copy of its submission to the Anderson (year 12) inquiry in 1978.

I believe that that should be the Jones inquiry. The letter continues:

This particular document is worthy of your attention. I commend it to you for some quite informative reading which should convey the attitude of my colleagues and myself rather well. It is still university policy.

In summary, I fully endorse the proposals for the new authority and the reasons for setting it up. The university seeks to retain a guaranteed influence only over the syllabuses and standards of those subjects that it will use for university entrance. It specifically does not seek such an influence over any other subject. It has been said that we are 'over-reacting'. Had my experience on the P.E.B. been different, I might possibly have agreed that no 'guarantee' was necessary. I have to record, for example, my vivid recollection of the statement of a member of the P.E.B. (a senior member of the Director of Education's department) that, 'the question of standards [was] irrelevant, all the university needed [was] a list of candidates in some sort of order, from which they would select the top ones to fill their quotas'. My memory of this occasion is quite vivid and there is no possibility that I misunderstood what was said. I hope you will see the basis for my concern. Lest I be misunderstood, I do not believe that the universities alone should fix those syllabuses and standards. Both universities and teachers should work together. But there must be a guaranteed place for the university. You will note in the enclosed document that reference is made to the experiences of staff members who have worked in the academic world in other countries. You will certainly have seen in the press accounts of the parlous state of standards in the United States, particularly in science and in English.

In my capacity of Professor of Physics and Convener of the Employment Subcommittee of the Australian Institute of Physics, I get much information from interstate and overseas. I must report that my colleagues in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria all express concern about falling standards at the interface between school and university. Indeed, Professor Sabine, for the Employment Subcommittee of the Institute of Physics, is currently assembling evidence on this matter for a report to the executive of the institute. You may be interested to know that in the Province of Alberta when I was last teaching there (in 1971) the physics syllabus committee had no member from the universities and no say in setting the examination. The English (!) examination was multiple-choice.

In 1968 the University of Calgary abandoned the pretence that the senior Matriculation examination was adequate for Matriculation and was forced by falling entry standards to go from a three-year to a four-year degree. In 1977 it spent \$100 000 on remedial English for its undergraduates and the sum was inadequate. It is because I do not wish to see that happen in South Australia that I write and speak as I do. Our State has no pressing need for partly-trained doctors, or engineers or teachers (or indeed partly-trained graduates of any sort). I do not believe we should be content with what many of my colleagues see as an already falling entry standard. We cannot afford the waste of public resources that goes with high failure rates in universities, quite apart from the personal trauma for the individuals concerned.

The rest of the letter is technical and need not be read in, but if anyone wishes to read it they are very welcome. I should say, of course, that that is signed by Professor John Prescott, who is the Professor of Physics at the University of Adelaide (physics, of course, being one of the so-called status subjects in the present Matriculation system). I now wish to refer very briefly to the report that he mentioned, which is the University of Adelaide's submission to the inquiry into the year 12 examinations in South Australia, which was made in 1978 (therefore, the report is somewhat out of date). There are two or three matters in it which the House should hear, because it really explains the university's attitude to the whole system. On page 2 the report states:

Nevertheless, the university does hold the following opinions:

- (a) The Matriculation examination should not be taken for reasons of social prestige by students for whom it is unsuitable.

That is exactly one of the main purposes of the new board and the new year 12 assessment system. I continue the quote:

- (b) The Matriculation examination should not be automatically ranked above alternative year 12 examinations by employers;—

once again, that is a major purpose of the new year 12 assessment system—

but there should be some authority (e.g. the P.E.B.) responsible for accrediting the various examinations and in particular indicating their appropriateness as qualifications for further study or for employment.

- (c) All secondary students should have basic education to maintain minimum standards of literacy, numeracy,

and social awareness, and this general education should where possible continue up to the end of secondary schooling.

I find it very hard to believe that members of this place and, indeed, members of the community could disagree with that. Finally, page 3, referring to the requirements of a Matriculation student states that he should:

- (a) have a certain minimum of intellectual ability;
 (b) be sufficiently mature for university work as a result not only of age, but of experience of a certain kind of study;
 (c) have had a general education, including both scientific and literary studies;
 (d) have sufficient knowledge of individual subjects to enable him to cope successfully with work in those and related subjects at first-year university level.

That shows that the attitude of the university is not anti-secondary. The universities have told me quite forcefully that they support the new year 12 assessments. All that they wish to do is have an influence on the subjects that they require students to have before they enter the institutions.

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

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SITTING TIMES

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I seek leave at this stage to make a statement so that members may be aware of what is happening. I want to inform the House that I have taken out an average of the debating times of the Appropriation and Supply debates. We have now gone beyond that average—the highest average. At 5.45 p.m. we have all been debating this matter for 12½ hours. The highest over the last six years (five years, anyway) is 11 hours and 52 minutes. So we have already gone beyond the time that one could reasonably have expected the House to take in debating this matter.

In those circumstances, I have no option (the Government warned what legislation was required earlier in the week) but to sit tomorrow night. I do not want to sit tomorrow night; I made an announcement that the House would not be sitting on the Friday night. We have no other option, and I want to give members an opportunity of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I want to give members an opportunity of being informed of that now, and not tomorrow. If members opposite do not think that that is fair, then in future I will leave the announcement until five minutes before it happens. If members opposite want me to be fair then that is what I am doing. The one matter—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: One matter that does concern me, and it will concern all members of the House, is that tomorrow night members will probably have accepted an invitation to a reception for the ASEAN delegates, which is being held here at 6.30 p.m. and I understand that it will go until 8.30 p.m. The House will adjourn tomorrow night at 6.30 p.m. to enable members to entertain their guests, and resume at 8 p.m. This will also give the ASEAN delegates an opportunity of seeing how well this House can perform even after a function of that type.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Debate on motion resumed.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I am staggered by the attitude of the Government in relation to the programming of the work of the Parliament over the last few days. In the 10 years that I have been a member of this place I do not recall any occasion in the programming of work which has been so much out of gear and so clumsily produced in agenda form for the members so that they can go about the duties of their respective offices. I have heard a number of statements by the Premier and the Deputy Premier in relation to these so-called programmes and the amendments to them over the past few days. Indeed, collectively it demonstrates a lack of management of not only their programme but their function as a Party in Government and it is nothing short of a disgrace. I support the remarks of members from this side of the House who have criticised not only—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that all the remarks that he is making at this time have nothing to do with an Appropriation Bill and I would ask him to come back to it.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: This is a grievance debate.

The SPEAKER: The Chair apologises to the honourable member.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I accept that apology, and note that some members are having difficulty hearing what I have to say. It is not my job to organise either the programme of this House or organise the effectiveness of the public address system. That is the responsibility of the Government, and yet another that apparently it has neglected.

The programmes that I speak of in relation to the hours of sitting of this House are further aggravated by the disorder that the Government is in in relation to its legislative schedule. Of the weeks and months that have passed since coming into Government, with the legislation programme inherited from the previous Government, with that which has been consistent with their own policy, there is absolutely no excuse to load on to this place the listings that they have in the past 48 hours in particular, and expect members from both sides of the House to cancel or disregard their commitments to the electorate and elsewhere for the purposes of shoving that legislation through this place. I do not think that it does justice to the programme of legislation, and I do not think that it in any way upholds our responsibility to the respective districts and electors of the total community. I think that the Deputy Premier ought to take a good shake of himself in relation to his job. That is not the subject that I intended to grieve about.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do you know why he is not sitting tonight?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: No, I do not know, but it would appear that it is to suit the convenience of the Deputy Leader or his colleagues as a result of A.L.P. commitments that the disruption of this House is being caused again. We have members assembled in the city, metropolitan and country members, some from long-distance locations. They are here on the spot and, as I gather from the offer made by the Opposition members, we are willing to sit on into the night in order to co-operate with the Government. That does not suit the Government; apparently it does suit the Government to disrupt everyone's programme, not only tomorrow but tomorrow night as well.

It is like singing to the breeze in this instance, because we have not one Minister of the Crown in the Chamber to hear what is said by the Opposition or, for that matter, by any member of the Government back-bench. It shows a degree of contempt that is being applied by the Cabinet of

this State during this period in office. It shows a degree of arrogance that is not to be tolerated. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is 'That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for—'

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

That the debate be now resumed.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Klunder, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman (teller), Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Ms Lenehan and Mr L.M.F. Arnold.
Noes—Messrs Evans and Olsen.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.
Motion thus carried.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Now that that little debacle has been cleared up, I return to the subject that I wish to address in this grievance debate. It is pleasing to have an audience (for the time being anyway) of some numbers, although they are dwindling.

An honourable member: It's nice.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: It is not only nice; it is important and essential for the good workings of this House that we have a Minister or two on the front bench. A few days ago I received correspondence from a constituent from Kingscote who happens to hold down the important office of senior fire officer for the Kangaroo Island community. Attached to his note was a circular received by that Country Fire Service organisation and, apparently, it has been circulated to all Country Fire Service organisations in this State.

The circular was produced by the Summertown C.F.S. and incorporated a request for funds to be paid from all associated services throughout the State to the Summertown group for the purpose of assisting a woman who was widowed as a result of the last major bush fire. I will not place on the public record the details surrounding that widow's situation. The correspondence clearly reveals that she is in dire straits and in need of financial assistance. Her husband died during the course of the Ash Wednesday bush fire this year, and apparently she and her family were left destitute.

Indeed, they are very grateful for the assistance offered and provided from near neighbours in that Summertown region. I gather from the details of the letter that the Summertown C.F.S. has done its level best to help in the welfare of that family. However, in order to apply appropriate assistance it has called on the C.F.S. organisations throughout the State. It is a deplorable situation that, after a natural disaster of that kind, any person should be reduced to a level of destitution or extreme need wherein a local organisation should have to make a call across the State for supplementary assistance. Obviously, there has been a breakdown of communication somewhere in the system and I am not directly alleging breakdown in Mr Gear's department of natural disaster assistance which has been set up for these purposes in South Australia. It may well be that that division has not received an appropriate application. It may well be that it was assumed that the family was being helped from other sources. However, it does not alter the fact that there is a classic example of where assistance,

and the organisation of applying assistance, needs a brush-up.

I drew the subject matter of that correspondence to the attention of the Minister of Community Welfare and I am satisfied with the attitude he adopted on receiving that correspondence and that he will do his level best to tidy it up. However, I raised the matter in this forum for the sole purpose of indicating that, if any member is aware of any family or any victim of the fire who was put in such an untenable situation, indeed there is a welfare department that handles this subject set up for the purpose in South Australia. I personally know the officer (Mr Barry Grear) in charge of that division and I know him to be an officer who is competent to carry out his duties appropriately and promptly. He is a delightful person with whom to deal. I would urge anyone who has experienced or has had similar circumstances drawn to their attention, to go either via the Minister or directly to Mr Grear's office located in the State Administration Centre.

I raised the subject because I think that it is bad news that organisations like the C.F.S. should be called upon for such financial assistance, particularly in these times. The Country Fire Services organisation is located in all the centres throughout the country regions of South Australia. It is having enough difficulties of its own to meet the expenditure necessary for the provision and maintenance of appropriate equipment and, indeed, manning its own local responsibilities without having to cope with a call of the kind I have outlined.

I would hope that that matter and any like matter is resolved effectively and swiftly within the divisions of the Government service that I have outlined.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I would like to deal with three aspects of tourism in the time that is available to me. However, before I do, and fortuitously because the invitation has just arrived, I would like to commend to all members of the House their attendance at the South Australian Tourism Conference and to support the Minister of Tourism in his commendation of that conference to all members of Parliament.

It was extremely good to see the details of the conference in the letter boxes this afternoon. I could perhaps make the observation that I am pleased that the Minister is encouraging members of this House and of the other place to join the delegates to that conference. It will be an extremely worthwhile programme. The key note speakers (Noel Smith and Martin Stern) should be able to arouse a great deal of interest and inspire South Australians who hear them to emulate their very great achievements in tourism.

In particular, Martin Stern should attract a great deal of interest because he is the Executive Vice-President of the advertising agency which developed the 'I Like New York' Campaign which has really transformed the city of New York, in terms of its attraction to visitors from a city which was regarded as being almost a dangerous place to visit to one which is now acting as a magnet for visitors from all over the world.

Having commended the Minister on the one hand, I will now criticise him on the other. Yesterday in the House, in response to a motion condemning his Federal counterpart, Mr John Brown, the Minister said that he was reluctant to make any condemnation until he had heard a tape of the Minister's speech in which he questioned why any one would want to fly into Adelaide. I believe that it should go on the record that this is an extraordinarily dilatory approach to take. A week has passed since that speech was made and I would have thought that that was time enough for a

transcript of that tape to be dispatched to Adelaide, or even that section of the tape which was read to me and which confirmed Mr Brown's remarks.

The fact is that the Minister might have written, and spoken, to his Federal counterpart, but the Government has done pretty well nothing. I recommend that the Premier, as a matter of urgency, seeks from the Prime Minister funds to compensate this State for the damage that it has suffered as a result of Mr Brown's remarks. I will put a notional value (and only a notional value) on that compensation. A round figure (and one I believe would greatly assist the Department of Tourism) is a figure of \$1 000 000. In putting this figure I am not suggesting in any way at all that \$1 000 000 is sufficient to compensate for Mr Brown's criticism and derogatory remarks about South Australia. I am simply saying that it would make amends and would assist the tourist industry. Indeed, if South Australia were able to sue Mr Brown, in law I believe it could get a great deal more than \$1 000 000 because the damage done is incalculable.

An amount of \$1 000 000 would enable the Department of Tourism to literally double its efforts, because it has, in marketing terms, in its budget this year \$1 200 000. If we round that figure off at \$1 000 000 then the department could double its efforts in the marketing of South Australia as a tourist destination if a further \$1 000 000 was added to the existing budget. I want the Premier to take action on this suggestion. I want him to contact the Prime Minister, as a matter of urgency, and I want him to stress that this request (or demand) comes from the Opposition and is supported by the Government even though it was not initiated by the Government and comes after we have waited seven days for an apology, retraction and some kind of offer to assist and to make amends for Mr Brown's remarks. No such thing has been forthcoming. In fact, in tonight's *News* the Federal Minister is reported as confirming what he said.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Incredible.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: And all the Minister can do is sit there and say 'incredible'.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It will be incredible to me if this State Government does not stand up for the rights of South Australians and tackle the Prime Minister. It is no good doing this on a Minister to Minister level, this is a serious matter that requires a Premier to Prime Minister activity.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: It would appear that our Premier is completely ineffective. That idiot John Brown has come out and reaffirmed his statements.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: You're messing up a good speech.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He's an absolute idiot, or our Premier is totally ineffective.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Light has raised an interesting and related matter in regard to how much it cost the Murray Valley when Labor members of Parliament decided to really put the fear of God into the population of South Australia and those people in other States by suggesting that they might succumb to Murray encephalitis. That is the kind of thing that can deter visitors, and no amount of money can compensate for that kind of damage. We believe that in the interests of justice and equity some kind of compensation should be made. In regard to matters away from Mr John Brown, thankfully, and closer to home, I want to refer to the review of the Licensing Act that is currently being undertaken. In my travels around South Australia and my discussions with people in the hospitality industry, I have discerned a great deal of interest in this review, and very firm views are held about what the outcome should be. Naturally, some segments of the industry

hold a certain view and other sections hold another view, but it is generally considered that the Act should be simplified and that a licensing system should be developed which facilitates tourism: it is as simple as that. It should be a system that facilitates tourism rather than one that exacerbates difficulties.

It is interesting to note an article in the latest edition of the *Australian Wine Industry Directory* (which is an excellent publication) concerning the licences that operate in the various States. An excellent analysis of the various licences is given, and in regard to South Australia details are given on no fewer than 15 liquor licences that can be held, and of course some tourist facilities have to hold more than one of those licences.

Probably the most notable facility that holds a set of multiple licences is the Old Clarendon complex at Clarendon just south of Adelaide. That establishment holds a limited publican's licence, a wine licence, and a vigneron's licence, because, of course, it is a wine maker, albeit a small one. Other licences required include the full publican's licence, the wholesale storekeeper's licence, the retail storekeeper's licence, wine licence, the brewer's Australian ale licence, a distiller's storekeeper's licence, a club licence, a packet licence, a litre licence, a restaurant licence, a limited restaurant licence—

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): Before I address the main points that I want to speak about in this debate, I want to record my absolute disgust about the manner in which the Government is presently running this House. I do not think that any other word but disgust can be used. Obviously, the Government cannot control the House at all; it cannot control its programme. We have sat for very few weeks since the Government was elected, suddenly finding that we must sit four days this week and four days next week, and now the Deputy Premier has advised in a Ministerial Statement that we will be sitting tomorrow evening.

Most members will probably realise that when money Bills have been introduced into this House, as they have been recently, the normal convention that applies is that we speak for half an hour on the first Bill but not on the second Bill, although a Labor Opposition in the past has breached that convention and spoken on both Bills. I want to indicate to the House at this stage that it is my intention to speak for my quite rightful 30 minutes on the second Bill if the Government persists in forcing us to remain here tomorrow evening.

I have spoken to many of my colleagues, who agree with me. Therefore, if the Government wishes to abuse the running of this House, I see no reason whatsoever why I should not continue the remarks I would very much like to make on the financial control of this Government. If we are to remain here tomorrow evening, the Opposition will be provided with an excellent opportunity to continue to point out how poorly this Government is performing.

I now refer to the Government's decision to defer the completion of the O'Bahn project (that is, if it ever completes that project), to which I referred previously. The Premier advised this House quite categorically as follows:

Cabinet has accepted in principle the recommendations flowing from that review which included—

and he was referring to a review of capital works—

rescheduling of the north-east busway programme to permit:

The opening and operation of the Park Terrace-Darley Road sector in 1986.

A review of other options for the sector beyond Darley Road after 1986.

As we well know, had the previous Government been returned, the work through to Tea Tree Plaza would have been completed by 1986. Obviously, the telephone in the office of the member for Newland has been running as hot as has the telephone in my office because of the Government's intention. I have received innumerable telephone calls about this matter, and I would say that the member for Newland has gone to the Premier and advised him of the tremendous concern that is being expressed in north-eastern suburbs about the Government's decision. What do we find in the *News* tonight? An article under the heading 'O'Bahn bus system still on the rails' states:

The controversial O'Bahn system still may be completed and in operation by 1986.

The article then refers to the Premier, and states:

Today he said the need for re-scheduling had only been 'flagged'.

I wonder what on earth we have to do to get a categorical statement if the statement from the Premier that I previously read is only flagging an intention. The article further states:

Mr Bannon said the busway would be re-scheduled to allow the operation of the Park Terrace to Darley Road section by 1986—the date on which the entire project was to have been completed. Doubts over the future of the Darley Road to Tea Tree Plaza sector were raised in January when the Government referred plans for that section to a special committee.

Of course, that was the first suggestion that the Government made to soften the public to its accepting the fact that O'Bahn, and for that matter any rapid public transport system, from Darley Road to Tea Tree Plaza, will not be provided if Labor remains in office. The Government used the excuse that it was necessary to undertake a full investigation of the soil stability. To save the Government a lot of money, I suggest that it speak to Zublin. The engineers from that company are designing and laying the guideway track in South Australia, and the chief engineer has told me that, without a shadow of doubt, the soils between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza are stable enough for guideway tracks.

Therefore, I can tell the Government that its costly investigation can stop, because the experts are convinced that the soils are stable enough to allow the guideway to continue. Let us hear no more nonsense that a committee of review is necessary to determine whether, structurally, such a system could continue. It could continue, and that is straight from the mouth of the experts. The article further stated:

The review could recommend the O'Bahn track not be extended to Tea Tree Plaza. This would limit the track to the middle busway sector from Park Terrace to Darley Road.

Thus, there would be a guided busway system from nowhere to nowhere, one that would not service the suburbs in regard to which a rapid public transport system was originally devised by both a previous Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government. The system would be absolutely useless. Tens of millions of dollars would 'go down the gurgler', to use a colloquialism.

What on earth use to anybody is a system that only runs just over half the distance? We will still have the crowding of the North-East and Lower North-East Roads. It will be no quicker and people will not be attracted to public transport. In other words, it will be absolutely wasted. The article continues:

The member for Newland, Mr Klunder, said he was disappointed at the prospect of delay in linking the outer north-east suburbs to the city.

The member for Newland's crocodile tears have not won him any friends in the north-eastern suburbs. He is a member of the Labor Party and Government and if he really believed in looking after his constituents he would be in the Chamber right now using this grievance debate to attack the Government for what it is doing to the constituents of Newland. I

certainly intend to continue my attack on the Government for what it is doing to the constituents of Todd.

If the member for Newland was representing his constituents and not the Labor Party, he would be in the Chamber talking to the Speaker and demanding that he be given his 10 minutes so that he, too, can attack the Government for what it is doing to his constituents. However, I do not believe we will hear a word from the member for Newland. He has squeaked a little in the *News* and has squeaked a little on the A.B.C. He has said that he hopes that the Government will think things through. What use is that? I can tell the House quite categorically that the Leader of the Opposition has stated that, when the Liberal Government is returned at the next election, the section between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza will be commenced immediately and completed as soon as possible. So, the constituents of the north-eastern suburbs have a clear choice at the next election. They can choose between a Government that will proceed with a rapid public transport system to Tea Tree Plaza and a Government that will not. They can choose between a member who puts his Party politics first and a member who puts his constituents first.

Mr Oswald: He's worried about his pre-selection.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is right. He is more worried about his membership in the Labor Party than he is about his constituents in Newland whom he purports to represent. So, people in the north-eastern suburbs can see the difference between the two members. I will continue to press this Government. I hope that the point which the Premier is now making is that perhaps we will be able to go ahead with it. I hope that the pressure which I and residents of the north-eastern suburbs exert on him will have the Government see sense and go back to the original promise which the Government has made since the election and which the then Opposition made before the election—that the rapid public transport system to the north-eastern suburbs would be completed in 1986—exactly as the Liberals promised. We will continue that pressure, and I hope the Premier will see the mistake he has made on the vital issue affecting transport in the north-eastern suburbs. It is important to the member for Todd but is not important to the Government or to the member for Newland, and the way in which the Chief Secretary is now acting shows the frivolity with which he and his Cabinet colleagues view this vital issue.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I rise to protest on behalf of two groups in the South Australian community; in essence, it is for the whole of the South Australian community. I refer to problems caused to persons employed in the manufacturing industries in South Australia and, on the other side of the equation, to the manufacturers in South Australia. As the two are part of the one equation, anything which is causing them distress or problems is compounding upon the whole South Australian community. Quite recently a joint manager, chairman and director of a small wholesale furniture manufacturing business in this State wrote to the Prime Minister. The letter was written at the time of the summit conference and was a manufacturer's endeavour to bring before the Prime Minister (and others in whom he may have confided the information), something of the present plight of manufacturers in Australia but, more specifically, in South Australia.

In the opening aspects of the letter, the Chairman indicated that the jobs in manufacturing had shrunk from 1 289 000 in 1969 to 1 123 000 in 1979, and to around 900 000 in March 1983; this is against an increasing population. He said:

If manufacturing had remained as a constant 25 per cent of the work force as it was in 1969, I believe the current number

employed now in manufacturing would be 1 500 000 (that is, 600 000 more jobs plus flow-on jobs).

If we accept the multiplier effect, I believe that is a very valid point which has been raised and one which highlights the difficulty which exists. This manufacturer then said, 'What is the answer? What can we do? Why are we in the position? Why am I as a manufacturer unable to compete as I could recently? Why am I as a manufacturer unable to employ more people?'

So, he started to analyse the situation and decided that there was value in creating a comparison between Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain and, in the Great Britain context, he recognised that there was both a non-union factory situation (as applies considerably in the United Kingdom) and a union factory situation. He made the comparison of Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain (under both systems) and prepared a comparison table. It is statistical material, and I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Do I have the normal assurance on that from the honourable member?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Speaker has that assurance. Leave granted.

Comparison—Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain
Current direct labour cost per hour in Australian Currency

March 1983

Australia		Furniture tradesman		
				\$
Award wage \$250 per x 52 weeks			13 000
Pay-roll tax 5 per cent			650
Workers compensation insurance (7-8 per cent)			1 000
Long service leave			320
1 7/2 per cent loading on holiday pay			200
				\$15 170
Days not worked—				
Annual leave	20	(4 weeks)	
Public holidays	10		
Sick days	8	(paid for by employer if not taken)	
				38
Potential weekly working days per annum				260
less above days not worked				38
leaves working days on job				222
222 working days at 7 hours 36 minutes per day (38 hour week)				
—Total working hours per annum—1 687				
Direct labour cost per hour \$15 170 ÷ 1 687 = \$9.00 per hour.				
New Zealand				\$
Award wage \$225.92 x 52 weeks			11 748
Workers accident compensation (2 per cent)			235
Long service leave (2 weeks after 15 years)			30
				\$12 013 N.Z.
Days not worked—				
Annual leave	15	(3 weeks)	
Public holidays	11		
Sick days	5		
				31

Potential weekly working days per annum	260	
less above days not worked	31	
		229
Leaves working days on job	229	
		229
229 working days at 8 hours per day		
Total working hours per annum	1 832	
Direct labour cost per hour	$\$12\ 013 \div 1\ 832 = \6.56	per hour
		N.Z. or \$4.92 Australian.
Source—N.Z. Award and letter 16 December 1982 from N.Z. Employers Federation.		
<hr/>		
Great Britain (Non-union factory)		
Tradesman's wage £120 x 52 weeks	£ 6 240	
Workers compensation and national insurance £9 per week per employee	468	
Death in service life premium	22	
		£6 730
<hr/>		
Days not worked—		
Annual leave	15	(3 weeks)
Public holidays	8	
		23
Potential weekly working days per annum	260	
less above days not worked	23	
		237
leaves working days on job	237	
		237
237 working days at 8 hours per day		
Total working hours per annum	1 896	
Direct labour cost	$£6\ 730 \div 1\ 896 = £3.55$	per hour or \$6.21 Aust. per hour.
<hr/>		
Great Britain (Union factory)		
Tradesman's wage £120 x 52 weeks	£ 6 240	
Workers compensation and national insurance £9 per week per employee	468	
Death in service life premium	22	
		£6 730
<hr/>		
Days not worked—		
Annual leave	20	(4 weeks)
Public holidays	8	
		28
Potential working days per annum	260	
less above days not worked	28	
		232
232 working days per annum at 8 hours per day		
Total working hours per annum	1 856	
Direct labour cost	$£6\ 730 \div 1\ 856 = £3.63$	per hour or \$6.35 Aust. per hour.
Sources—Direct contact with High Wycombe Furniture Factory and direct contact with London Period Furniture Factory.		

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Having made that comparison—and it was on material which was provided by the appropriate industrial organisations or, alternatively, by a manufacturer in each of the countries that I have mentioned—he started to look at his competitiveness (that is,

the South Australian manufacturer's competitiveness) and he found that there was quite a disparity.

Mr Ferguson: Against whom?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As against the same type of manufacturer in New Zealand and in Great Britain (both in a non-union and a union circumstance).

Mr Ferguson: Same industry?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The same industry, the same period, and the values balanced to Australian figures. He found, as will be determined by the information which is now tabled, that, for example, in Australia the direct labour cost per hour is \$9. The direct labour cost in New Zealand was \$NZ6.56 per hour (or \$A4.92). In the non-union Great Britain circumstance it was £3.55 per hour or (\$A6.21). In the union factory it was £3.63 per hour (or \$A6.35), relatively no difference between the union and the non-union manufacturing business in Great Britain. But, I repeat, leaving Great Britain out of it for the moment, that the difference in Australian dollars today of the direct labour cost for manufacturers of furniture is \$9 in Australia and \$4.92 for New Zealand per hour—a very vast difference.

The question that the manufacturer asked, again in his interest, not only for himself and his industry but more particularly for the large volume of unemployed persons in South Australia at this moment who might want to work in his industry and whom he would like to put to work in his industry, was this: where do I go now to remain competitive in the furniture industry because of the changed circumstances which apply and which allow New Zealand manufacturing materials to come on to the Australian market without any charge?

We know the problem which has occurred over a long period in the clothing industry with the changes which were effected in 1972-74 and with the intrusion of manufacture from Taiwan, Hong Kong and other places.

It has been well documented and accepted that the destruction of Australian industry (and it is reflected in those initial figures that I gave) has been because it is possible to import much more cheaply than it has been to manufacture. In relating this purely and simply to the furniture manufacturing business in South Australia at this moment, let us assume that the cost of the raw products is basically the same. We will have to accept that wood is essentially part of the furniture industry and that New Zealand may have the edge on us because of its supplies, favourable circumstances, and also in relation to its labour content.

For the information of members I repeat those figures. The Australian worker costs \$A9 per hour; a New Zealand worker costs \$A4.92 per hour. The cost of transportation by sea from New Zealand (or, indeed, by air) adds one further complication to the Australian scene because with the amount of traffic between Australia and New Zealand and the capacity for cargo, there is competition to fill the cargo holds of jumbo jets.

Not wishing to criticise at this juncture the fact that New Zealand products are going to be able to come upon the Australian market at this advantageous non-custom or non-introduction fee basis, I must say that it is an argument which might develop. I am genuinely concerned that the economy of South Australia and, indeed, Australia is going to be further eroded by this cost advantage to New Zealand. I believe that it was right that this manufacturer should exhibit concern and project this information to the Prime Minister. I will be waiting, as I believe every member of this House will be waiting, for a considered reply from the Prime Minister as to how he perceives that the Australian Government or State Governments may be able to correct the imbalance which is not to the advantage of any Australia.

lian, and certainly not of our children. I commend the tables that I have prepared to the House.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I wish to take time in this grievance to refer to matters relating to the South Australian Police Force. There are three or four matters that I want to refer to, and I am pleased that the Chief Secretary is in the House and I hope that he takes note of the matters that I want to bring to his attention. The first matter relates to the Evidence Act which is before Parliament at the present time. I am disgusted at the attitude of the Government and particularly that of the responsible Minister in relation to the Government's refusal to abolish the unsworn statement. Last week in the House, I asked the Minister this question:

In the light of concern being expressed publicly by many people and organisations in the community, including the Police Association, in regard to the Government's refusal to abolish the right of an accused person to make an unsworn statement, will the Chief Secretary inform the House whether he or the Government has sought or been provided with advice from the Police Commissioner on this important matter? If so, what was that advice and what action has the Government taken in regard to that advice?

I know, as do all members of the public in South Australia, that the Police Force in South Australia is very concerned about this matter. It has made it known through its association and through the media on a number of occasions, and I was looking for the Minister to indicate what action he would take on behalf of the Police Force in this State as a result of its concern in the matter. The answer that I received from the Minister was as follows:

I will obtain from the Attorney-General the information that the honourable member requests and bring down a report for him.

That is one of the weakest answers. I know that I got the Minister on the hop, but that is one of the weakest answers that I have ever heard. I was asking whether the Minister responsible for the South Australian Police Force knew of that concern, whether he had been advised of that concern, whether he had read of that concern in the paper, and he merely said that he would ask his colleague the Attorney-General to provide that information that I requested in my question.

I hope that when the Chief Secretary does bring down a report he will indicate his support for the South Australian Police Force and that he will go against those of his colleagues in the present Government who are hell-bent on not abolishing the unsworn statement, that he will support the Police Force, and that he will do something about the situation. I do not want to say anything more about that subject at present, because I will have the opportunity, and I can assure the Chief Secretary that I will be taking the opportunity, in the debate that will be in this House at a later stage to bring up other points in that regard.

While referring to the action or lack of it by the Minister, I also express my concern again about the very shabby treatment of the South Australian Police Force in regard to the Government's earlier decision to expand the random breath test programme. I have already referred at some length to this matter in this House, and it is not my intention to say more at this stage, because I do not have the time to do so. But I believe that it was shabby treatment, and that was made quite clear in questioning Ministers at that time, just before Easter.

I want to refer now to the amendments to the Police Offences Act and the lack of action once again on the part of the Government and particularly the Minister responsible, the Chief Secretary, in regard to the introduction of amend-

ments to that Act. When we moved out of Government, we were in a position to have that legislation placed before Parliament. The Bill was in draft form and was ready to bring before the House. I suggest (and I am sorry that the Chief Secretary is leaving the Chamber, because I would have liked him to have heard this) that the Minister has now had ample time to negotiate with anyone or seek advice or consult with those interested in this Bill in order to determine the present Government's attitude.

The major thrust of the Bill that the previous Government intended introducing was to bring about urgently needed law reform which would establish a proper balance between the community need for effective law enforcement and the need to preserve and respect basic human rights and freedom. I suggest that it is found frequently that the police are hampered in their efforts to prove guilt in certain instances because of inadequate legislation and the ability of criminals to exploit loopholes and deficiencies in the law.

It is most important that police officers have wider powers for the investigation of crime. A revision of penalties was also undertaken to fulfil the former Government's promise of more flexible penalties, because the majority have remained unaltered since the inception of the Act in 1953. The Government has had plenty of time to consult and make any changes that it believes necessary. It is vitally important that this legislation be now introduced.

I had hoped, and I know that the South Australian Police Force had hoped, that the amendments could have been dealt with during this session. We will now have to wait until the second session, but we will then have to deal with the Address in Reply and the Budget, and I suggest that we will not debate the new legislation until some time in September.

My next point relates to the action that the Government has taken in relation to the appointment of a committee to examine the best way of investigating complaints against the police. When I saw an article in the *Advertiser* this morning about this matter I wondered how much consultation had taken place with the Police Department in relation to the establishment of this three-member committee. The *Advertiser* article stated that the committee would consist of Mr Grieve, S.M., who would head the committee, the President of the South Australian Police Association, Inspector Moyse, and a nominee of the South Australian Council for Civil Liberties. As I have said, I wondered how much consultation had occurred with the Police Department in relation to the establishment of this three-member committee. It appears from an article in the *News* tonight that there has been very little consultation.

The article in this morning's *Advertiser* referred to the attitudes of the Acting Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, and his department in relation to the committee. In fact, the Chief Secretary is quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying:

My view would be that they would welcome the committee because one of their people, Inspector Moyse, is involved.

I say at the outset that I am delighted that Inspector Moyse is a member of the committee. However, in tonight's *News* we learn that the Acting Police Commissioner is not satisfied because the committee does not have a representative of the Police Department. The article states:

The Acting Police Commissioner, Mr D.A. Hunt, confirmed today he had spoken to Mr Keneally about the absence of a Police Department representative

He said he had told Mr Keneally he believed the department should be represented. 'I have asked him to reconsider the matter and he has said he will give my submission consideration,' Mr Hunt said.

As I have said, the story in tonight's *News* indicates that the Police Department is not happy. I was concerned when I saw the article in the *Advertiser* which stated that there was no representative of the Police Department on the

committee. We now find that Acting Police Commissioner Hunt has spoken to the Chief Secretary about the absence of a Police Department representative on the committee.

I totally support the points made by Acting Police Commissioner Hunt. The Police Department should be represented on the committee and I urge the Chief Secretary to not only consider the matter but also act in a positive way and immediately provide an opportunity for the department to appoint a representative.

Mr MATHWIN: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I wish to address the question of traffic volume. The deteriorating situation in relation to the volume of traffic in the Adelaide metropolitan area has been of concern to me and I imagine to a large number of Adelaide citizens. I am sure that if we could go back 10 years and start all over again we would make far different decisions. I can recall the situation that prevailed 10 years ago when the traffic volume was 30 per cent less than it is today. We had a relatively free flow, easy access and a whole number of attributes which I believe were desirable at that time.

However, over a period a number of decisions have been made by the Government which have altered that position. Having visited a number of the major cities throughout the world, I can only be amazed that in some of these areas traffic can move far faster than it does in Adelaide. However, I still believe that Adelaide has a good transport flow compared to, say, the centres of Melbourne or Sydney.

Mr Mayes: Paris and London.

Mr BAKER: I have travelled far more quickly in London than I have in Adelaide on odd occasions, and London has a population of some 9 000 000 people.

Mr Mayes: You must have been in a different city.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BAKER: I see that there are several major problems with respect to traffic which will have to be addressed. Of course, one is the old MATS plan—the 'through' routes that no Government will grasp.

It is politically sensitive. It is very expensive, but if it had been implemented at the time it was first mooted it would have provided Adelaide with one of the best transport systems in Australia. However, what is happening today is that there has been a mushrooming of traffic lights throughout the Adelaide metropolitan area. I know that in my electorate of Mitcham three sets of traffic lights have been introduced over the past three years and another one is proposed. As anybody with a fundamental knowledge of traffic knows, the more traffic lights there are, the slower is the traffic, and this leads to other problems. It leads to movement through the back streets of Adelaide which was never ever intended. I imagine that most people in the electorates which abut the city centre, and further out, would understand this difficulty. As soon as there is an impediment at a traffic light, people will take an alternative route even if, in some cases, that route is longer, because they dislike sitting at traffic lights.

There are a number of negative aspects in relation to traffic lights which people fail to appreciate. The first one is the rerouting of cars through streets which were never designed to take them. The second one is the pollution aspect when people are required to stop for short periods of time. Frustration is the third aspect. I have been to Sydney and noticed very courteous drivers; they have had to put up with far worse circumstances than we have in Adelaide, and they have at least become accustomed to them. However, in Adelaide we still try to beat the lights:

we still try to go through on the yellows and reds. We still get very frustrated if we have to stop for even 30 seconds.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr BAKER: In certain cases I would say that the traffic flow relative to the cars on the road is certainly superior to our own.

Mr Mathwin: I think that they are more polite.

Mr BAKER: They are certainly more polite and far more adept at driving than we are in Adelaide. There has been some suggestion for at least five years and perhaps 10 years that there will be a synchronisation of the traffic lights in Adelaide. We are still waiting for that. I know that there have been a number of statements on behalf of the previous Government and the present Government on this matter. We are still waiting for synchronised lights. It is a project that seems to have been waved before the electors on a number of occasions, but has never been achieved. It certainly must be achieved. We must be able to speed up the through traffic in Adelaide so that we do not have the impediments that we have today.

It is important that the Minister of Transport comes to grips with the fact that we should not have traffic lights which hold up traffic every 100 metres as we have in the city today. I think that it is useful to know that when I worked for the Department of Environment and Planning we had occasion to have an expert from England on traffic planning come across to a seminar. The English expert commented that we had done poorly by the citizens of Adelaide in our traffic planning and that we had applied the old bludgeon rule that if you have a problem spot you put up traffic lights. Whilst I admit that traffic lights do provide certain safety measures, there has never been sufficient attention to other means of providing safety for citizens crossing roads. I would like the Minister of Transport to think about what we are doing in Adelaide about this matter. We might not be able to remove existing traffic lights, but we can certainly stop the erection of further traffic lights.

I can remember, prior to being elected to this Parliament, approaching the Road Traffic Board for details of Adelaide traffic lights which had been completed or were planned for the previous two years and the next 12 months, respectively. The response from the board at that time was that it could not provide any details of road traffic lights because it was having a review. I still do not have any information about that matter. I presume that the review that was under way during the life of the previous Government has been completed and that the recommendations from it have been put before the Government. However, we have not seen that review. It is almost as if it does not exist.

The second item that I wish to address relates to road impediments. During tonight, and last night, we considered the Budget situation. However, I now ask that certain items be looked at in terms of road renovations and improvements in the Adelaide metropolitan area. It appears to me that there has been a large escalation in road repairing on Adelaide's major routes. For example, some two months ago I had cause to visit a number of areas on the one day. During that day I found Brighton Road was under repair and difficult to traverse at certain points; Holbrooks Road had, and still has, a total detour; and, Belair Road, near my office, has, for the past eight weeks, had road impediments slowing traffic. Then, of course, there is the Old Belair Road.

Mr Mathwin: What about Fullarton Road? The island there took years.

Mr BAKER: A number of things have taken years, as the member for Glenelg reminds me. I understand that there may be a need to upgrade roads because of flooding damage or the onset of winter, but I fail to see why at least four

major routes in the south and south-western suburbs have been tied up at the same time. It suggests to me that either there has been bad planning or there is excess money in the Budget that must be spent before 30 June. It is inconceivable to me that a Government intent on saving money would, in fact, push ahead with a number of different projects which are tying up our roads. I think that savings could have been made in these areas, but I am unaware of the needs in these areas, so it may be that they have had difficulties caused by floods, or needs that must be met before the winter sets in. I ask the Minister of Transport to address himself to these issues in the forthcoming year.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I will address my remarks towards the proceedings of this House. When one considers the way that matters in this House have supposedly operated over the past few weeks it is amazing that the administrators in this place, the so-called Government and its leaders, have not been asked to resign.

I say this because in any other organisation, any other administrative body, if proceedings occurred such as those that we have experienced during the past few days, the chairman of that body, and probably the elected members also, would have to go for re-election and the chairman would be put out of his position, because those involved would not have stood for such a disorganised body. Over the past day or two I received a sheet entitled 'Probable House of Assembly sitting times': it is probably not worth a scrap to me or to anyone else, because the times on that sheet do not seem to mean anything. The sheet is simply there to be pinned on to the calendar notice board for one to do with it as one wishes. It states on that sheet that we would conclude by 6 p.m. this evening.

Mr Klunder: If the members of the House had kept to the debate we would have.

Mr MEIER: The honourable member says that if the House had kept to the debate we would have concluded by now. We were informed earlier that apparently, we go on averages here—that there is an average time for debate on Bills. We were told that the average time was so many hours and that we had overstepped it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They are a very average Government, aren't they.

Mr MEIER: They are way below average. It seems that debate is not allowed in this Chamber, although I thought that Parliament was a forum for debate.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: I am giving you plenty of time. What are you talking about?

Mr MEIER: The Deputy Premier is the one who said that we had overstepped the mark, and that therefore we would continue.

Mr Mathwin: He always get niggly after a late night.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! The honourable member does not need any help; he is doing very well.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Why do you not move an extension? I will accept it.

Mr MEIER: Actually that is not so funny, but, again, it would make a farce of the proposed programme. Those trying to run the show should surely be able to look far enough ahead and work out approximately how much time is needed. With two extra days of sitting, extra hours of sitting and sitting way into the night, it is obvious that no programme was worked out, or, if it was, it was not worked out properly. Therefore, we are now trying to cram things.

Mr Mathwin: We didn't sit for two months.

Mr MEIER: Of course, we have not sat for a long time, but, be that as it may, there has been plenty of time to get legislation through on extra weeks of sitting, if necessary, but we have not been informed about that. I was saying

earlier before an interjection was made that a normal committee or organisation would have had its chairman removed and its committee put up for re-election if it had run the organisation in the way that this House has been run over the past week.

The fact is that one cannot plan ahead. Many members here, certainly those on this side of the House, had made arrangements for Friday and for Friday week. I had to cancel two engagements for Friday. Maybe it is a plot by the Government to try to win some extra votes, because they know that a member who has to cancel engagements will not be very popular with those electors.

It seems to me that these prolonged sittings relate very much to what in army terms is referred to as 'bastardisation', when possibly in the evening or at night soldiers were forced to go on a march all night just to test their endurance. It seems to me that that sort of thing is what has been experienced here in this House.

Mr Mathwin: Legislation by stealth.

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

Mr MEIER: Only a few weeks ago we saw a newspaper article (perhaps other people had more inside information about this) which referred to bastardisation at Duntroon again being rampant and that it had to stop. We find, though, that in this House it seems to be still occurring, and I think it needs to be looked at. A point that might be raised is that it is not only the present Government that has brought in late sittings and deviated programmes, although I have not been in the House during the term of any previous Government—I cannot deny that.

What I wish to get across is that I believe that this House should re-evaluate the way in which it operates, irrespective of which Party is in power. In this day and age efficiency and forward planning seem to be key factors in every organisation, and every organisation that does not plan well ahead will go through the hoop sooner or later. We have been asked to debate into the early hours of the morning, and I believe it is difficult to debate with proper reason and proper judgment when one is very tired. In fact, during the early hours of this morning a Minister was snoring and making audible sounds.

Mr Groom: Come on! You are out of order now.

Mr MEIER: I do not see how I could possibly be out of order. I saw another honourable member sleeping on a table. If that occurs during Parliamentary sittings—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: We should re-evaluate what we are doing, and I am talking to members on both sides, even though members opposite are in Government.

Mr Groom: Which members on your side are you criticising?

Mr MEIER: The honourable member would not like me to refer to the Minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair and not answer interjections.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Sir, for your protection. This House seems to be divorced from the real world, where efficient and forward planning are necessary, and I hope that all members will do their best to see that things change in the coming years, or months—and I am aware that things do not change overnight. There is another factor to consider. The Appropriation Bill was brought down earlier and the key factor was saving money, yet the way in which we carry on, sitting into the late hours of the night, means that, after 6.30 p.m. the staff are on time and a half, and after 9.30 p.m. on double time. If the Premier and the Government are serious about saving money, surely that is one area in which money could be saved. I hope that things will change.

In the normal yearly calendar we find that Easter has no fixed date: Easter changes each year. There have been suggestions that Easter be established on a set date, so that people can plan ahead. Yet, we do not seem to be able to plan ahead for a matter of hours. A dinner engagement that was scheduled for 6.30 p.m. tonight looks as though it will not eventuate.

Mr Klunder: Will you ask for an extension of time?

Mr MEIER: I do not believe that that is the issue. I hope that some sanity will prevail in this House and that we will perform on a much more organised basis in the future so that members can plan ahead and can consider their electorate and their constituents.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I would like to know what is in the mind of the Government. It would appear that it has embarked on a vendetta against the people of the Riverland and the area as a whole. Heaven knows what the Government's objective is in this process because most members in the House would be well aware of the difficulties that confront the people in the Riverland, particularly in relation to industries in that area. One only has to look at the dried fruit and canned fruit industries.

The member for Florey would recognise the problems in the canned fruit industry without my going into detail to explain them to him. What have we seen in the last few days? Only two days ago we had the Premier coming into this House and making an announcement that the Government was going to delete the construction of the Cobdogla irrigation rehabilitation scheme from the capital works programme in South Australia—a scheme which is currently half constructed. We had an announcement from the Premier some six or eight weeks ago that it had removed the construction of the Berri bridge from the bi-centennial roads programme.

The Riverland Cannery is currently under review, under the chairmanship of the member for Florey. Are we going to see that valuable institution and industry in the Riverland also wound up? If it were not for the fact that we were as far down the track with the construction of the theatre at Renmark, the Government would also have cancelled that project. A considerable capital works programme in the Riverland has now been reduced to almost nothing. The only major programme left in the Riverland at this time is the theatre. If it were not for the fact that the previous Government had let the contract and had started to lay concrete before the election took place, I am sure that that project would also have been cancelled and abandoned by the present Labor Government.

I refer again to the Berri bridge project which was initiated by the previous Liberal Government. We were able to secure total funding for it from the Commonwealth under the bi-centennial roads programme. That funding is still available. Some six weeks ago I introduced a deputation from the Riverland to the Premier. The deputation was made up of the Mayor of Berri and the Mayor of Loxton, along with their two respective clerks from the two councils. We had a meeting with the Premier on this vital project which had just been cancelled in the Riverland. It would appear from that meeting that the Premier had very little knowledge even of how the project was to be funded. In fact, when it was put to him by the deputation that there was a compromise situation, even though the Federal Government was going to provide virtually the total funding for the project and the State was committed only to the moneys which had been put into it by the previous Liberal Government, the Premier appeared to have a closed mind. The deputation

put to the Premier that, even though the total funds for the project were being provided by the Federal Government, if he wanted to milk off a considerable portion of the funds for that project (a project which was costing in the vicinity of \$19 000 000), he could build the Berri bridge in two stages. The Government could build the bridge across the river and consider the causeway at a later date. It could be built as two packages. That would effectively halve the cost. That proposal was put to the Premier some six weeks ago. To date there has been no response to that proposal from the Premier to either the Mayor of Loxton or to the Mayor of Berri. I do not know how long we have to wait. It was a very simple and straight-forward proposal. It was a compromise which would have enabled that major project to proceed.

If it is not to be proceeded with at this stage when funds have been made available by the Commonwealth, I cannot see that, in the economic climate in which the Government now finds itself there will be any likelihood in the years to come to fund that project from State resources. The Federal Government was quite happy to proceed with it; in fact, when it was put forward by the former Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson), the Federal Government questioned whether or not South Australia wanted to devote such a large portion of its total funds which were available to it from the Bicentennial Roads Programme Fund. The decision from the South Australian Government was that it did and, consequently, the Federal Government had no objection.

The suggestion was put forward by the Premier at the deputation that the Federal Government was opposed to the amount of money being spent on this project. I can assure the House that that is not the case. The Federal Government did question whether or not South Australia wanted to allocate that amount of funds to that project. What is more, even at this stage, I am quite sure that, since the funds have been determined, even the present Hawke Government would have no argument if the Labor Government in South Australia wished to proceed with that project.

We have put forward as a compromise to the Premier and the Government that this major project should be built in two stages if the Premier wants to use half of the resources for some other project in South Australia. I believe that that is a very acceptable compromise, particularly in the light of the election undertaking that the Premier gave. Not only did the Premier give an undertaking that he would honour that commitment and that project, but the present Chief Secretary also gave a personal guarantee to the Mayors of both Loxton and Berri that this project would proceed if the Labor Party was to gain office at the election on the following day. That promise has not been upheld. We have offered the Government a very real compromise. I hope that it is still not too late for the Premier to honour his undertaking and that he can do it by only half the expenditure that the Liberal Government was prepared to put into that project.

It will be a project which will exist as a monument to the Bicentenary of Australia, and it is the type of project which the Federal Government supports. It stands on its own and can be clearly identified as a bicentennial project. Because of that, the Federal Government is more than happy to see the funds that the previous Liberal Government had allocated out of the bicentennial programme go into that project. It would be there for generations of people to come.

If it is not built at this stage and if it is frittered away on other small projects here and there—small sections of road which will need to be reconstructed every so many years—there will be nothing to identify that money spent in South Australia as a bicentennial project. A very real option is

open to the Government; that is, to build the Berri bridge as a two-way project, proceeding forthwith with a bridge over the Murray River at Berri.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

At 7.15 p.m. the House adjourned until 10.30 a.m. on Friday 6 May.