

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Friday 6 May 1983

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

QUESTION TIME

CASINO

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Since taking office, has the Premier or any other Minister held discussions with any company or organisation which has expressed a desire to establish a casino in South Australia and, if so, will the Premier give to the House details of any proposals which have been put to the Government?

In this morning's *Advertiser*, the Premier is reported as having said that the Government had no specific plans for a casino. Of course, as the law stands at present, the Government can have no such specific plans. However, the Premier's statement raises the possibility that the Government has plans for action on this matter contingent upon a change in the law. The Premier has already indicated that there is interest in the establishment of a casino in South Australia. He told this House on 29 March, 'certainly, a number of groups are interested in such a proposition'. This being the case, I ask the Premier whether these groups have approached him and, if so, without naming the groups involved, will he give the House details of any propositions they have put to him or any of his Ministers?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot speak for all the other Ministers, although none of them has reported to me any propositions that might have been put to them. I would have thought, in those circumstances, that I would have known of any propositions, depending on the basis of the approach.

One will recall that last year when the former Government made its abortive and bungled attempt to introduce casino legislation, there were a number of groups interested at that time in the possibilities of a casino. When the current legislation was introduced by the Hon. Mr Blevins in another place, one or two groups had written in general terms to the Government saying that if casino legislation was passed they would be interested in making some bid for a licence; nothing more. In other words, I guess that it is one of those situations where people are registering an interest in anticipation, as would have happened prior to the last introduction.

Mr Mathwin: Who were they?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that I should name those companies although I doubt that they would be very coy about it. In other words, I think that it is well known that a number of groups will be very interested in establishing a casino because they have made it public in times gone past. That is all they are doing, registering an interest.

The matter was raised, I think, in fact by the Deputy Leader at one stage in connection with the Adelaide railway station project. I made it quite clear then and it is still the position that any negotiations that have been conducted and discussions held on that project are being held on the basis that its viability and any indentures or contracts to be entered into must exclude consideration of a casino because, at the moment, that is not a viable option.

So, I mention that specifically because that is where the matter was raised. Those instructions have been made very clear to anyone interested in that project.

That is not to say, of course, that if legislation does not come up, they will be among those groups who say, 'Now there is an opportunity to have a casino, can we include that in the propositions that we have got?' as clearly they had in mind when the previous Government introduced its Bill. The statement that I am reported as making this morning in the paper makes the position quite clear: that unless and until there is legislation in place, the question of who may or may not get a licence and under what conditions is obviously something that cannot be contemplated and people have been informed accordingly.

GRANGE ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House of any plans to alter the traffic engineering of traffic lights at the corner of Tapleys Hill Road and Grange Road? The traffic lights at that corner have existed for many years. Development at West Lakes and the introduction of new shopping centres at Fulham Gardens have increased the traffic flow at this intersection. Motorists wishing to make a right turn from Grange Road into Tapleys Hill Road do so with great difficulty. It may be said that motorists entering the lane to make a right turn are entering a panel beater's paradise. Many motorists have expressed concern that it is now necessary for a redesign of the traffic lights at that intersection.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Currently, there are three lanes each way on Tapleys Hill Road, one of which is a shared right turn and through traffic lane. Current signalling delays all through traffic while right turns are made. It is proposed to create an exclusive right-turn lane in each direction by moving the median slightly and resignalling to allow both right-turn movements to occur as soon as possible. This will greatly increase the efficiency of the intersection. The cost of the work will be about \$40 000, and it is hoped that the work will be commenced in August.

CASINO

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: My question is supplementary to the answer that the Premier gave to the Deputy Leader's question. Will the Premier now inform the House of any further progress in relation to negotiations for the redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station site? I understand that the Premier has intimated that a decision is likely within the next few weeks. The Leader of the Opposition revealed in this House on 29 March that negotiations had been authorised by the former Government for redevelopment of this site to include a 400-room hotel, apartments, a convention centre, a bus-train interchange and a parking station.

The Leader raised the matter at that time because 31 March—two days later—was the expiry date for an option granted by the former Government for the completion of an agreement to redevelop the site. The former Government had given a consortium a year in which to seek financial backing and to develop the proposal to the stage at which a commitment to proceed could be given. In granting this one year option, the consortium had indicated to the Government that this should be sufficient time to establish whether or not the project was feasible and attractive to investors. As it is now five weeks since that option expired, I ask the Premier whether he is able to report any further progress to the House on the matter particularly in view, as I say, of the understanding that an announcement was imminent.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not believe that I have encouraged any speculation about imminent announcements, although I had made it clear that negotiations and discussions are still continuing. When the member for Torrens says that the Leader of the Opposition revealed to the House certain things—it was not much of a revelation. It had already been announced by the former Premier in the week or so preceding the election. It is that sort of announcement and premature speculation that has cost us some problems in development projects in this State.

The member for Torrens would know from his Ministerial experience and from his involvement in this project that it is quite undesirable and bad commercial practice to canvass publicly what is occurring in the course of negotiations, particularly in relation to a project of this scale. I am afraid that I am not in a position to add anything to any statements that have been made. I am certainly not going to adopt the policy of the previous Premier and trumpet supposed gains, achievements or whatever before their time. Let things be set in place first and let the proper negotiations proceed. It will then be quite proper for us to discuss the matter in Parliament and in the community.

GOODWOOD COMMUNITY SERVICES

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Community Welfare urgently consider allocating additional emergency funding to the Goodwood Community Services organisation? Goodwood Community Services is a community-based organisation providing a wide range of important community facilities and services in the Goodwood area and immediate surrounding areas. With increasing unemployment, particularly in this area, there is an increasing demand on Goodwood Community Services facilities and, as a consequence, the demands are placing the organisation under great strain. One urgent area of need is the services provided through the Greek community social worker Father Nick Despiondis. I ask the Minister to consider this matter urgently.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am aware that the honourable member has been maintaining an active interest in this matter for some time—indeed, well before he became a member of this House. I will most certainly ask my officers to get in touch with the honourable member and with Goodwood Community Services to ascertain the precise nature of the needs of the centre and how the department can best help.

I point out to the honourable member and to the House that I have instituted an inquiry into the functioning of the Community Welfare Grants Committee (not that the committee has performed in any way adversely in the past) primarily to look at the increased demand that is being placed on the work of that committee and on the work performed by the Community Welfare Department in relation to the increased demands that are being placed on the provision of welfare services both by the public and the non-public sectors. The increased demands alluded to by the honourable member are of concern to us all because, with increasing unemployment and other social dislocation factors throughout our community, increasing needs must be met by those who care for others in the community. I will most certainly take up the honourable member's point and see what additional assistance can be provided by the Government.

OVERSEAS TRIP

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Did the Premier plan to go overseas in the week commencing Sunday 27 March? If so,

where was he planning to go, what was the purpose of his visit and why was it cancelled? In this House on 23 March in response to a question the Premier said that he did not know whether he was going overseas the following week and could give no details about his itinerary. However, I am informed that arrangements were made for the Premier to visit several Asian countries and that detailed plans had been made for the trip, including the ordering of gifts to be presented to people that he met.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know what source of information the honourable member claims to have, but it is probably the same source as the member for Hanson who was also carrying on about this matter.

Mr Becker: I haven't even spoken to him.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It seems that they have separate sources of deep throat type information. This is a fairly ludicrous line of questioning. In terms of any—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It will be much better questioning when you answer truthfully.

The SPEAKER: Order! It will be a much better Parliament when interjections cease, particularly when an answer is being given.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This descent into porno-politics by the member for Light is pretty poor and it has happened before. When I began my answer the honourable member said 'It will be much better when you answer truthfully'. I am answering truthfully. What is the meaning behind the honourable member's remark? What sort of aspersion or innuendo is the honourable member trying to cast?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will not pursue that line. It is disappointing, coming from that particular source. The question is based on supposed information that the member for Light had concerning a possible overseas trip which I might have taken to certain Asian countries that I could have visited, and certain gifts that I could have given. As Premier of this State, if the Government is involved in negotiations on particular projects of importance, I must stand ready to be involved, should they reach a particular stage of fruition, to take part in any of the final details as may be necessary. There are a number of projects under consideration now. They should not be, as I said earlier in response to the member for Torrens, a subject of speculation. What has the Opposition in mind? Is it to try to somehow ensure that any of a Government's transactions are being conducted in the full blaze of publicity? I know that that was the policy of the former Premier, who went off half-cocked so often that we ended up getting barely anything as a result of what are complex financial negotiations. I have to stand ready at any time to be available if negotiations reach a certain point. That was true of a particular project, standing ready, but there was no question of my participating in anything unless it is of substance and unless we are advancing the project. The truthful facts are that I have not gone overseas. I am using the word 'truth' because there is a concern by the member for Light about this. I have not gone overseas and I have no announcement to make about it.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport say whether there is any evidence of nepotism within the State Transport Authority? I have received correspondence from the Acting State Secretary of the Australian Railways Union, dated 4 May 1983, which states:

I have been requested to raise a matter with you, requesting your assistance re: new S.T.A. appointments to positions within S.T.A.

The letter goes on to say:

It has come to our attention that 15 to 20 persons have been employed over recent months under an act of nepotism. If this is so, then this organisation questions S.T.A.'s motives. As you would be aware we are continuously being placed under pressure re: made available staff being requested to become direct S.T.A.— and I gather from that, he means S.T.A. employees— and under this type of situation, one can see is a step by S.T.A. to overcome employees objection, as family ties would be used to undermine staff objection.

Hoping you can assist in this matter.

The letter is signed by the Acting Branch Secretary, J.K. Crossing.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I can assure the member for Albert Park that no appointments are made to State Transport Authority positions on the basis of nepotism.

CONVENTION CENTRE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier reveal with whom he had discussions before the last election about the establishment of a major convention centre, using the Adelaide railway station building and site? This question is supplementary to the Premier's answer earlier today concerning the railway station redevelopment. In his policy speech before the election, the Premier revealed that he had already had discussions about the establishment of a convention centre using the station site as follows:

Labor will take every step to ensure that this project is realised.

In his previous answer, the Premier said that it was wrong to speculate about future projects, yet it was the Premier who began speculation about the project while negotiations were being carried on by the previous Liberal Government.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I see the point that the Deputy Leader is trying to make. He thinks that he is being smart by saying that I have suggested that there should not be speculation, and yet I have announced that we were interested in a particular project. I repeat that the reason for that was based on what had been said by the then Premier: he had been jumping up and down and carrying on about this. He had been letting people know around the traps that big announcements were imminent. He made a speech in Melbourne about it. I happen to know what sort of negotiations were going on. It was public knowledge going right back to 1974, that there were proposals covering the Adelaide railway station; a desirable project. It was well known that the S.T.A. had called for firm propositions to advance the development of the Adelaide railway station project. I had contact with at least two groups that were interested in that project. I knew that they were interested and I was also aware that the S.T.A. proposal ought to be advanced as vigorously as possible. However, the public statements and announcements that I made were connected with—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Who were they?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will tell the honourable member privately who they were. The member for Torrens would know both of them, and I will tell him afterwards. I do not think that names should be canvassed in this forum. Does he really seriously think that that is proper commercial practice? One wonders how this previous Government survived for three years with that kind of attitude to commercial transactions.

However, putting that aside (and I am happy to give the names), the facts are that the previous Premier had been carrying on about this issue; it was fairly public knowledge. I would have thought that the previous Government would

have welcomed the Opposition's positive affirmation of support for the project. We had it then in Opposition: we are carrying out that policy now in Government.

METROPOLITAN RESERVOIRS

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Water Resources say what is the current position in regard to the holdings in metropolitan reservoirs and whether recent rains have assisted the intake into the reservoirs?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am pleased to say that recent rains have provided substantial intake for the metropolitan reservoir system. As of yesterday, the overall capacity of metropolitan holdings was 44 per cent of total capacity which is exactly the same as the position last year. As I indicated some weeks ago, pumping from the Murray River is no longer necessary and, with the overall reduction in consumption, the holdings of the reservoirs are very secure. The recent heavy rains in parts of the Murray-Darling basin and reports of heavy rains in southern Queensland in the Darling Downs area, grading to fair falls in parts of New South Wales, are expected to provide substantial run-off and flows, and good intakes into the Menindee lakes can be expected in the next few weeks.

BRAGG BY-ELECTION

The SPEAKER: I have been given a circular purporting to be signed by the Leader of the Opposition and distributed in the electorate of Bragg which, amongst other things, says:

In choosing 14 May as the date of the by-election to select a replacement for David Tonkin, the Government has ignored the difficulties which will be created for voters in this area.

It purports to be authorised by D. Willett. I am not concerned with fighting between the political Parties. However, let me make it quite clear that I chose the date, under the Constitution, as was my duty. I was not directed by the Government. In fact, the date does not represent the date suggested by the Leader of the Opposition or the Premier. The rest of the discussions are totally privy to me and to them. I will not go into that. However, I am sure that the electors of Bragg will be intelligent enough to deduce that I chose the date without any pressure from anyone, in my own way trying to minimise the difficulties to them.

TOURISM MINISTER'S REMARKS

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Has the Premier made any representations to the Prime Minister seeking not only a retraction of the derogatory remarks about Adelaide made by the Federal Minister of Tourism, Mr John Brown, but also compensation in the form of Federal funding to supplement the South Australian Department of Tourism's marketing budget to assist this State to overcome the adverse effects on the tourism industry of Mr Brown's remarks, and, if he has not, will he do so?

By publicly questioning why anyone would want to fly into Adelaide, and then reaffirming his statement. Mr Brown, as Federal Minister for Tourism, has put South Australia's interstate and international marketing efforts at a severe disadvantage. It would help in some degree to overcome this disadvantage if the Federal Government were to provide funds of the order of, say, \$1 000 000 to enable a special marketing campaign, over and above the campaign provided for in the State budget, to be conducted in our principal domestic and international markets. In placing the figure of

\$1 000 000 on Federal compensation, I stress that this is purely a notional figure and that the damage done by Mr Brown's remarks is incalculable. If the State could sue the Minister this figure would be magnified many times.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the Government is taking action over the statements made by Mr Brown. My initial response, when confronted with them in the first round of these remarks, was to say that they were pathetic and did not represent the true situation. My Minister of Tourism reacted even more strongly in respect of his public statements. Also, he immediately communicated with Mr Brown expressing his dismay.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Did you contact the Prime Minister? That was the question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am giving the honourable member the full picture. Perhaps I should have given her an agenda listing items 1, 2 and 3.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. C. Bannon: I am explaining what has happened from the day Mr Brown has made his statements, what action the Government is taking, and all I get is chivvying interjections when, oddly enough, we happen to be on the same side in this issue. The Minister of Tourism wrote a letter to Mr Brown expressing his dismay, and saying that he was incensed by the statements, and, among other things, inviting him to come to Adelaide at the earliest opportunity to meet with and confront the tourism industry here, explain himself, and have a look at the true picture of things. The Prime Minister's office was contacted by me complaining about these statements.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The fact that the interjections coming from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are *sotto voce* does not make them any more lawful.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: What does that mean, we have to add salt?

The SPEAKER: I am not allowed to use the Australian vernacular but, 'in a low voice', if the honourable member would like a translation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I fear that such learning is wasted, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That will gain the honourable member nothing.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thought that there would have been some positive response to these approaches. Instead, we had the report yesterday that Mr Brown was not at all contrite about his remarks and, in fact, was repeating them. I think that that is the last straw, and last night I authorised a letter, which is going today to the Prime Minister, protesting in the strongest possible terms about the actions of his Minister. We will reiterate that it is time Mr Brown, as Federal Tourism Minister and a man who is supposed to be skilled in the industry (and the industry welcomed his appointment), came to South Australia and not only explained his remarks to the industry but advised himself of the true situation in terms of tourism in South Australia.

As to the question of damages, it is a useful publicity gimmick, I guess, to talk about it in those terms. However, clearly there is no way of computing such damage. Indeed, I would hope that the publicity that has been given to this, and the consequent retractions or modifications and the attention that we can turn on this will in fact have some value. Incidentally, I notice that Mr Brown has been supported on this matter. He was supported by the Queensland Tourist Minister, one of Mr Bjelke-Petersen's troglodytes up there, and the Minister of Tourism is taking up that matter very vigorously. I hope that the shadow Minister will do likewise.

WINTINNA COAL DEPOSITS

Mr PETERSON: In view of the recent reports stating that it may be necessary to import coal from interstate for power generation, will the Minister of Mines and Energy say why the high-quality coal deposits at Wintinna have not been considered for use? It has been reported that coal deposits suitable for power generation are available at that site. A day or two ago a letter from a Mr Clifford Boyde appeared in the *Advertiser*, which stated, in part:

It has been known for some time that the Wintinna coal deposits in the Arckaringa Basin (west of Lake Eyre) are ideally suited for this purpose [meaning steam generation]. Furthermore, the coal field straddles the new Alice Springs railway and there are proven reserves of 1 500m. tonnes at this site, which figure the Government has not publicly disputed.

I think the people of South Australia have a right to know the justification for ignoring this rich coal deposit in favour of more costly interstate supplies.

With the employment potential of such a development (and that is employment which is badly needed in South Australia—not New South Wales), and in the interests of the national railways and the possibility of an export market for such coal, many people will be interested in the reply of the Minister.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for the question, because a certain amount of comment has been made recently about the Wintinna coal deposit and about how, where or why it may be used. Certainly, in the explanation that the honourable member gave he referred to a letter published in the paper. The words 'publicly disputed' appeared. I think it would be fair to say that the letter that appeared in the paper was inaccurate. I do not mean that in a critical way, but the person who wrote the letter may not have been aware of the statements of the previous Minister of Mines and Energy over the last couple of years in relation to Wintinna coal. I support the attitude taken by the previous Minister at that time in relation to Wintinna coal.

The situation was that statements were being made, which might have perhaps meant more in relation to the Stock Exchange rather than to the technical likelihood as to whether the coal may or may not be used. Since that time when, as I said, the former Minister very properly made known the Government's view and knowledge of the coal, the extent of the reserves, its quality, and so on, there have been some developments. I have had a meeting with Mr O'Callaghan who is one of the leaseholders in that area, who has put before me some additional information which looks to be somewhat promising.

The honourable member can be reassured by the fact that I announced only yesterday the setting up of the Stuart Committee for future electricity generation requirements for South Australia. Among the tasks given to that committee is the requirement to evaluate a number of coal deposits in South Australia and for it to advise me and the Government on their details and whether or not they ought to be considered as options for use for generation of electricity. I would assume that I have been helpful in this case in giving the honourable member a better understanding of the situation.

Before concluding, it would be fair to say also that the advice I have received to date from ETSA through the General Manager and the Chairman of the board is that quite a deal of additional information on the quality of the coal would be required before any definitive statements might be made on the future of the deposit and its possible uses.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Deputy Premier say whether or not Mrs Lynn Chatterton made an approach to him for Government employment? The *News* of 27 April reported the Deputy Premier as saying that Mrs Chatterton had approached him for a Government funded position. In the *Advertiser* yesterday, in a letter to the editor from Mrs Chatterton, it was stated:

Jack Wright's allegation about my approach defies belief.

In view of the conflict between these two statements, does the Deputy Premier stand by the statement he made on 27 April?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I find the question quite repugnant.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I do not believe there is much to be served by airing this matter publicly any further: it involves a person who is not a member of this Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I suppose that over the years I have been in office—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: But you are—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member for Davenport intend to defy me? I call him to order.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Over the years I suppose that we have all been approached by various people who have asked us to assist them with employment. I have not noticed that the member for Glenelg has pursued that line with me, with any other Minister, or with any other politician. People come to our offices daily looking for work. The honourable member and I know that, but he wants to make something of the fact that the wife of a Minister, who, I think, has already been vilified enough over the years, is involved. The honourable member wants to pursue that even further. I am prepared to give an answer, but I do not respect the honourable member for asking that question. It is pretty low politics, and I am surprised that the member for Glenelg would use such tactics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: This is a long way below what we are used to from the member for Glenelg, not that we are used to very much from him. This is right down in the gutter. I will not tell the House a lie, as the honourable member knows full well, because I do not tell lies in this House, unlike members opposite.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable Deputy Premier is out of order, and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I unreservedly withdraw the word 'lie' and replace it with 'untruth', if that is satisfactory to the member who made the point of order.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I take a further point of order, Mr Speaker. I submit that the withdrawal should be unconditional.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that, but I took it that it was unconditional.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think I heard the word 'unreservedly'.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did unreservedly withdraw the word 'lie' and replace it with 'untruth', which is quite Parliamentary.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I take a further point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe, and I think that everyone

else in this House believes, that that is not unconditional. It is a qualification.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I plainly recall, and I want to think back calmly, because everyone was jumping up and down, on the first occasion I thought to myself that it was a strange situation in Parliamentary procedure where one can unreservedly withdraw one word and then, because of some rule that goes back to Simon de Montfort, replace it with another word that would be just as offensive but is quite Parliamentary. I do not uphold the particular point of order on this occasion.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I rise on a point of order. The Deputy Premier, in using the word 'lie', used an unparliamentary term. However, he also cast aspersions on the integrity of every member of the Opposition. That was the basis of the complaints. Whilst he has withdrawn the unparliamentary term, he has not withdrawn and apologised for the aspersions he cast on every member of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether or not the member for Coles was listening to me. I am upholding everyone's Standing Orders, not the Government's Standing Orders—the Standing Orders of the House. As strange as it may be, I heard the Deputy Premier (and I did hear him) unreservedly withdraw the word 'lie'. He then substituted a word which I know would not be pleasant to honourable members on the other side, but there is nothing I can do under Standing Orders—your Standing Orders.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Standing Orders say that, if a member objects because his or her character has been impugned by another member (as the Deputy Premier just did in saying that the Opposition was accustomed to telling untruths), that member is entitled to object, and I do so.

The SPEAKER: So far as I am concerned, this is the last step in this little saga. If we are going to go any further, somebody had better dissent from my ruling. The Deputy Premier has cleared his position. The member for Coles is correct. A precedent was set by my predecessor: a member can replace a word with another which is not unparliamentary (and it was not unparliamentary—and I give members the chance to dissent). I ask the Deputy Premier whether he is prepared to withdraw the word 'untruth' in relation to all members of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is quite difficult for me to do that, because I proved quite convincingly and clearly in this House yesterday that the member for Davenport had told untruths the day before.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Premier to either—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In order to facilitate the affairs of the House and to make Opposition members happy and content, I will withdraw the word in relation to the people whom it does not affect.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. The Standing Orders are quite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Standing Orders are perfectly clear on this point. Standing Order 169 provides:

... if any member, having used objectionable words, refuse either to explain the same to the satisfaction of the Speaker, or to withdraw them and apologise for their use; the Speaker shall name such member and report his offence to the House.

It is quite clear that the Deputy Premier has no option but to withdraw and apologise for the use of those words.

The SPEAKER: I thought I had made it plain, although it appears I have not made it completely plain. I rule that I am satisfied. The honourable Deputy Premier.

Mr Mathwin: Answer the question, Jack.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I did not forget anything, John. It was clear in my mind that I had not given an answer. If I had not been called again I would not have bothered, after all the kerfuffle, John.

The SPEAKER: Even if the Deputy Premier has an affection for the honourable member, he must still call the honourable member by the name of his district.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: One cannot help but like the member for Glenelg, even though he gets down to the pits sometimes. If he is insisting on an answer, the person in question did discuss the possibility of employment with me in November last year.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Is that all you have to say?

The SPEAKER: Order! That is enough.

Mr WEBB

Mr WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy elaborate on the fairly sparse coverage given in Wednesday's *Advertiser* to the resignation of the Director-General of the Department of Mines and Energy?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I can elaborate, and I am thankful to the member for giving me the opportunity to do so. I expect that the former Minister in the previous Government would also appreciate that I can take this opportunity to put something on record relating to the decade or so of service that Mr Webb has given to the State of South Australia and its citizens.

Members will recall that on Tuesday I made the announcement that Mr Webb intended to retire on 24 June. He has led the department since 1972 and has played a significant role in the resurgence of mining and mineral exploration in South Australia in the past decade. The South Australian Department of Mines and Energy is now regarded by the mining industry as the most professional and efficient organisation of its kind in Australia. In the time that I have mentioned, Mr Webb has been closely associated with the various developments in the Cooper Basin, and is presently Vice Chairman of the Pipelines Authority of South Australia and the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation, and has been a member of a number of Government bodies, including the Water Resources Council, the South Australian Energy Council and the State Development Council.

Prior to joining the department in 1972, Mr Webb was Vice President and Exploration Manager of Newmont Pty Limited, based in Melbourne. Earlier in his career, he had worked as a geologist in the geological survey branch of the South Australian Department of Mines from 1950 to 1962, including three years as mine geologist at the former Radium Hill mine.

The Government is reluctant to lose Mr Webb's services, but it is appreciated that he has been considering a change of scene for more than a year, and this was well known to the previous Minister. Mr Webb has agreed to remain available to the Government as a consultant on natural gas supplies. Because of his deep involvement in important negotiations in this area, his availability will ensure continuity in that important activity. In addition, Mr Webb will remain a member of the Amdel Council, where he is presently Chairman of the board of management. I am pleased to say that his experience and ability will therefore not be lost to the service of South Australia.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN POLICE FORCE REVIEW

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I ask the Premier, as he is responsible for Government policy: when will the Government begin the first of its regular public reviews of the

South Australian Police Force, and will the force be represented on any body that is established to conduct these reviews? At the 1981 State conference of the Labor Party, it was decided that a future Labor Government would conduct regular public reviews of the control and management of the Police Force. This move was initiated by the member for Elizabeth. The intention of these reviews, according to the motion moved by the member for Elizabeth, is to look into the management, control and effectiveness of the Police Force with a view to ensuring that it is as effective as possible, that officers can do their work with pride and confidence and that public confidence in the force is maintained.

In calling for these reviews, the member for Elizabeth told the convention that he did not believe that the public was necessarily getting value for money. It is my understanding that there is concern within the Police Force—which I share—about the Government's intention in relation to these reviews and, therefore, I ask the Premier when they will start and whether he will give an assurance that the Police Department will be represented on any such body, considering the concern expressed, and again quite rightly, by the Acting Commissioner, Mr Hunt, and a concern that I share in relation to the Chief Secretary's earlier decision not to have a member of the department represented on the complaints committee.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer the question to my colleague, the Chief Secretary, but I would like to pick up the reference to this complaints tribunal, which has received some publicity. I would have thought that the Chief Secretary had made his position quite clear. There was no decision in absolute terms to exclude anybody or any interest.

In fact, the Chief Secretary has had discussions with the Acting Commissioner, and I am quite sure that the matter is being very satisfactorily resolved. In fact, contrary to what the honourable member might believe, I understand that the Chief Secretary's image when dealing with the Police Force is very high indeed. They have considerable confidence in him, and I can understand why, because I believe that the Chief Secretary is doing a very effective job in liaison with the force.

As to the question that the honourable member asked, it is a matter for the Chief Secretary to make an appropriate recommendation, and I shall refer the question to him.

AQUATIC CENTRE

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Deputy Premier tell the House on what date the Government acquired the land for the proposed aquatic centre in Adelaide and what financial arrangements were made for the purchase?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for his question. This is a very serious matter, in my view. The whole sorry story began, I understand, on 25 October 1982, when Cabinet gave approval for this project to the then Minister of Public Works during the election period and after the election had been called. Cabinet met and gave authority to the then Minister of Public Works to purchase the South Australian Brewery site at a cost of \$795 400 to be paid by 30 June 1985, 2½ years hence. In effect, what really happened was that, after the former Premier had called an election, Cabinet then gave approval for the purchase of this site. That, I think, was quite wrong, and that view was supported by the Constitutional Convention last week wherein delegates decided that Governments should not make major financial commitments during election periods. One can only hazard a guess as to why this approval was given on that date. Obviously the Government

knew that it was in trouble and wanted some further announcements.

As I said, the total amount had to be paid by 1985, but there had to be some coverage of the amount of money over that period. A further agreement was reached that the interest on the money would be paid on a quarterly basis at 13.59 per cent, which works out to \$27 024 per quarter.

That amount was never budgeted for by the former Government and the burden was placed on the poor old public works (the milking cow) to pay this amount. I am now stuck with this bill, and have to write out a cheque every quarter for that amount. The total interest for the whole site for this great deal that the former Government did was \$270 240 and the former Government never had the money to pay for it, which is clearly bad management.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The former Government did not have the money to pay for it, so it post-dated the payment date, which cost a lot in interest, and it did not have the money to develop the aquatic centre, either. I leave it to members of the House to establish in their own minds why a Government, which had already determined an election would be held, would determine two weeks into the election campaign before an election to purchase that property without the money or without the money to build an aquatic centre.

The real crunch came, in my view, with the signing of the transfer, that is, the effective ownership of the property. That took place on 5 November, the day before the election. The Opposition has made allegations about our mismanagement of the resources of the State when we were in Government previously. I do not know of anything that would compare with this mismanagement. It is a whole series of bumbles and a whole series of costs to the incoming Government. The point about it is that we would probably have never known about it if we had not won the election.

I place on record here and now that this Government will not take actions of that nature once an election period is entered. I believe that the honourable thing to do in those circumstances is not to sign any agreements and not to commit the possible incoming new Government, irrespective of how confident one is of winning. As I have said, this was substantiated only last week by the Constitutional Convention here in Adelaide.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Why did the Premier support officers of the Department of Agriculture rather than the Hon. Brian Chatterton following the former Minister of Agriculture's request for more funds and facilities for overseas farm projects? In the *Stock Journal* published yesterday, the former Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Brian Chatterton), has revealed details of a letter which he says eventually led to his resignation. The letter of 17 February 1983 was signed by the Director-General of Agriculture, Mr J.C. McColl, in his capacity as Chairman and Managing Director of SAGRIC International. It referred to the provision of more facilities and funds for projects in Algeria and Iraq. Mr Chatterton quoted a section of the letter, as follows:

The board discussed the matter at some length but on the basis of the information available resolved that it was not prepared to allocate company funds to enable the implementation of these initiatives at this time.

Mr Chatterton's letter to the *Stock Journal* then goes on:

I subsequently established that the information supplied to the board by Messrs McColl, Harvey and Hogarth was not correct. It was this letter that eventually led to my resignation when I did

not receive the support of the Premier to reverse this stand and obtain suitable resources to respond to overseas initiatives.

The view that the Premier supported departmental officers rather than his former Minister has also been expressed by Mrs Chatterton. In a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, published yesterday, Mrs Chatterton wrote:

When the Chairman of SAGRIC refused in writing to carry out Labor Government policy, the Premier chose to support him rather than his elected Minister.

Therefore, I ask the Premier whether he can give the House the reasons for this situation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not wish really to involve myself in detailed comment on this issue; I do not think that it is necessary. In response to the precise question, the Minister of Agriculture has apparently published or made available a letter of 17 February, which was quoted by the member for Mount Gambier. I draw his attention to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser*, I think last Saturday morning, in which two further communications were referred to. One related to the commissioning of a review into the operations of SAGRIC and the overseas projects which was signed jointly by myself, the Minister of Agriculture and the Deputy Premier, as the shareholders of SAGRIC, and a response to that from Mr McColl which promised full co-operation with that review. If one examines that article and those letters and then looks again at what the former Minister has said and what was said in the letter to the *Advertiser* Editor, one can then make a judgment as to what sort of support and what sort of action took place.

HOLIDAY PROGRAMME

Mr GROOM: With the approach of the May school holidays, can the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House as to what programmes have been planned for schoolchildren by the Department of Recreation and Sport?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am pleased to tell the honourable member and the House that the department has planned a programme for schoolchildren during the forthcoming May school holidays. It will be a 'Life. Be in it' programme adopted by the recreation section of the Physical Education Branch and will start on 17 May. The programme will be known as 'Fit for sport, fit for Life. Be in it programme' and has been specially developed for children aged between 10 and 14 years. The programme encompasses a variety of sports, including athletics, soccer, volley ball, hockey, net ball, basketball and, of course, the good old game of Australian Rules football.

It begins with an introductory session dealing with fitness, sport and nutrition. Instruction on each of the chosen sports will be conducted by leading sporting personalities and junior coaches who will use material developed from the daily physical education programme. I think that this is a unique opportunity for children aged between 10 and 14 years who are interested in sport and fitness to meet and be instructed in such a variety of sports by leading sporting personalities in South Australia, to receive expert instruction in general fitness techniques, and to understand the issues involved in such things as correct warm-up activities, flexibility, acrobatics, and so on.

They will also be able to learn sound nutritional habits required by today's and tomorrow's successful sportspeople. In addition, a free skills booklet, articles and relevant material from 'Life. Be in it', and physical education will be a feature of the programme. I also point out that the 'Life. Be in it' munch and crunch lunches, which I think the member for Hanson should attend—

Mr Becker: I could be in it.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There is no suggestion that he will not.

The **Hon. J.W. SLATER**: This may not make him too happy (I do not know whether he is between the ages of 10 and 14 years), but the all-inclusive cost will be \$6. The programme will run from Tuesday 17 to Friday 20 May between the hours of 10 a.m. and 3.15 p.m. daily; special arrangements may be possible for an 8.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. session if required. I think it is an excellent programme, and I certainly advocate that children between the ages of 10 and 14 years take advantage of it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TEACHER HOUSING AUTHORITY

The **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. B.C. EASTICK**: During Question Time yesterday, in reply to a question asked by the member for Newland, the Minister of Education referred to a statement that I made during the Appropriation Bill debate the previous evening. Under the heading 'Teacher Housing Authority', Mr Klunder asked:

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?

He went on to explain his question, and in reply the Minister stated:

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.

Later in his reply, the Minister said:

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.

In my contribution to the Appropriation Bill debate on Wednesday evening, I referred to an article appearing in the *News* on Tuesday 3 May, and I specifically mentioned that it appeared on page 20. Reference to page 20 of the City-State edition of the *News* of Tuesday 3 May 1983 elicits the following statement:

The Education Minister, Mr Arnold, has announced a \$434 000 injection of funds for maintenance of Teacher Housing Authority houses in rural and remote areas of the State.

The article then quotes the Minister as follows:

'The funding, additional to money previously allocated under the authority's 1982-83 Budget, marks the start of the progressive elimination of the maintenance backlog,' he said.

I did not, as the Minister implied in his statement yesterday, conjure up a method of appropriation. I quoted the Minister's own statement as to the source of the appropriation and correctly referred to the appropriation as being evidence of a Government blow-out.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: AQUATIC CENTRE

The **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON**: I understand that the Deputy Premier, in answer to a question just now, cast reflections on the former Government in connection with the signing of the land purchase deal involving the aquatic centre, the agreement between the South Australian Gov-

ernment and the South Australian Brewing Company. I need to put this matter in context. Unfortunately, I was out of the Chamber dealing with an urgent telephone call when the Deputy Premier answered the question, but I will study *Hansard* very closely. However, this land purchase was a very complicated matter indeed, and it had been in the process of negotiation for at least 12 months.

The **Hon. J.D. WRIGHT**: I take a point of order. I have no objection, nor would I deny to any member the right to make a personal explanation. I made no reflection on the honourable member, and I mentioned no members personally. However, I think that the honourable member is treating this matter as a point of order rather than as a personal explanation.

The **SPEAKER**: As I understand it, the Deputy Premier made a series of statements of opinion as to the activities of the Government and since, as I recall, the honourable member for Torrens was the former Minister of Recreation and Sport and also directly involved in the aquatic centre, I believe that he is in order. The honourable member for Torrens.

The **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON**: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I was indeed the Minister responsible. As I have said, it was a complicated business and I inform the Deputy Premier that not only were there negotiations for the purchase of land from the brewery for the site of the aquatic centre but that part of that land was to be ear-marked for the north-east busway terminus. At the same time, the South Australian Brewing Company was negotiating with the Highways Department (which was also my responsibility) to purchase from the department excess land in the north-south freeway corridor.

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: I take a point of order. The honourable member, by way of a personal explanation, is referring to matters that were not the subject of the statement made by the Deputy Premier. The thrust of that explanation was the actions of the Government, in right of the Crown, in the transfer of property which involved an action collectively of the Cabinet and circumstances surrounding that governmental decision, not the actions of any individual Minister or, indeed, any matters precedent to that decision being taken.

The **SPEAKER**: I take the point made by the honourable Minister. As I understand it, the honourable member for Torrens is attempting to explain the very point which the Minister correctly states was the thrust of the adverse comment made by the Deputy Premier. I rule that the member for Torrens is perfectly in order, provided I am correct in assuming that this is his build-up to defending himself. The honourable member for Torrens.

The **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON**: You are quite right, Mr Speaker, and, if I could continue on from what you said, I am trying to establish that the negotiations, which were complex, had been continuing for at least 12 months, if not longer, prior to the signing of the transfer agreement and that the point I wish to make is that the transfer agreement—

The Hon. J.D. Wright interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON**:—was signed on the date that it was in fact signed, in the normal course of events and did not have anything to do with the calling of a State election.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TWO WELLS WATER SUPPLY

Mr **MEIER (Goyder)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MEIER: Yesterday in the second reading debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) I said that the Virginia Plains situation had reached critical proportions because of the lack of an adequate water supply, and I added that some people living in ordinary houses on house blocks at Virginia had no water supply. That should have been Two Wells, not Virginia. I thought that the house blocks to which I referred were in the Virginia area, but they are a little farther north and in the Two Wells area.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The purpose of this small amending Bill is to raise the percentage allocation from the Highways Fund under section 32 (1) (m) (i) of the Highways Act, 1926-1982, in respect of road safety services provided by the Police Department. At present, a contribution equal to 9.8 per cent of the fees received by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles by way of motor vehicle registration fees is applied for this purpose. When this provision was first enacted in 1971, the contribution was fixed so as to recover about 75 per cent of the costs estimated to be incurred by the Police Department. If the contribution rate is left unchanged at 9.8 per cent, only 41 per cent of the costs in 1982-83 will be recovered from the Highways Fund.

It is desirable to work towards the intention of the original legislation over the next year or two, and to that end the percentage levy is increased by this Bill to 12 per cent. The effect of the increase is to recover 50 per cent of the estimated police costs. The period in relation to which the increase is to operate is the 1982-83 year. Consequently it will be necessary for the measure to have retrospective effect from 1 July 1982. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall be deemed to have come into operation on 1 July 1982. Clause 3 amends subparagraph (i) of paragraph (m) of subsection (1) of section 32 by substituting the percentage figure of 12 for the existing percentage figure of 9.8.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debated on motion:

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

(Continued from 5 May. Page 1270.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): This is the first time I can remember that we have had officially to sit on a Friday, certainly starting at 10.30 a.m., as part of the weekly sitting

of Parliament. What concerns me is the Government's attitude and the manner in which it has carried on the business of the House this week, and the threat that we appear to be under, at this stage, that we will probably be sitting this evening and possibly tomorrow morning. One cynical suggestion was that perhaps we had better forget Sunday if we want to keep debating this issue.

I am concerned about the manner and the attitude expressed in Parliamentary proceedings last night. We have a loyal, dedicated, hard working staff, which is extremely keen and which does everything it can do to assist members of Parliament and to provide back-up support. The situation last night at 6.45 p.m. was such that many of the staff had just about had it. I feel sorry for the Clerks, *Hansard* reporters, editors, typists, general staff, messengers and the rest of the staff employed at Parliament House to provide very necessary back-up facilities. I am not concerned for myself as the hours do not worry me, but there are many other people dependent on what is happening in this Chamber and what happens within the precincts of Parliament House. To make the staff work the hours we have been making them work is, in my opinion, intolerable.

Mr Oswald: What about their families?

Mr BECKER: The member for Morphett is quite right, what about their families, because they will have to cancel arrangements at the last moment. I do not believe any responsible shop steward or union organiser, and certainly I would not when I was in a white collar union, would tolerate this type of working conditions and hours. I think the Government is fortunate that it has a tolerant, loyal, keen and dedicated staff in Parliament House. We have asked them to contribute and to work beyond what I think is fair and reasonable.

The Government may well say to members of the Opposition, 'But you have taken your full time in speaking on the Appropriation Bill; you are insisting that you have your say.' That is my democratic right on behalf of my electorate and I will do it. It is a most important part of Parliamentary debating procedure and a part of the Parliamentary business. It is the first opportunity under the new Government (and it is fair and reasonable to assume that the Opposition would want to know the answers—and also Government members) to debate State finances and question the reasons for what is happening. Throughout the whole of this week there have been many calls for a quorum to be formed in this House. It should not be necessary for members to have to remind you, Mr Deputy Speaker, or the Speaker, that a quorum is not present in the Chamber. Only 17 of the 47 members need to be present at any time to form a quorum. On many occasions there are only three or four members in the House, which is an insult to the people the members represent and to the institution of Parliament.

It indicates that members of Parliament are becoming awfully complacent. They are not interested in the debates, and if they are not interested in the current debate on the Bill before the House, then it means that they could not care less about the State's finances or about the possibility of the Government's having to impose very high taxes. I fear that the Government will see this as an opportunity of increasing taxes in the vicinity of 12 per cent across the board. I think I mentioned previously the areas that could be subject to tax increases, namely, property taxes, gambling taxes, motor vehicle taxes, pay-roll tax, statutes and business franchise fees for regulatory services, statutory corporation taxes, water and sewerage rates, and marine and harbor charges. If the State Government brought in a 12 per cent tax increase in every area it could wipe out the \$17 000 000 deficit that exists at present. If a political Party goes to an election and states that it will not increase taxes, it is being foolhardy. However, if it does so it is bound by it. We are

often reminded (and certainly have been in the past) that the Government of the day has a mandate to do whatever it wants to do in introducing various legislation.

The present Government has a mandate to the people of South Australia to not increase taxes. I remind the Government that the Opposition would be quite within its right to oppose every piece of legislation that meant that taxes would be increased in South Australia. I am going to do that. It is not being irresponsible: it is simply a fact of life that the current Government campaigned that it would not increase taxes. It does not have a mandate from the people to increase taxes in any shape or form. We can bet our bottom dollar (a lot of people in South Australia, unfortunately, are down to their last dollar, but nothing has been done to help them) that water and sewerage rates will be the first services to incur an increased charge.

Again we will have that ridiculous situation where the price of water will be increased by at least 12 per cent, and I would think that it will probably be more like 15 per cent, and our water allocation will be reduced. This will mean that more and more people—and remember that we are considering tens of thousands of property owners—will be put on to excess water rates. The Government does very nicely out of excess water rates, and in actual fact that is where it makes its money.

As has been mentioned earlier, this calendar year water meters in the West Torrens area were read up to three weeks early. Some of my constituents still claim that some of the meters were read a month early. Those residents who were on excess water and who have been on excess water for some period because of low property valuations have, of course, benefited from that early reading. The early reading meant that those residents had only 11 months water usage, and this included the hottest time of summer. Therefore, the impact of the excess water bills on those people was reduced.

However, the people who were conscientious and monitored their water consumption, those who tried to do the right thing by conserving water in South Australia (and many of my constituents together with others in the metropolitan area are now changing to native gardens and natural gardens to cut down on excess water usage) were virtually slapped in the face, because the Government took away from them the incentive to save water. They lost up to a month's water consumption, and in the case of several of my constituents this represented an amount of up to \$30, \$40 or \$50. That is what it cost them for one month for the hottest month of the year. They feel absolutely insulted and let down to think that the Engineering and Water Supply Department treated them in that fashion.

I agree with their feelings wholeheartedly, because I think it was the greatest insult of all. It is an arrangement (and the Act stipulates the period of a water year) that everyone takes to mean 12 months: anyone would be prepared to give or take a few days, but certainly not to the extent of giving or taking three or four weeks, as is the case in that instance, and ratepayers should not be penalised by as much as \$50.

The Minister said that it is a one-off situation. It does not matter. It was the final insult in the argument of the continuing dispute in this State in regard to assessment of a fair and reasonable charge for water and a fair and reasonable supply of water to property owners. The situation is far from resolved. The Government must come to a far more equitable solution.

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

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I wish to air a number of subjects in this brief grievance debate. The first

relates to bushfires. The failure of the Bannon Government to establish and fund a research programme on reducing the loss in future bushfires is a matter of great grievance. Parliament has been asked this week to allocate \$37 000 000 to compensate the victims of Ash Wednesday. I am in no way begrudging that money, because people suffered greatly: they suffered enormous property losses and enormous losses in human costs, as well as a great deal of inconvenience.

However, I am greatly concerned that, having allocated \$37 000 000 for the compensation of bushfire victims, the Government has not taken the initiative to set up and fund a research programme at a cost, I believe, of \$100 000 at the most. The cost will certainly be nowhere near \$100 000 for the current financial year. That research programme is urgent, and it will involve investigating and reporting on a number of matters, in particular how houses can be made more fire resistant. There is confusion over whether certain types of tree around a house may protect it from a bushfire. In particular, it has been suggested that British trees can help to protect a house, but that is only speculation. We need the facts, and we need a research programme to ascertain those facts.

Research is required to inform people whether they should remain in a car when a bushfire sweeps past. Following the bushfires, there was certain speculation that perhaps the former advice that one should stay in a car was no longer sound, partly because more plastic is used in cars and partly because the glass area of cars is far greater. We must ascertain whether or not that is the case, and only a research programme can do that. In addition, simple advice must be given on what type of shelter should be established on farms to protect the families that are often held to a farm during a bushfire and are in isolation: they cannot take refuge on large ovals or from other community facilities, as people in towns can do. Yet, for the sake of \$100 000 and some initiative by the State Government, this advice apparently will not be available.

Valuable information is available from the Ash Wednesday fires that could form the whole basis of such a research programme. However, as burnt houses are replaced, as trees regrow and new trees are planted, and as people's memories of events on that frightful day fade, that information will be lost. I stress again the importance of taking action quickly so that a research programme can be implemented and so that the people who witnessed the nature of the fire can be interviewed before that valuable information is lost. I called for a research programme in this House when I gave my Address in Reply contribution in March. I gave details of what I thought the functions of that research programme should be. However, I am horrified that since then two months has passed and no action whatsoever has been taken by the Government. This week the reality has come home, because we have now been asked to allocate \$37 000 000 to compensate the victims. I stress again that I am in no way begrudging that money.

The second matter I wish to raise is one referred to by the Deputy Premier yesterday by way of Ministerial statement in which he claimed that I had misled the Parliament. It related to the Technology Park multi-tenancy building. His claim was that in fact the Public Buildings Department had not engaged additional people to help with the contract work and that it was being done by surplus labour within the Public Buildings Department. That is not true, and I stand by my original statement. I think the Deputy Premier is trying to split hairs. Perhaps it was not a formal contract of employment as such, but people were engaged by the Public Buildings Department to assist in the architectural work of that project. The Deputy Premier shakes his head across the Chamber.

I ask the Deputy Premier to check whether or not some people had been engaged although it may not have been a formal contract of employment. However, they were engaged and paid a fee for being so engaged. I stand by my statement. I do not believe that I misled the House. I believe the Deputy Premier has misled the Parliament by deliberately trying to fudge the issue. The facts are quite clear: a formal contractual relationship was established between Hassell and Partners and the South Australian Housing Trust. It was established by letter in February of this year. I have given the details to the House. I again call on the Government to release the details of those letters to the House.

That has been asked for in Question Time. I have asked the Premier to release the letters, and he has refused to do so, because he knows that the point I have made is valid and would prove once and for all that he has misled the public of South Australia. I reiterate that, and challenge the Premier to release the contractual letters between the South Australian Housing Trust and Hassell and Partners. I also challenge the Deputy Premier to release all details of all people and all fees paid for the design, documentation and any contract supervision for that building and all contact between the Public Buildings Department and outside persons in relation to that contract.

The third matter I wish to raise is one which has just been aired on 5DN this morning and relates to the future of Kelvinator. Mr Tumbers, of the A.M.W.S.U., has made certain statements and has speculated on the future of jobs at Kelvinator; I understand that he has implied that hundreds of people may be about to lose their jobs. As Minister of Industrial Affairs, I was heavily involved with Kelvinator in looking at the future of the company and some of its products. The obvious lack of interest and effort from the new State Government, in particular by the Minister responsible (the Premier, Mr Bannon) in making sure that the future of Kelvinator is secure in this State and that people's jobs are also secure, has concerned me. I do not wish to add to speculation by Mr Tumbers or comment on it further. That is for Kelvinator to do. However, it is up to this Parliament to make sure that the Premier, as the Minister responsible, gives adequate attention and effort to ensuring that jobs are retained if not expanded in this State.

I am greatly concerned about the almost complete lack of effort exhibited in the past six months by the Premier, who is the responsible Minister, towards any attempt to save jobs in a difficult economic climate. One needs to get out, talk to and assist companies. That is apparent not only with Kelvinator but in many other cases. The Premier has sat by and has tried to put the blame on general economic conditions and on the former Liberal Government. I call on the Premier to have immediate talks with Kelvinator, to make a statement with Kelvinator, and to reassure the House and the State, particularly the employees of Kelvinator, on the future of their jobs and of the company, and, if necessary assist Kelvinator to make sure that the future of this wellknown, established and highly regarded South Australian company is secure.

The final matter that I wish to raise concerns the Happy Valley water filtration plant. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has recently called tenders for steel reinforcing rods. Does this mean that the Government has decided to construct this plant using E. & W.S. employees rather than private contractors, as proposed by the former Liberal Government? Does this mean that the Premier refuses to allow even a rundown of surplus Government employment by attrition in the E. & W.S. while people are being retrenched in private industry because of the lack of any new Government contracts being called? This is one project which was planned by the Tonkin Government to involve the private sector very heavily and it is apparent,

because tenders are being called, that that is no longer the case.

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

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): First, before dealing with the specific matter that I have in mind, I would like to object to the shockingly underhanded manner by which the Government, just to aid its tax income, devised tactics which are disgraceful and blatant, by bringing in and giving a first reading to a private member's Bill in Government time, and not being honest enough or lacking the credibility even to admit that the Casino Bill is now a Government Bill. It is about time that the Government informed the public that it will give the time because of the importance of the casino in relation to the income which it expects to derive from it, if it occurs.

I draw the attention of the House to the unfair situation that exists in relation to the Surf Life Saving Association of this State when compared with its counterparts in the other States of Australia. Indeed, this community service could well be compared with services such as the fire service, because it is a community service, a life-saving service and a very important service manned mainly by volunteers.

The association was formed in South Australia in 1907. A State centre was formed and began to operate in 1952. There are 19 affiliated clubs right down the coast, from North Haven to Semaphore, Grange, Henley, West Beach, Glenelg, Somerton, Brighton, Seacliff, Hallett Cove, Christies Beach, Port Noarlunga, Southport, Moana, Aldinga Beach, Chiton Rocks, Port Elliot and Goolwa. The situation is a little fluid in Port MacDonnell and Kingscote. There are two others in the country areas: at Whyalla (which you would be well aware of, Mr Deputy Speaker) and at Port Lincoln.

The total number of rescues to date is 2 571. I do not know whether anyone wishes to put a price on that service, but it is quite considerable. The total of the rescues in the 1981-82 season was 72. They were performed by these volunteers who man the coast to make the beaches safe for all users, whether local users or people on holiday from interstate or overseas, a service which, I might add, we could not do without. If anything happened as far as surf lifesaving is concerned the Government would be obliged, as happens in places in America, to pay surf lifesavers or people to man the beaches to make them safe, and to look after people who get into distress.

The membership in relation to South Australian surf lifesavers in the 1981-82 season for senior, junior, cadet and active reserve was 1 151 (others, 703). The number in the junior association (which is 7-13 year olds) was 1 470.

That is a fair number of juniors taken into a healthy sport and subjected to a little discipline, which is good for anybody. Junior association officials number 187, giving a grand total of 3 511 people actually involved. Volunteer beach patrol manhours over the last season covered a minimum of 44 000 hours. A conservative estimate of club administration time is 42 750 hours, with six professional staff in the State centre and the club. Self-help programmes are also available and are continuing over a very wide field. For all those services, the Surf Life Saving Association receives from the Government a total grant of \$35 000.

Let us compare that with what surf lifesaving associations in other States received from their Governments. Obviously, other State Governments appreciate the job that lifesavers are doing to keep the beaches safe for all people, whether locals or tourists. The Queensland State centre controls 51 clubs and the State Government subsidises each dollar raised. The total grant amounts to more than \$1 000 000 a year. If the Government feels that way and believes that the club

ought to do something for itself and received a subsidy, I am sure that that would be quite acceptable to the Surf Life Saving Association in South Australia. Of the \$1 000 000 grant to the Queensland association, the State centre receives \$370 000. In New South Wales, the State centre controls 123 clubs and receives a total of \$305 000. After distribution to various areas, the State centre is left with \$100 000 for administration purposes.

In Victoria, the State centre controls 26 clubs and receives a total grant from the Victorian Government of \$118 000 for administration. I remind members again that this State gives the Surf Life Saving Association a grant of \$35 000. In Western Australia (a State very similar to South Australia in a number of areas) the State centre controls 16 clubs and receives a total grant of \$57 500 for administration. There is quite a difference in the allowances given by all the other States to their surf lifesaving associations. That would tend to point to the fact that in South Australia we do not appreciate the marvellous and excellent job performed by the surf lifesavers.

You, Mr Deputy Speaker, would be aware of the excellent job done by surf lifesavers, as you have a very good surf lifesaving club within your district of Whyalla. That club has developed extremely well and at the last State carnival it put up a very good show indeed.

The surf lifesavers, with their jet rescue craft (which have been donated not by the Government but by private enterprise and different organisations) have adopted a 24-hour call-out system, so that the lifesavers can assist in any rescues, other than rescues from the beach. They are on call to assist the police and the State at any time of emergency. The lifesavers are always willing and happy to provide that service for the benefit of people in dire need.

I call on the Government, and particularly the Minister of Recreation and Sport, when it is considering the situation in regard to the next Budget to look seriously at the situation that now exists and the meagre amount of money—I am not blaming the present Labor Government but the former Government—that is provided for this excellent service that is rendered to citizens and to the community in general, which is far below by many tens of thousands of dollars that of any other State.

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

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to raise at this time an issue which is still going on in country areas and which is of great concern to the community; that is, the dispute over the wide comb issue. I do not wish to inflame the issue here, but I wish to point out to the House some of the consequences that are occurring as a result of this internal dispute. It is an internal dispute in that it is a dispute over the tools of trade within an industry, and that is where the matter should rest. Unfortunately, it is wider than that and serious consequences to the community are now occurring. I draw the attention of the House to an article that appeared in the *News* on 27 April by Mr Craig Bildstein when he went into some detail about the consequences of the dispute as he saw it. The article is headed 'Now it is a wider issue than just a new comb', and in big bold letters 'Our golden fleece is dying' whilst the side notation states 'Shearers on the boards: will they kill the goose that lays their golden egg?' This is a matter of far greater consequence than just that.

It was back in September that farmers were destroying sheep because of drought conditions. They would sooner

shoot the animals than see them die and be fed to the crows. I refer to the article, as follows:

Farmers throughout the State chose to shoot 60 000 sheep rather than see them starve to death. It was a grim slaughter, but a humane one. Because of the drought, there was nothing left for them to eat. Farmers took the agonising decision to ensure the survival of their younger, stronger, breeding stock. But with the drought far from over, the unimaginable happened—the Black Wednesday holocaust. More than 300 000 sheep died or had to be destroyed after the bushfires raged through the South-East.

Just weeks later, as most farmers rejoiced heavy March rains, 10 000 more drought and fire weakened sheep died in a cold snap. If that was not enough, police say there has been a sudden rise in stock thefts; 1 400 sheep disappearing from one flock alone.

This seems to be the case when the price for mutton increases. The report continues:

The sheep flock has dropped to 15 000 000 head, and the United Farmers and Stockowners says it cannot go lower. And yet South Australian shearers, by voting yesterday to maintain their bitter month-old strike—

the report is dated 27 April—

have sentenced thousands more to death. The Agriculture Department says the welfare of tens of thousands of pregnant ewes has been placed in jeopardy.

The following section describes in some detail the humane aspects in relation to the welfare of sheep. I think it is desirable that I quote this extract because it raises the question of the position of the R.S.P.C.A. Throughout the State thousands of sheep are heavy with wool and many of them are fly struck. A number of sheep owners have contacted me because they have not been able to obtain shearers to crutch their sheep because the shearers have been abiding by the shearers' strike. It is the humane aspect that is causing concern. The Department of Agriculture is quoted in the article, as follows:

The ewes should have been shorn weeks ago. Unshorn ewes approaching lambing could die for any number of reasons. According to a senior department research officer in Adelaide, Mr P. James, the biggest threat is fly strike.

More than 300 000 sheep died from blowfly strike in South Australia last year, costing farmers about \$13 000 000. The effects are shocking. We make no apology for printing the following—

I make no apology for reading this into *Hansard*:

Delayed shearing greatly increases risk of fly strike—encouraged by excreta clinging to unshorn rumps. Mr James explained: 'The flies are attracted by the odour of urine or excreta stains on the breach. As maggots scratch away at the skin, it reddens and weeps—like nappy-rash. It is very painful. Some sheep will die quickly, others may exist for weeks with up to 50 per cent of their bodies infected. Fly strike spreads easily when a sheep is unshorn. A strike on a bare, shorn sheep usually doesn't last very long.'

Sheep burnt in the fires were at special risk because of weeping burns and broken blisters. If the sheep don't die from fly strike, they could become 'cast'. This means a sheep falls under the weight of the fleece and the unborn lamb and cannot get up again. If they are down long enough, picking them up is no help. They lose their sense of balance, will fall again and die.

Even if they are shorn at this late stage, many will die from pregnancy toxæmia. This is a fatal alteration of the metabolism brought on by the considerable physical stresses of shearing and the imminent trauma of lambing.

Finally, even if the ewes survive the lambing unshorn, many of their offspring will die. Unshorn ewes, particularly Merinos, carry a heavy fleece which covers the udder. As a result, weak, new-born lambs often cannot find the teats. Instead, driven by suckling instinct, they suck continually on strands of wool hanging from the ewe's belly. They do not survive long. When the Australian Workers' Union last week recommended shearers return to work, there was a glimmer of hope sheep would not have to suffer or die. But graziers say with yesterday's decision to continue the strike looms the prospect of 250 000 sheep dying in Eastern Australia unless they are shorn.

The article then goes on in some detail to explain the method of shearing and the mechanisms involved, as follows:

On 10 December last year, after hearing arguments from both sides, Commissioner McKenzie gave shearers the choice of using either comb. The A.W.U. appealed, and the matter was heard by the Commission's Full Bench, which on 23 March also cleared the way for the wide comb. Woolgrowers and shearing contractors

claim they are not particularly concerned which comb shearers use, so long as they do the job properly.

But the A.W.U.—which represents 20 000 shearers across the nation—wants its use banned, and has twice taken the issue to arbitration. This will be a third. As a result of the judgment, the union pulled its members out of the shed, and shearers have been on strike since.

I could quote more from that article, because I believe it shows a balanced approach to a very sensitive issue. I make an earnest plea to all people involved—shearers, Government and all workers—to recognise the seriousness of this situation and the manner in which this country could be brought to its knees.

It has often been said that Australia rides on the sheep's back. That cliché is rapidly coming into question because persons who have an opportunity to diversify out of the wool industry obviously would look seriously at such diversification. Regrettably, such diversification is not possible in the majority of areas so, in practical terms, we are still riding on the sheep's back. We only hope that that situation can continue.

I think it is fair to repeat the point that farmers are not concerned how their sheep are shorn. Quite frankly, I have yet to find a farmer who is at all concerned about how his sheep are shorn—whether by narrow combs or wide combs. It does not matter one iota to the farmer, because he pays exactly the same amount of money on a per head basis or per 100 sheep shorn. It does not matter to the farmer: he would use a three-foot comb and do the job if he could remove the fleece without injuring the sheep. Of course, it is not possible to use a comb of that size. It makes no difference to the farmer what size comb is used. From the owner's point of view there is no problem at all.

Many people in the community do not really understand the shearers' viewpoint. I do not believe that the shearers or the proponents of the banning of the wide comb have sold their story to the public. It has become a nonsensical issue which the public does not understand. People therefore 'turn off' when the issue is raised in the media. When one considers that the nation's interest in the wool industry may be jeopardised, and when one bears in mind the nationwide drought, the floods, the bushfires, retrenchments at the abattoirs, and stock dying in the paddocks because of an internal dispute, one wonders where we are going in this State. I earnestly ask that all those involved consider these vital questions very carefully.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I wish to raise the question of the guidelines for eligibility for Electricity Trust concessions for pensioners. The following four guidelines are set out in the standard letter that is forwarded in connection with eligibility:

- They must hold a current Pensioner Health Benefits Card;
- Live in the home in which the electricity has been used;
- Be the person responsible for paying the electricity bill;
- Do not share their home with another person who receives an income, pension or benefit (excluding a married pensioner couple living together).

I would like the Minister of Community Welfare to review the fourth guideline. Because the Morphett District has a relatively high proportion of elderly people, we find many instances of sisters and widows living together in their old age. The benefit to which I have referred is passed on to a married couple, and I believe that the Government should extend the benefit to include aged sisters and widows living together. It should not be extended and given to both of them: I mean that they should be treated as a unit, and the benefit should be passed to a couple (comprising two sisters or two widows) as it would be to a married couple. If the Government could take that on board and see whether it could be implemented, I am sure that the Government

would receive the gratitude of the people to whom I have referred.

I ask the Treasurer to take up the question of loans from the Savings Bank for a first-home buyer. At present, to get a loan a first-home buyer has to deposit \$2 500 with the bank for 12 months, and this gives eligibility. A points system operates: \$1 000 deposited for one month merits 1 000 points; \$1 000 deposited for two months, 2 000 points; \$2 500 for 12 months, 30 000 points. It gradually builds up to the extent that one can qualify for one's loan.

It is possible, by placing larger sums of money into the bank using this points system, to build up what is called 100 000 priority points, which is equivalent to \$25 000 invested for four months, and that lets one qualify. I am building up to the point that an anomaly exists and I think that it is unfair and is penalising South Australians. That anomaly is this: that a South Australian must have a four-month qualifying period before he can apply for or expect to get a loan.

However, on the other hand, a member of the public from interstate who has never deposited a cent in the Savings Bank of South Australia can come to South Australia and, by the very nature of moving across the border, is immediately eligible for a loan. I think that this is unfair on South Australians. I would like to quote an example of a young couple of whom I have knowledge. They went through the Family Court and, unfortunately, their marriage was dissolved. At the property settlement, the lass concerned received \$45 000. She and her former husband had been regularly paying off their first mortgage with the Savings Bank. They had never missed a payment in their lives. She received a lump sum. However, that lass now wants to buy a new home. There is a home that she would like to purchase, but she cannot do so because that money must be deposited with the Savings Bank for this qualifying period before she can get the balance of the loan.

On the other hand, if someone walked in from interstate with the same amount of cash in his pocket under the same circumstances, the bank would give him a loan immediately. I believe that that is not right: it is unfair. Perhaps the Treasurer could take up that matter with the bank and ensure that South Australians and people coming from interstate are treated on the same basis. I believe that people from interstate should be treated on the same time frame as people in South Australia.

The other matter to which I would like to refer is more of a warning, I suppose, to pensioners. I have recently struck a lot of pensioners who travel overseas and who, in good faith, when they go to the booking agents to get their tickets, take out on the instruction and advice of the issuer of the ticket an insurance policy to cover themselves while they are away against personal accident and any medical complaints that may happen to them. Personal baggage is usually included in such policies, as is money, passports, injury, and loss of limb—the usual thing that one takes out when one goes overseas.

On the whole, the booking clerks usually say to these old people, 'Look, you must have this cover because, if ever you get sick overseas, medical expenses are enormous and crippling.' Of course, most people who are not pensioners are in the Mutual Hospital Association or the National Health Services Association and they are covered while overseas: however, pensioners are not. Not being covered, they accept these policies and go away with them thinking that, if they get sick overseas and have to go to a doctor on board ship, for example, they are automatically covered. In fact, they are not. They find that when they go to the doctor on board, for example, on one of these overseas cruises, and they had a sickness that they picked up on board (say, the flu), they are covered.

However, a lot of these old people (they might have been on a three or four week trip) go along to the local doctor on board, to have, say their blood pressure taken. They suddenly get exorbitant accounts rendered on them because the company that issues these policies says that that was an illness that existed before the person set foot on the ship and, therefore, is not covered by the policy.

I believe that through the medium of this Parliament (hopefully this matter will be reported in the press), we can warn pensioners who are going overseas to look carefully at the fine print in insurance policies that they buy because when they read it they will find this pre-existing illness clause, which means that if they step on-board with something wrong with them (and most elderly people have something wrong with them in the form of heart trouble, sugar, or whatever) and they need check-ups, they will be in diabolical strife financially when they get these exorbitant bills. They must merely make sure that their insurance policy covers such matters.

Another matter that I would like the Government to take up (it is one for Treasury to cost) is the matter of Medalert bracelets. I point out that many people wear these bracelets, which cost \$15. Many people, particularly old people (and I am mentioning this because of the elderly people in my district) must wear these bracelets because they have a medical condition that is not obvious, as they look perfectly normal. If such persons collapse, the information about their condition is contained on the bracelet. Although these bracelets cost only \$15, many people cannot afford them, and I believe that the Government should pay for them for pensioners and disadvantaged people who cannot afford them, as they are an essential item.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to refer to the operations of this Parliament and some views I hold on that matter. There is no doubt that the past few days have tested the patience of many people. I suppose it has shown the public, even more conspicuously, the stupidity of the way in which this place sometimes operates, or is supposed to operate. If one is to talk about changes, one needs to look at the history of the operation of this place and to consider why we have got ourselves into the sort of situation that we are in at the moment. This is a good opportunity to talk about this matter, particularly when a large proportion of the Parliamentary representation within Australia is talking about fixed-term Parliaments, a suggestion which seems to have considerable support in the community.

If we are going to talk about fixed-term Parliaments, while allowing for emergency situations that might arise, surely it is commensense to take this one step further and to ascertain whether it is possible to have fixed-term sittings of Parliament and to look at the benefits of such a suggestion. I am sure that, when most people vote for a member to represent them, they think that that member spends a lot of time in the House debating or considering legislation. I cannot cover the whole of this subject in the 10 minutes available now, but will cover it later this afternoon when I have another opportunity to speak. I will then give statistical detail of the operations of the Parliament over a number of years to show that we do not spend a lot of time actually sitting in this Parliament.

It is true to say that until they got electorate offices, members spent more time in Parliament House than they do now. Therefore, there was a greater opportunity for members, regardless of what side of politics they came from, to exchange ideas in the corridors, at *ad hoc* meetings or at Party meetings, because people were frequenting the House more often than they do now. It was the meeting place for

members and the typing pool and operations were here. I take part of the blame for the advent of electorate offices, as I was the first one to advocate them and, subsequently, a Government of the same philosophy as the present Government granted them.

The Hon. David Brookman, a longer serving politician than I, said to me at that time, 'All you will do is create the situation where members of Parliament are nothing more than highly paid social welfare workers.' To some extent, we all must admit that he was right. We must accept the fact that change has occurred when we now have more Government agencies supposedly serving the public. When one thinks about that, one wonders why we should get more social welfare work.

Although we have had a short recession, which has been in evidence for the past couple of years, that was the case during the flush times of the 1970s, when money was thrown around as if the supply would never end. I am of the view that, the more we do for the community by way of Government agencies, and as members of Parliament, the more we will be expected to do, because it is an automatic human trait that if someone will pick up the tab or do the work people will become dependent on that source of help. That is human nature and we will not change that.

What benefits would there be if we had fixed-term sittings of Parliament, with a provision that changes could occur only where, in the Government's view, there was an emergency, or where there was general agreement by both sides of the House? The benefits are that members would know when they were expected to be at Parliament House in this Chamber, and would know the approximate times for debates. The staff who work in this building (and I took note of the comment made by the member for Hanson earlier today) would be able to organise their holidays, their long service leave and whatever. They could plan for the future.

Members of Parliament would be able to plan more readily with their families the holiday breaks that they might want to have. I hope that members would consider very seriously the benefits of fixed sitting times, accepting that there needs to be an opportunity to change them in the case of an emergency.

I am not advocating that electorate offices should be taken away, but I believe that many of us have become tied to our electorate office more than we need to be and that we should perhaps be relying more on our electorate staff to direct people to where they can obtain help by way of Government agencies.

The other change that has occurred (and this can be easily verified by looking at the Statute Book) is that the number of laws that it was proposed to change some 10, 15 or 20 years ago was much less. However, over the years a multitude of new laws and regulations have been introduced which we keep trying to amend, repeal, or whatever, together with the fact that new Acts are being proclaimed all the time.

I am not reflecting on my colleagues (and I mean the total number of members within the Parliament), but I think it would be fair to say that no more than perhaps 5 per cent of politicians have the time to review completely any more than about 10 per cent of the total amount of legislation that is brought into this Chamber or the regulations and by-laws that are made available to us for perusal, agreement or otherwise. That is a sad reflection on our method of operation.

That has come about because over the years we have not increased the number of sitting days or the length of sitting time in comparison to the increased number of Parliamentarians. The number of Parliamentarians has increased from 59 to 69 since I came here. The extra 10 members expect to express a point of view in the Parliament and to participate

in examining and reviewing of legislation. We have decreased the percentage operating time for each Parliamentarian but we have increased the work load dramatically. Therefore, members of Parliament (and I have been on the back-bench of a Party in Government) become frustrated because they cannot participate in the Parliamentary operations and express a point of view.

Also, because there are more Parliamentarians and because more laws are being changed, there is less interest by the media in everyday matters: there is interest only in sensational matters. If one looks at the newspapers of years gone by, one will see that that is the case. At one time the point of view of a back-bencher was published quite frequently. There was no long interval until a sensational matter arose, and people were able to know the points of view expressed in Parliament.

The only way in which a back-bencher can put across his point of view is to write articles for a local newspaper and hope that they are published, or he can attempt to find a way to speak in general debates in this place, those speeches being recorded in *Hansard*. I object to sitting to 3 a.m. or 4 a.m., but I am prepared to do that if that has to be part of the process. Later this afternoon when I have a further opportunity to speak for 10 minutes, I will further consider the position regarding sitting times. I hope that we can have fixed times for sittings of Parliament.

Mr RODDA (Victoria): Further to the statements made by the member for Hanson and the member for Fisher, I find myself here on a Friday dealing with the business of the State. I am not denying that the Government has the right to govern and that our job is to consider its business. I suppose that one could quibble about the arrangements but, whether or not this situation has been sprung on the Government, I agree with the member for Fisher that there is an increasing need for legislation and amendment. The public demands more from Parliament, from the Government, and from members of Parliament.

Those who have been here for a long time would know that on many occasions, at least in the 19 years that I have been here, when members have shown disinterest in their electorates the next election has put paid to their service to the State. I was interested in the comments made by my colleague regarding electoral offices, which are the focal point of representation, bringing Parliament closer to the people. I have had to cancel a number of appointments that I was to keep in my office at Naracoorte, but I have a very efficient secretary who I am sure will deal with all those problems, and I am confident that the constituents who raise problems will obtain some service. However, quite a number of constituents want to see the member, and that is their right. Constituents often refuse to discuss a subject with my secretary, and I do not blame them for that, although it does not please my secretary.

Over the years a member builds up a rapport with many people. I do not look upon myself as a social worker but I enjoy the confidence of many hundreds of people in the District of Victoria. If they want to see me, I can make myself available to them. The point made by the member for Hanson in relation to Parliament House staff was a valid one. I am sure that the Premier and Ministers have not thought about that and I hope that they will talk to the staff.

I can remember 1966, when the Walsh Government brought down far-reaching amendments to the Licensing Act to change 6 p.m. closing to 10 p.m. closing. That measure met with much resistance from the community, and there was very strong debate in the House, especially as it was on the eve of Easter. I can recall not going to bed for two days. In those days, some of us lived in the House.

There were 14 country bumpkins, and we took refuge in what is now the glorified sanctum of the Opposition on the second floor of this building. The occasion in question was the day before Good Friday, and the callousness and ruthlessness that exists between politicians in the Chamber was just as rife then as it is today.

It was decided that the debate would continue, and unfortunately one or two members became ill, as also did a couple of members of *Hansard* through the stress of work placed upon them. We were all pleased when it was decided that that sitting would end at 8 p.m., and Mr Burdon, Mr Corcoran and I made a mad dash to the train to get home for Easter. I do not believe that members of the *Hansard* staff are in any better physical condition today to cope with such conditions.

I only hope that if this sitting continues tomorrow we do not have any need for St John to carry any of these people away. I do not think anybody else here can fulfil their role. I know that we have electronic equipment to record what is said in this place, but we must not forget about the staff, including the messengers, caretakers, police officers, drivers and the catering staff, all of whom do so much to facilitate the work of this place. They work after we leave and after the ringing of the three bells which we love to hear.

It is often said that there is nothing so silent as the shearing shed the day after shearing. However, that does not apply to Parliament House. Many people are left to clean up, and we are putting a big strain on those very decent people who make this place function. I would hope that the Government takes this matter on board. I do not necessarily oppose what the Government does, as I believe it has a busy legislative programme with which to deal, but the present situation has created problems for us. On the matter raised by the member for Flinders regarding the wide comb issue, I hope that sensible agreement can be reached and that it will not become a national problem.

The wool industry, and indeed all the pastoral industry, suffers from this problem. In my district there is considerable argument and dissension involving decent people on both sides of a very difficult issue, and it is something that we do not want to see continue. However, the proponents on both sides are dogged with sticking to their courses, so there is a problem. What the member for Flinders pointed up was extremely valid because we see the cruelty to livestock. Sheep shorn with long wool are lambing ewes and, as we are approaching that stage of this great maternity function in the wool industry, if those animals are not shorn there will be havoc.

On the question of the wide comb, graziers will not put up a case to seek a cheaper shearing rate: the award will be honoured. Very strong fears have been expressed about these hard-hearted cockies and skinflint graziers who would seek to use this issue as an opportunity for beating someone over the head. Those days are gone, and if any grazier were to take a hard line with his employee on such an issue I would be the first to take the line of the employee. I know that that is the wish of the producer, so there is no point—

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I rise for the second time in three or four days to air an issue of vital importance to the South-East, namely, the Finger Point effluent scheme, which has been scrapped by the present Government and for which absolutely no forward commitment has been made. This scheme is essential to the well-being of the South-East, with the city of Mount Gambier (the largest provincial city in South Australia) discharging its effluent raw into the sea at Port MacDonnell, just 20 miles to the south.

On Tuesday evening I brought this matter to the attention of the Government, expressing my concern that the scheme should be scrapped. I am also acutely aware of the interest currently being shown in the South-East by the Port MacDonnell District Council, along whose shores the effluent is discharged, and by the South-East Professional Fishermen's Association, whose members' livelihood is being threatened. I say that their livelihood is being threatened, because the South-East professional fishermen are engaged essentially in shell-fishing (fishing for lobster and abalone) and are only very slightly engaged in scale-fishing.

It is the shell fish which are most likely to be affected by the depositing of effluent into the sea at Finger Point, some few miles east of Port MacDonnell. Those shell fish are likely to be affected because along with the effluent some metallic and other poisonous substances are discharged into the sea absolutely untreated through the long pipeline which goes from Mount Gambier through to Finger Point, off Port MacDonnell's eastern shore. As a result, with the discharge of effluent over a number of years, an environmental impact statement was prepared (I believe at the request of the former Labor Government in the late 1970s) which had been in the process of examination and finalisation until 1982, when it was released in draft form to the Department of Fisheries. I would request once again that that environmental impact statement be released publicly.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Alternatively, if the Government is not inclined to release that report, at least the Premier and his Cabinet should study it. I hope that the Premier personally will accede to any request from the Chairman of the Port MacDonnell District Council, Mr Noal Norman, and the President of the South-East Professional Fishermen's Association, Mr Morris Leggett, for a deputation to be received by him and by the Minister of Fisheries. So important is this matter to the councils and to the professional fishermen of the South-East.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It has been around for 16 years. Why didn't your Government do something about it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We did. The honourable member, by way of interjection, has just pointed out the very next thing I was about to say and that was that this matter has been kicking around for far too long. He asks why did not our Government do anything about it. The point is that the Liberal Government did do something about it. It provided—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It provided \$500 000 towards the commencement of the scheme. The Leader of the Opposition two days ago in a letter addressed to the district council chairman and to the Mayor of the Mount Gambier City Council reaffirmed the Liberal Party's intention to complete the effluent discharge scheme from Mount Gambier to Port MacDonnell immediately upon our return to Government. I thank the honourable member for his comments.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: He has admitted it was in the works programme and that's why he has deleted it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This Premier has admitted that the scheme was in the works programme because it had to be deleted, and it is deleted for the next three years and there is no forward commitment.

The Chairman of the Port MacDonnell District Council, to whom I spoke a few moments ago, has reiterated that he is concerned about the fishing industry, the potential impact on that industry, about the health hazard (and it certainly is a very smelly issue), the years of waiting (which the Minister has just referred to), the fact that the Port MacDonnell population is increasing and not declining, the

fact that it is one of the leading seaside tourist resorts in South Australia and also the leading south-eastern resort from the point of view of those people living in the extreme South-East.

I have also spoken over the luncheon adjournment (and I am pleased that we have had some time between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. for me to do so) to Mr Morris Leggett, Chairman of the South-East Professional Fishermen's Association. He says that he recognises the concern that exports of crayfish and abalone may be affected should this news be spread widely around. He pointed out in a television interview last night on S.E.S. 8 that the South-East professional fishermen had deliberately been keeping clear of the Finger Point area, that that area is a very rich fishing ground and that the fishermen are being deprived of a potential increase to their livelihood; however, they do take all precautions. He says that there is no breach of that gentlemen's agreement between the professional fishermen not to extract fish from that threatened area and that there is absolute quality control in the cleaning and packing of export crayfish. I hope that the honourable member who is interjecting is not interjecting for the sake of doing so. This is an extremely serious matter and I point out that the fishermen themselves are acting in an absolutely responsible manner in doing all they can to protect the export quality of crayfish by not fishing in that threatened area.

Mr Whitten: They shouldn't either.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They should not either, and they are not doing that. To say that they should not either is acknowledging that there is a threat to one of the most potentially valuable fishing areas in the South-East. Surely it is the height of ridiculousness to say that professional fishermen should not extract fish from such a valuable fishing ground when the problem could be cured by the implementation of the Mount Gambier to Port MacDonnell effluent scheme.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The interjections are coming along precisely in line with my rationale: the cost. The Premier has given the excuse that it is a non-viable, non-cost effective scheme. Would we stop providing a health system because it is losing money?

Mr Whitten interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Would we stop providing water to South Australia because it is costing money? Surely our health is of prime importance to this State and questions of cost and viability are surely the last things that we should consider when we have at stake the viability and long-term future of a national export industry and also when we have local health to consider. The Premier's response simply does not stand up to the light of cold, common, sensible and reasonable examination. What I would like the Government to do is to reconsider immediately its decision to shelve this project, and to reinstate it at once on the public works programme. It will provide more employment for people in the South-East; it will contribute towards the safety of a local and export industry; it will safeguard what we have when across South Australia we are already continuing to lose many jobs which the Government said it would reinstate. Surely we should be looking to retain as much of the employment that we already have as we can.

That will take care of a quite serious local health hazard and, for the Premier to come along and loosely say that this project should be scrapped for the most specious of reasons simply is not good enough. I ask the Premier to receive a deputation from those responsible people in the South-East as soon as they request it, and I can assure him that the matter is certainly not one of small concern in the South-

East. Were the Liberal Party still in Government, that scheme would have been progressing right now with the \$500 000 which was provided in the 1982-83 Budget.

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

Mr Whitten interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Did I hear the member for Price say, 'Sit down' to another honourable member? I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr WHITTEN: Mr Speaker, I apologise. I was out of order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Thank you, Mr Speaker—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Recreation and Sport to order. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: Begging the indulgence of the House, I would like the opportunity to make a contribution. I had intended to ignore the interjections made prior to the commencement of my remarks, but they are relevant in the context of the matters about which I wish to speak. Whereas the grievance I wished to bring to the attention of the House related to matters of grave concern to my constituents, as they relate to particular items of policy, I find it now necessary for me to forgo that in the interests of ensuring that this institution, this Parliament, can continue to survive as a place in which duly and democratically elected representatives of the people are able to put views on their behalf in a way that will ensure that they are respected, not only by members of the House but by members of the general public.

I am distressed by the proceedings and precedents that have been set this week, the number of conventions that have been broken by the Government and the number of precedents that have been set at the instigation of Government members, particularly as they have been directed at me. Not the least of those, as I understand it, was designed in conspiracy by members of the Government back-bench and it was especially relevant in the context of the interjection made by the member for Price before I began my speech. I refer to *Hansard* of 1 September 1982 at page 925 and a speech by the Hon. J.D. Wright, as follows:

Two significant factors have not gone undetected by me in this debate.

I could well be using those words myself. Mr Wright continued:

The first is that the—

and I will substitute the Labor Party for the Liberal Party—back-benchers have not, in any great numbers, come forward and supported the Premier's Budget.

In this case, it is the Supply Bill. At that point in the debate that statement was true: Government back-benchers were giving Opposition back-benchers the opportunity of speaking at times convenient to them early in the debate before the Government cut off the time that it wished to spend on the debate and before it disrupted the normal business of members outside this place. That cannot be said about this Government, because it has disrupted the arrangements and commitments made by members, by giving such late notice of the way in which it has extended the sittings of this House.

Today I am precluded from attending the opening of the Lameroo Hospital. My attendance was arranged after continual consultations with members of that community and His Excellency the Governor who will perform that duty. I cannot be present. I have another meeting this evening in my electorate, but I have been informed, as recently as just before mid-day today, that I am unlikely to be able to get to it. Mr Wright continued:

So far, I believe only one has spoken.

In this case no member of the Government has spoken. Mr Wright continued:

Whether any more intend to speak or whether they are ashamed of the Budget, I do not know. The second factor is that those who have spoken on our side have not had a good audience to address. The numbers in the House last night were something of which to be ashamed. There were about four or five members in the House when I was here.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: There are a few of us here now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I now refer to the member for Albert Park's contribution.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: More than a couple.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: The member for Albert Park made the first comment about whether or not Government back-benchers had been gagged. I have already explained that no Government member was gagged during the Budget debate last year. However, in relation to this Bill, a money Bill, it is quite clear that all Government members have been gagged. Mr Hamilton said:

Where is the member for Henley Beach, from whom we hear so much on other occasions? But on the Budget, he says not a word—not a word about the community welfare or housing problems that he has in his electorate.

Quite clearly the member for Albert Park had chosen to breach a convention in that speech of not interfering in the affairs or the manner in which other members represent their constituents. The member for Albert Park continued by saying, 'I should have thought that we would hear from the member . . .' Later in his speech, referring to back-bench members of the Government, he said:

They could at least say, 'We do not believe that the Government has gone far enough or that it has done enough in this area' . . . it is a puerile performance.

I believe that those remarks are equally relevant to the Government's performance in relation to this measure today. I refer now to page 858 of *Hansard* of 31 August last year, to illustrate how short the memories are of some members. In response to an interjection, the member for Albert Park said:

Then stand up and talk, but I do not think the honourable member will, because he has been gagged by the Premier. He has been told to sit down and sit back. So much for Liberal policies, so much for Liberal concern in South Australia for the electorate! Members opposite have been gagged, have been told to sit down and be quiet.

That was not true on that occasion. The record now shows quite clearly that it is true on this occasion in relation to the Government and its back-bench. Later in that debate last year we heard similar contributions from the member for Unley and the member for Napier, who is now Minister of Housing. Mr Hemmings said:

Not one Government member has been willing to defend the Budget that has been put before this House. Not one member has been willing to say that the Budget is good for the economy of this State. They have neither defended it nor attacked it.

He then said, 'They have nothing to say.' Mr Hamilton then interjected and said, 'They've been gagged.' The record shows that they were quite wrong. Mr Hemmings went on:

That is right: Government members have been gagged.

Quite clearly they have in this debate; they were not on that occasion. Then the member for Peake said:

I was amazed to sit in this House today and listen to those members who have spoken to the Budget, especially those who have stood up and defended it, because there have been none.

He went on:

What is the reason for that? I will give the House a few reasons. There are a few members opposite at the moment, but there were no members opposite who were present earlier, because none of them were prepared to open their mouths.

That was not true. Later on he said:

Members opposite have not addressed the House.

And still further on he stated:

The honourable member does not have to be stood over by the Party, on the other hand, like the member for Mallee who has apparently been told to keep out of the House tonight because the Government does not want him blowing up and spilling the beans.

As he learned, subsequently I made a contribution and pointed out those areas in which I regarded the Government had a responsibility to my constituents. I commended the Government for the actions that it was taking in those areas where it was addressing those problems. Then we heard from the member for Whyalla, as follows:

I wish to begin my remarks in this debate by disclaiming the continual barrage coming from my colleagues on the other side of the House when challenging members of the Government to get up and speak in this debate. Let us be perfectly honest about the situation.

So let us be perfectly honest about the situation now. After having said that in August last year (with such conviction it would seem), constantly reminding the House of the fact that members were failing in their responsibilities, we find now that that standard no longer applies, and when I attempted to draw attention to that yesterday, I had points of order taken on me by members opposite which precluded me from drawing attention to that fact, even though in the context of that debate—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I raise the question of the possible loss of the police greys. It has been suggested that the breeding establishment at Echunga, a highly regarded centre, will be closed. The *Advertiser* of 4 May has a heading 'Our police greys may go'. The article states:

The future of the police greys—the horses which have been the pride of South Australia for generations—is under great threat.

I support that statement. They have been the pride of South Australians for generations. The article continues:

Breeding stock at the Police Force's Echunga Stud are to be phased out. But the move does not mean the end of the police mounted unit. Its strength will remain—with horses introduced from other sources.

I am something of a horseman myself, which may come as a surprise to some. I find it hard to understand how they can continue the colour strain with horses from interstate, and why I say that is that I have had the opportunity to see police horses in other centres, and to my observation there is not another line of police horses in grey. The others are all dun or roan.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: A horse of a different colour.

Mr PETERSON: That is so. It concerns me that we are getting the breeding stock from interstate. I notice that the Premier said the other day it took a lot of effort to keep South Australian David Hookes here; he was outstanding in his particular sphere. I think we should endeavour to keep this line of horses here. I do not believe they have been used anywhere near enough in the community. They have a very high standard in the eyes of the public. It is a very respected force. They certainly have some application. I do not think they are used sufficiently.

I think that there is an aspect of tourism in them. I think that they can be used much more for the spectacle of seeing the horses as they are, so that they have a much higher profile in our community.

Mr Mathwin: They are used in the duties of the Police Force.

Mr PETERSON: I have just said that, if the member for Glenelg was listening. I said that they could have much more application in the Police Force in the course of its

duties. The attitude of retaining these horses has been borne out in a brief survey, carried out by the *News* in its edition of 5 May, which strongly supported that the horses be retained.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I have a high respect for the police. I think that we have the best Police Force in Australia, and that the greys add to their image. The horses are efficient, and so is the Police Force. I have had quite a number of contacts from people who are concerned about the possible loss of the greys, and I would like to think that their opinions will be taken into consideration before a final decision is made.

I move on to another point. A debate is going on around the country and the State about longer-term Parliaments. It may not be commonly known that this Parliament itself was once a longer-term Parliament. The Parliament of 1933 was a five-year Parliament. I would like to quote from a book called *Responsible Government in South Australia*, by Mr Combe. It is a book that I would recommend to everybody who is interested in Government. Mr Combe says:

The normal term of the House of Assembly has been three years throughout the century of responsible government in this State, with the exception of the House which assembled in 1933. By legislation brought down by the Butler Government in 1933, the Twenty-Eighth Parliament was converted to a quinquennial Parliament, provision being made for the House of Assembly then in existence to continue until 28 February 1938, subject nevertheless to be sooner dissolved by the Governor.

He says that this action was taken under a promise of the then Government, and mentions that there was a trial period. He states:

In 1937, however, during the extended life of the Twenty-Eighth Parliament, the Butler Government, being convinced after four years' experience 'of the wisdom of quinquennial Parliaments' introduced a measure which passed both Houses, to make five-year Parliaments a permanent feature of the Constitution.

I would like to quote one other item from this book, which I think is significant, even though it was later repealed in this State (for what reason, I have not been able to research yet). He further states:

During the term of the five-year Parliament, the financial and economic stresses were eased, unemployment was greatly reduced, public borrowing restricted: to South Australia belonged the valuable distinction of having led the field in the return to balanced Budgets.

Therefore, there is an argument in favour of longer terms. As I say, it was later repealed, but there is an argument there for it. It would not be the first longer-term Parliament in this State.

Some comment was made by the member for Hanson about the staff of this House and their working hours. I certainly sympathise with those statements. It is a remarkable staff and is to be commended on what I will call its 'normal duties'. Staff members serve this House well, and the reports I have received from people involved in the conference stated that they performed in an outstanding manner. This Parliament should commend them on their application to their duties at that time.

In other grievances, mention was made about our electoral staff and the pressures put upon them. I think that what was said is true. They are more and more subject to demands from the electorate for social work. Much more work is put on them now, in a social sense, than ever before.

It is sometimes difficult for them to find the appropriate Government department to which to refer people. This might be something to be considered by, for example, the Minister of Community Welfare, with a view to providing electorate assistants with a list of people who can be contacted regarding certain problems to ease the burden on these offices. Sometimes there is much work for them in ascertaining the right person to contact for assistance in certain

matters. Electorate assistants work hard, too—another group of unsung heroes who should be commended.

There has been comment made about the length of this debate. It is the right of every member of this House to have a say in such matters. I support the stand taken there. I do not think that one could find a more sincere member than the member for Mallee, whom I hold in high regard. I hope that he does not group me with those people who are part of the plot against him. I think that the member for Mallee applies himself (perhaps sometimes in the wrong direction), and I respect him for that. He commented that the Opposition had been gagged in this debate. I am not aware of any such gagging and I am certainly not being gagged; I am speaking to this Bill. I was going to read from this book on responsible government about the Government formed by Butler many years ago when, after the 1938 election, there were 13 independent members. Obviously, independent members have played a significant role in this Parliament over the years.

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

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Schedule.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$4 100 000.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I noticed that you have commenced, Mr Chairman, by putting the lines separately. I was going to ask at the outset whether you would follow that course. This Bill covers an *in globo* total of \$120 000 000, but I think it would facilitate questioning on the lines if we could come to understanding that we will take them singly, if that is acceptable to the Chair. I believe that that would prevent the changing from one set of circumstances to another. The Opposition would appreciate that being the case. I think I have your assurance on that, Mr Chairman and, that being the case, will the Treasurer say, in relation to the line 'Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$4 100 000' what is the scope of this line and, more specifically, will he indicate to the Committee how he arrived at the need for the additional \$4 100 000? It may be that within the scope of that answer other issues will arise, and I think that we should address them as they arise.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer is quite simple: the amount of \$4 100 000 is due to the effect of the remission granted by the previous Government following the gas price agreement. Incidentally, that did not appear in the Budget because that amount was given after the Budget was in place, just before the election. Indeed, we inherited the commitment. It represents the amount that will have to be credited to current receipts for that period for a remission effective from 1 January 1982 up to 30 June 1983.

No consideration has been given to extending it beyond that period. This was simply to cover the Gas Company for the fact that the agreement that had been reached was retrospective. Of course, it could have been extremely embarrassing (which I understand was the thinking of the previous Government). If such a remission had not been granted, there would have been an increase in tariffs to consumers to cover that amount, and effectively they would be recovering now for the payment that was back dated. That was the thinking of the previous Government. We were not in a position to give consideration to it. We simply honoured that commitment, but provision must be made because it was not in the original Budget.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I thank the Premier for that information. Would it be correct to accept that, although the total of \$4 100 000 has been requested due to this previously unexpected cost increase, the Budget estimates for the Treasurer—Miscellaneous line (always a very large item)

as presented to this House on a previous occasion are on target in every other respect? In other words, there has been no extension beyond the provisions called for and the provisions made in the Treasurer—Miscellaneous line prior to this untoward expense—untoward in the sense of a fiscal nature, but certainly beneficial in the sense of a reduced sum which might have been available other than for the negotiations that took place.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No other appropriation is being sought for the Treasurer—Miscellaneous line. When we obtain the end-of-year results there may well be a rise or fall in particular items in that line, but at this stage this is a large item that needs appropriation.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I note that answer. However, at this stage, 10 months into the financial year, it appears that there are no known blow-outs in relation to the Treasurer—Miscellaneous line. I think it is worth-while having that information on record. Regardless of claims that may or may not be made, supported by evidence (if there is any evidence given for an alteration), at the moment the Treasurer has no knowledge of any other major expenses in regard to a line that is traditionally a line used to overcome any circumstances or untoward expenditure in areas of the Treasurer's responsibility. I am quite interested to have that information on record, because it puts to rest some of the claims and counter-claims that have been made in fairly recent times that a number of activities of the previous Government caused a gross blow-out of the Budget.

With the information that the Premier has now provided in relation to that line and a clear recognition that the Government is looking after the guaranteed gas costs and the commitment made by the previous Government (and one which the present Government has been pleased to pick up at \$4 100 000 rather than a very much expanded amount, which would have been the case had the former Deputy Premier not negotiated downwards, rather than upwards), I believe that that line can be left. If my colleagues do not have questions in relation to this line, we could proceed to the education line.

The CHAIRMAN: I would advise the member for Light that we are required to deal with the schedule line by line.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Treasurer say whether Treasury officers, in putting forward the sum of \$4 100 000, took into account proposed legislation to remove funds from the Highways Department and transfer them to general revenue, that is, to the operations of the Police Force. If that is the case, how much money is involved?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware that such payments were taken into account nor how much money would be involved if that was the case. I could obtain that information for the honourable member.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I make that point, because it is a very important matter. The Treasurer will realise, proposed legislation having gone through Cabinet, that the Government proposes to increase the police contribution levy from the Highways Fund from 9.8 per cent to 12 per cent, which involves several million dollars. I would be interested to know whether it is retrospective. I understand that it will apply to the whole year. It is important that members have this information, and I would be grateful if the Treasurer could supply detailed information on that matter.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The member for Coles has drawn my attention to a matter that was explained to the House on a previous occasion in relation to tourism. While I recognise that we are not considering tourism, notwithstanding the advice that the Treasurer has provided in relation to the line 'Treasurer, Miscellaneous,' \$4 100 000, where is the sum that the Premier and the Minister of Tourism have stated has been made available for tourism

reflected in the document before us? While there is an increase under 'Treasurer, Miscellaneous', \$4 100 000, in regard to gas prices, this raises the question whether there have been other adjustments within that line to allow for the extension of the \$300 000 which is available in the tourist area.

We cannot come to grips with this issue immediately, but will the Treasurer explain whether the \$4 100 000, although it equates with the amount that has to be paid for gas, is conceivably related partly to gas (because there is some spare cash) and partly to other activities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can assure the honourable member that there is no spare cash. The question he raises is not the subject of this line. That relates to the amount of anticipated receipts which will have to be credited because of the change of levy arrangement—that is what this line is about.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That being the case, I seek information as to which line I could use in order to question the Premier about the additional funds which have been allocated for tourism, because tourism does not appear on the schedule. Therefore, no additional funds have been allocated to the Department of Tourism. That is contrary to what the Minister of Tourism has told the House. I wish to question the Premier about the tourism allocation. If it is not encompassed in the 'Treasurer, Miscellaneous' line, nor in the lines for Education, Agriculture, Forests, Community Welfare, Aboriginal Affairs, or Health or in 'Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature—Woods and Forests Department)', where is it allocated? Indeed, was it allocated?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I believe that the honourable member does not understand the purpose of Supplementary Estimates. They are to cover the situation where payments additional to the Budget estimates cannot be met from the special section of the Appropriation Act or covered by savings in other areas or are too large to be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund—the other method of so doing. They can also be used as a means of informing Parliament of significant Budget developments even though extra appropriation authority is not technically required. The simple answer to the question is that the amount in relation to tourism is not recorded here because there is no need to record it here. It is not the subject of special appropriation by means of this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I advise the member for Coles that I have allowed this type of questioning on tourism. At that point of time it was not clear to the Chair as to whether the question was connected with that line. However, the Premier has pointed out that there is nothing in this line or vote which has anything to do with tourism. The questioning would therefore be out of order. I hope that the member for Coles does not continue with that sort of questioning.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The question is about additional moneys. The additional appropriation, according to the Minister's statement made in this House on 23 March, was not in the form of savings from other areas but was an additional appropriation—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Not from other areas of tourism.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Not from other areas of tourism, and I assume it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the Government to find \$300 000 from any other area outside tourism. That being the case, I ask the Premier how the Government can allocate an additional \$300 000 to any department over and above that provided for in the Budget and which cannot be achieved by savings in that or any other department without seeking additional funds from Parliament under this Bill.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Simply because we are looking at an overall budgetary situation. The Appropriation Bill picks out the major items and also the sum total of extra appropriation as necessary. There are a number of internal savings and other rearrangements which can be accomplished. That is the way in which the finances work. The full detail of the allocations can only be obtained at the end of a financial year when the accounts are presented to Parliament. They are not the subject of a Supplementary Estimates Bill. If it was needed it would appear there. However, it is not needed in this form.

Mr BAKER: Will the Premier acknowledge that this line results from a situation peculiar to 1982-83? Is it a 'one-off' item, so called, and will any remedial measures in fact be one-off measures?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure what relevance that has to this line. In relation to the levy, no consideration has been given to extending that remission beyond 30 June. We are simply trying to compensate for the retrospective nature of it.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the member for Mitcham, as I am trying to point out to other members, that this line does not open up a series of questions or debates on matters outside the line. I ask the member for Mitcham to be very careful about what sort of questioning he proposes to put to the Premier.

Mr BAKER: By way of explanation, I was seeking information as to how the Premier regarded this line because we have in the explanations that were given at the time the Bill was introduced a number of proposed remedial measures that were prescribed at the time. I was interested in the Premier's reply that this was a one-off situation for 1982-83, which would need special remedial measures that would not necessarily mean long-term changes to the long-term taxation basis.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is not the appropriate forum for me to canvass such questions. We are looking in Committee at a particular line. I have given the explanation for that line, and no further information is required.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would like to ask the Premier whether the Budget of any single department of the Government has been reduced by any amount in order to provide additional funds for any other department. That is to say, has any department had the amount which was voted to it in the State Budget diminished by any amount in order to provide additional funds for any other department?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I just do not understand the relevance of that question in this context.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The question is relevant to the Premier's answer to an earlier question which I asked and in reply to which he said that the amount of \$300 000, which the Minister of Tourism states has been granted to his department over and above that amount which was voted in the State Budget by the Treasurer, was not in Treasury; it is not provided for in these lines. Therefore, presumably it came from some other department. I am asking the Premier whether the line of any other department has been reduced in order to provide the additional \$300 000 for the Department of Tourism.

The CHAIRMAN: Before asking the Premier to reply to that question, the Chair has endeavoured to point out to the Committee that we are discussing or being prepared to vote on a particular line. Unless that line has anything to do with a particular matter that a member wishes to raise, the question is completely out of order. For example, we seem to have got on to the question of tourism, so unless the question of tourism is involved in this line, that question is out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Treasurer's Miscellaneous line is, as I understand it, the only line listed on the schedule under which additional funds could be granted to any department. The Premier has already made it clear that the estimated payments listed on the schedule under the Treasurer's Miscellaneous line—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The quickest way I can overcome this is to refer honourable members to the supplementary Estimates of Payments. In that members will see that \$4 100 000 is the line set aside for payments to and on behalf of the South Australian Gas Company in relation to licensing fees. Under no circumstance could the Chair in its wildest imagination link that sort of payment with the line of questioning that is going on at present. So, the line of questioning, I repeat to the member for Coles, is completely out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is true that the sum cannot be linked, but the identification of the line, namely, Treasurer, Miscellaneous, seems to me to be the only line listed on the schedule under which I can question the Premier on a not insignificant sum that has been granted as an additional grant to a department.

My impression is that the Treasurer can inform the House where that money would have come from and I believe that the Parliament should know where that additional money came from if it did not come from the Treasurer's Miscellaneous line granted in the State Budget. I am talking now not about the supplementary estimates but about the Treasurer's original miscellaneous line, which I presume is the only source from which the money could have come.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly do not want to get involved in this line of questioning, and I obviously do not want to try to impede the progress of the Committee. If an extra allocation is made, it clearly is just that: an extra allocation. It will either be provided for as a separate or special item or it has the effect of adding to the deficit. The member has asked where the \$300 000 comes from, and in this instance I say that it comes from nowhere in the sense that it is an extra provision which has been made but which was not contained in the Tonkin Budget which we inherited.

The exact results on a department by department basis (which apparently the member is seeking) cannot be supplied at this stage as they are properly the consideration of the Budget Estimates Committees when we formally table the accounts in the new financial year.

I guess that the implications of the questions are that, because one cannot see \$300 000 provided for the Department of Tourism on this list, that means that, when the Minister said that it had been granted, it had not been. I assure the member that it has been provided, but this Bill simply deals with those areas for which we are seeking extra and supplementary appropriation. We are operating off a very large deficit, which encompasses a number of special payments.

Vote passed.

Education, \$2 900 000.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Treasurer give the Committee a breakdown of this amount? As I understand it, the amount refers to the provision of extra teachers in line with the Government's election promises. It also provides, I would imagine, for the extra ancillary staff that would have to be provided because of the extra teachers. It would also have to include the extra allocation for ancillary staff because the Government reinstated the ancillary staff formula to the 1979 level. Will the Premier give the Committee the precise amounts for each of those three areas?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have only a global figure for them. It is somewhat difficult to be precise, because the actual allocations will depend on the numbers involved in each category and, more importantly, the amounts of actual

payments depending on the grades, levels, and so on, of the staff; it is not one rate that one can strike.

We have an overall figure which relates to holding the number of teachers in primary and secondary schools to allow for a reduction in class sizes. The Budget presented to Parliament last August reduced the funds provided to the Education Department to reflect a reduction in teaching and ancillary staff in line with an expected fall in enrolments. We have reinstated the equivalent of those positions, and it is costing \$2 900 000.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I have just stated that for the Premier in my remarks. I am not going to carp and criticise on this, but I am somewhat disappointed that the Premier does not have a breakdown of these figures. In answer to a question the other day, he was not able to give me a breakdown of what the Commonwealth was going to supply for the fire and flood relief. I hoped that the Premier would have these figures, or like figures; otherwise, this Committee cannot do its job.

We are entitled to have the precise figures. If the Premier has not got them, again, I ask whether he will get me that detailed breakdown. It is one of the Government's election promises, and it is important that the Opposition is able to cost accurately what those promises will cost the taxpayer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The accurate cost is \$2 900 000.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: But you are not breaking it down.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not see how it becomes inaccurate by our breaking down the figure. I can provide a rough proportion. I guess there is just over \$2 000 000 in the teacher area and a bit less than \$2 000 000 in the ancillary staff area. We do not have the figures in that detail. We would have to go back to the Education Department and, really, I do not understand: if the honourable member's purpose is to cost our election promise—there it is, \$2 900 000.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Parliament is entitled to have that detail, not just global figures. Let me assist the Premier. In answer to a Question on Notice, the Premier or the Minister (I think it was the Premier) told me that the average cost of employing a teacher, including superannuation, leave loading, holiday pay and the like, was about \$22 000 a year. It was certainly a little more for promotional staff and a little less for non-promotional staff. The Minister claimed that the Government has retained 231 teachers over and above what would have applied under a Liberal Government. That figure is not true, but I will not canvass that matter at this stage. I do not want to make this matter a political issue. All I want is to get the figures from the Premier. If one multiplies 231 teachers by \$22 000, I get about \$5 000 000.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That is for a full year.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: That is for a full year and gives some idea of the cost. The important thing is that, whenever extra teachers are provided, because of the staffing formula the Government must supply ancillary staff. Not only did the Government have to supply ancillary staff because of the extra teachers but also it altered the former Government's formula for the provision of ancillary staff and restored it to the 1979 level. Therefore, there are two lots of increases in ancillary staff as well as the increase in teachers.

I just want to make that point to the Premier. It is not something to be overlooked. It is important in the Education Department, because it was an important Government promise. Indeed, I am sure that the Premier would agree that it was one of the Government's more important promises before the election. I am merely trying to obtain the information without trying to be difficult or to carp on it.

I am not even criticising the policy: I just want the information.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will try to obtain the information for the honourable member but, in saying that, I indicate that we are talking about the half-year cost in the Budget which was \$2 900 000. Secondly, they were jobs that were to go; in other words, at the start of this school year those positions were gone. People were being given notice at the very time the Government came into office that either their contracts would not be renewed or their positions would not be filled.

In terms of ratios and ancillary staff, and the like, we are not creating two bites because those teachers were in place and were due to go. They did not go because of the policy; we held those numbers and cancelled those notices of displacement of teachers. There is not a double counting of costs of ancillary staff. I will try to get the information for the honourable member.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: There is just one other matter that bears on the \$2 900 000. The Premier has mentioned an accumulated deficit of \$400 000 000 in 1986. Has the Premier or his officers costed into that accumulated deficit the cost of the provision of about 950 extra teachers made in the Government's election promises? From my calculations, without taking into account ancillary staff, it is about \$20 900 000 in 1982 terms.

Obviously the Government will not be introducing those 950 teachers immediately, it will be done during the Government's term. Presumably, by 1986, if the Government keeps its election promise, it will have retained 950 teachers above the formula. As I have said, on my costing, that involves about \$20 900 000, using the figure of \$22 000 based on 1982 dollars. Obviously there will be an escalation, anyway, and by 1986 it will be more than \$20 900 000. Have the Premier's officers included that amount in the estimated Budget blow-out in the accumulated deficit of \$400 000 000?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is not precisely related to this line, but as I have already explained, those forward projections are based on costing for all the elements involved on both the receipts side and the expenditure side. We are not in a position to exclude any sector. We must try to make a reasonably accurate prediction in relation to the ongoing costs. Those costs are affected by time and by the level of salaries and wages, and certain estimates and predictions must be made on that basis. That is taken into account when arriving at the overall figure, in the absence of any immediate reduction.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I wish to pursue the question asked by the member for Torrens in relation to details of the education appropriation of \$2 900 000. I would have expected the Premier to have his Minister of Education with him to answer this type of question or, on the other hand, to have the relevant information with him. I think it is reasonable for the Opposition to expect answers on behalf of the public in relation to details about that \$2 900 000. I give notice that I will expect considerable detail about the substantial appropriation of \$17 000 000 in relation to health. I think it is extraordinary that the Premier cannot provide the information sought by the member for Torrens. What information does the Premier have with him in relation to the education appropriation of \$2 900 000?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have answered that question. I point out that this is not a Budget Estimates Committee. The Minister of Education is not required, nor should he be, to do as the honourable member suggests. I have my boon companion to keep me company. It is my role as Treasurer to answer questions on these appropriations. We have an Estimates Committee to provide the detail required by the honourable member. I find the honourable member's

line of questioning odd, particularly as I have already answered the question. I can add nothing.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Premier might have provided an answer to the question, but he has not answered the question, which was quite specific, about details of the \$2 900 000 education appropriation. The Opposition appreciates that this is not a Budget Estimates Committee but a committee to examine the additional appropriations. I would have expected the Premier to come into the Committee with broad details of that \$2 900 000, even if it was not the fine detail.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Read my speech.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have read the Premier's speech, and I have not found answers to the questions asked by myself and the member for Torrens.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What do you want to know? Do you want a list?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Torrens has asked about the number of teachers and ancillary staff. That information is basic and fundamental, and the Premier should be able to provide it for the Committee. Is the Premier treating the Committee with contempt? Is the Premier deliberately trying to withhold information, or is his information incompetent? The question asked seems to be simple, basic and non-complicated and we are entitled to be given an answer, just as the Committee is entitled to be given details of the appropriation of \$17 000 000 for the Minister of Health.

Vote passed.

Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forests, Miscellaneous, \$81 000 000.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The information given by the Premier is not in dispute as to either the totality or the distribution between the three disaster areas. It is appreciated that additional funds have been made available by the Commonwealth as an offset provision, and it is expected that the Commonwealth will provide \$58 000 000 towards the total \$81 000 000 outlay, leaving a debit of \$23 000 000 which the State is required at present to provide. However, there is clear indication of this in the document.

As, in line with the request, these funds will at least be committed within seven weeks, I ask the Premier to give a clearer indication of how this money will be spent and whether much of it will be placed in trust accounts against costs that may be incurred in 1983-84 as a result of the disasters.

Recent announcements have been made by Ministers to local government bodies, dealing with flooding and loss incurred on restoring culverts, bridges and roadworks, such work to be completed by 30 June 1983, which is quite an impossible task. There are not sufficient resources, in terms of either manpower or equipment, to complete that work, and I thank the Minister of Community Welfare for briefing me on the change in the situation. A letter was forwarded from the Local Government Department's officer responsible for liaison with council stating that, notwithstanding that the Government would like to see the money expended by 30 June 1983, it was not committed to spending the total restoration cost by that time. A request was made to comply with the restoration programme as soon as possible, and I accept that situation. One would not want a recurring problem over a series of years: it would be desirable to complete the work within a matter of months and certainly no longer than 12 months from the occurrence. There is now this commitment and an understanding that the work is to be undertaken over a period beyond 30 June 1983.

Members on this side would like to know where the money will go and what the intention is, so that local government bodies and others are guaranteed that the money is there for the work required when they lodge a claim, and

so that we can come to grips with this matter. There will be a disbursement of a considerable sum of money within the six to seven-week period up to 30 June 1983. My colleague the member for Alexandra will refer the Premier to a letter he received recently bearing the Premier's signature and explaining that only about \$5 700 000 is being spent this financial year in relation to drought. As to the \$81 000 000 forecast to be spent in these three disaster areas, we would like to know a lot more detail than has been provided thus far.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I covered some of this subject in answer to a question to, I think, the member for Alexandra the other day in the House. I said that we are treating the receipt of claims and the expenditure of moneys in this financial year with some urgency for one very sound reason in terms of State finance: that the amount that we have to carry over into the next financial year carries with it a penalty of the \$3 000 000 trigger before we can attract further three-for-one funding under the natural disaster relief arrangements. It is on that basis that, for instance, certain deadlines have been set for claims to be lodged and applications made for assistance in all the three categories of disaster that we have before us. We would certainly appreciate the fullest co-operation of everybody involved in that process, and I understand that it is now beginning to happen. In other words, we want to expend the money this financial year.

However, we accept the fact that, despite the priority given to it, there could be some carry-over into 1983-84. Indeed, as I said, there could be as well a number of claims and assessments of damage which we are just not in possession of at this stage and which will not be uncovered until later this year. Whether the Commonwealth will see that as qualifying at this stage is questionable. Therefore, it is obviously in everyone's interest to have their claims in as soon as possible. We must provide in this year's Budget for the meeting of those claims. These are the best estimates we have of the likely nature and extent of claims, and hence the provision of an \$81 000 000 expected payout on the three disasters covered by this appropriation.

Remember, of course, that that figure is in terms of the actual State resource. From that figure, in terms of what we have to put in, must be deducted the \$58 000 000 Commonwealth share which will be recovered by other means. That is the appropriation we need in order to ensure that all those payments can be made in the coming financial year.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I would like to advise the Premier, if he had any doubts at all, that he has the complete co-operation of members of the Opposition in anything that can be done in relation to South Australia's three disaster problems. That is on public record. I believe that the Premier has acknowledged and accepted on other occasions that that co-operation is there. However, he has hedged the true answer, in my estimation. Is the Premier of the opinion that, between now and 30 June 1983, along with the funds which have already been spent in these three disaster areas, about \$81 000 000 will have been paid out to individuals? There is no physical evidence at present that anything like \$81 000 000 has been distributed. It begs the question I asked earlier whether it is the Government's intention (if necessary, we would certainly want to go into bat with our Federal colleagues in an approach to that Government) that the State will place the balance (between the amount which has actually been paid out and the \$81 000 000 total which it is estimated is required) into trust accounts from which provision can be made beyond 30 June 1983.

In relation to local government alone, there is no way that any council which has suffered losses can meet its claims for payment by 30 June. I can give a brief indication

of claims in my own district: in the Robertstown District Council the figure is over \$200 000; in Eudunda, about \$930 000; and in Kapunda, \$680 000. My colleague the member for Kavel, as the Premier would well know, represents the area involving the District Council of Angaston, where the figure runs into many hundreds of thousands of dollars. They are not able to make their claims for payment by 30 June. Does the \$81 000 000 include those claims of all the councils and all the individuals in relation to drought, flood and fire which it can be expected will need to be met, allowing for an over-run with claims yet to be made? The Opposition believes it has a perfect right to know the whereabouts of this \$81 000 000 between now and 30 June, and beyond. I would like further detail on this question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, the \$81 000 000 is the current estimate of actual and likely claims. Secondly, it is our intention to be in a position to meet those claims in this financial year to the greatest extent possible. If that cannot be done, obviously there must be a carry-over into a subsequent year. That carries with it a financial penalty, as I have explained. At the recent sittings of the Federal Parliament the Commonwealth passed legislation enabling its share of that figure to be made available in this financial year. This Bill seeks to do the identical thing at State level. Our task is to get on and ensure that money is disbursed as quickly as possible. The funds will be called for as required. If it is necessary to carry over funds, then obviously that will happen.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I have listened with interest to the Premier's responses to the questions asked by the member for Light. In relation to the \$3 000 000 trigger figure required from the State for each natural disaster in each year, it is obvious that the State, for the balance of this financial year, is up for \$9 000 000 in total—that is, a \$3 000 000 trigger figure for each of the three disasters. If that is not the case, I would like that point clarified. This matter is quite important, bearing in mind the Premier's announcement of a couple of days ago that the Commonwealth had paid \$10 500 000 in the form of a grant.

If the figure of \$3 000 000 is only applicable once in each year to all disasters that have occurred in South Australia, and therefore only amounts to a total of \$3 000 000 payable by the State before it qualifies for a three-for-one subsidy for each of those three disasters, then the net figure the State is required to pay without subsidy is a one-off payment of \$3 000 000 and then, at the commencement of the next financial year, another \$3 000 000. That is not consistent with the natural disasters assistance schemes as they apply to rural industry Acts. Quite clearly, relief for primary producers under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, identifies and requires the State, for the purpose of assisting farmers in a time of drought, flood, fire or a natural kind as defined, to pay \$3 000 000 for each disaster in each year.

I do not know of any change to the interpretation of that Act since we left Government last year. Therefore, I would like the Premier to clarify what the new position is in relation to that Act. If the State now escapes the requirement to pay \$3 000 000 without subsidy for any number of disasters in any one year it is a hell of a lot better off than the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act outlines.

The matter referred to by the member for Light involving the funding for farmer assistance is really quite complex. I agree with the member for Light that details surrounding drought assistance to primary producers need to be clarified. For example, in a letter dated 27 April 1983 from the Premier, he identified the funds that were available within the resources and reach of the Department of Agriculture for the period 1982-83 to cover farm build-up assistance,

debt reconstruction and farm improvement during 1982-83, and that the figure of \$5 700 000 was budgeted for and that the figure was anticipated to be sufficient.

Indeed, on the first page of the Premier's letter he said that the funds available for the year 1 July 1982 to 30 June 1983 totalled \$5 700 000, that expenditure to December 1982 had been but \$2 700 000 and that the budgeted balance of \$3 000 000 was sufficient for those three purposes for the remainder of the 1982-83 financial year.

Therefore, farm build-up, debt reconstruction and farm improvement funding requirements through the Department of Agriculture were budgeted for and were on-stream (indeed, well within it). Further, according to the Premier's comments in that letter, they were deemed to be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair at this time has some doubts about whether the line of questioning now being adopted by the member for Alexandra is strictly dealing with a particular line.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: I am satisfied that indeed it is directly connected with the matter before the Committee, and I am sure that the Premier is also and that he will acknowledge that when he replies. Matters referred to on the second page of the letter that I received from the Premier on 27 April about this matter are very relevant indeed to the finances of the State for this current year and very relevant to the Appropriation Bill that the Premier introduced in the House within the past 48 hours, because indeed this matter concerns the distribution of assistance to farmers in the form of carry-on finance, frost damage, stock slaughter, freight subsidy, and all of those other things associated with a drought, and all those things associated with the sum of \$81 000 000 referred to by the member for Light. This is very relevant.

On the second page of the Premier's letter he identified the balances that were held for these given purposes: that \$3 200 000 was available and still held, as at 1 July 1982, within that Rural Assistance Division, together with a further allocation from Treasury of \$4 100 000, giving them \$7 300 000. Further, that expenditure to 4 February this year (that is, some eight months into the current financial year) had been \$6 800 000, and there was \$500 000 left over. I cannot relate that \$500 000 surplus in that division for the purposes that I outlined in response to the Chairman a few moments ago to a requirement for \$81 000 000, or anything like it.

Of course, there are other reasons, but it is those other reasons and those other details of expenditure outside of farm build-up, debt reconstruction, farm improvements, stock slaughter, levies, freight subsidies, carry-on finance, and so on, that have been made to primary producers during this disaster period since June last year to date that I cannot reconcile. I cannot correlate that detail to that which has been provided in this Appropriation Bill. Referring back to the \$81 000 000 identified as an additional requirement—quite additional to that applicable—

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is also pleased that the honourable member is back to the \$81 000 000.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The \$81 000 000 has been identified in three categories, including the matters that I have raised, and that is in regard to assistance to farmers in disaster periods. The sum of \$40 000 000 is identified in regard to drought, bushfires, and floods, and I take it that that is not only in regard to primary producers under the agriculture line but also in regard to all claims whether from primary producers, residents, householders, district councils, and so on. I hope that that point will be absolutely clarified. The document refers to gross payments for carry-on finance and other relief measures, and \$37 000 000 has been provided for flood and bushfire relief, and \$4 000 000 has been identified, apparently, as a short-fall in returns regarding floods.

Where is this expenditure identified? The member for Light has called for this information, and I would like a listing of the moneys expended as against what is anticipated to be spent to make up the total of \$81 000 000.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member has raised a number of matters. In regard to the \$3 000 000, I would have thought that the honourable member was a bit ingenuous: he has been a Minister of Agriculture and he would know something about these matters. The three disasters (drought, flood, and bushfire) have been equated as a natural disaster occurring in this financial year. The \$3 000 000 had already been achieved in terms of drought prior to the bushfire disaster, and it was simply added in. There was no requirement by the Commonwealth for a further \$3 000 000 to be identified separately and expended in regard to bushfires. The sum was taken up under the three-for-one funding on the basis of an overall disaster. It must be confined to a financial year, and that means that, if there is a carry-over, we could again be subject to the \$3 000 000 trigger on that group of disasters that are treated as one. Heaven knows what would happen if further disasters occur in 1983-84. It depends on the negotiations with the Commonwealth and the way in which the legislation is applied.

The honourable member could not relate certain figures because they are not really comparable. The provisions under the rural reconstruction requirements are separate from natural disaster relief arrangements. Some of the categories are similar, as are some of the causes, and perhaps there is a similar origin, but they are treated quite separately and are separately funded. At one stage the Minister of Agriculture took up with the Commonwealth the possibility of including the rural reconstruction type provision as part of a natural disaster arrangement. Instead of a 50-50 basis, it would have been three-for-one assistance, but the Commonwealth was not prepared to accept that. I believe I put that matter to Mr Fraser directly. Of course, there is some similarity, and obviously it all adds up to assistance to the primary producer, and that is fine, but it is separately accounted.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: In 1982 the Commonwealth agreed that drought affected stock and freight subsidies could be incorporated in disaster relief, and yet, according to what you have said in your letter—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly recall the submission that we made: it related specifically to the fires. I also know that that was the response we received. In relation to the \$81 000 000, the honourable member is right: it does not involve only loans to primary producers, although that bulks very large in that sum: it also applies to other costs, such as transport of fodder, fencing, restoration of public assets, and so on. There is a range of things to which these funds must be applied. The bulk of them is for assistance to primary producers by way of loan. In the case of the bush fires, probably 50 per cent would be going to that source.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The papers indicate that \$37 000 000 would be allocated for the bush fire disaster. I would appreciate the Treasurer's giving a breakdown as to where the \$37 000 000 is likely to be spent. How much is likely to go to primary producers, and to how many primary producers? How much is likely to go to local government bodies? How much will go to any other individual or group of individuals? As I understand it, the personal assistance, by way of a \$2 500 grant indicated by the Minister of Community Welfare, to each person who lost their house or part thereof is a grant which came from the \$9 300 000 public donation. I would appreciate a detailed breakdown.

I realise that the Premier may not have all that information, but I would appreciate his obtaining it. When a

once-off expenditure of \$37 000 000 on bush fires occurs, there is a need for this Parliament to have detailed information available. I do not want the names of individuals, but I believe we have a right to the total number of applications and total expenditure in each category as well as information on where funds are going. I am surprised that the amount is as high as \$37 000 000 and would like some justification on how the figure was reached.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot supply the honourable member with numbers and details of applications. At the end of the financial year, when the operation is over, that sort of information will be available. We will have some detailed accounts. At the moment we are providing for payments, and therefore best guess estimates are being made on what is needed. That is done by surveying in the field by various officers. In terms of the breakdown, as I indicated to the member for Alexandra a moment ago, something like half of the \$37 000 000 would be provided in loans to primary producers; that is, straight-out loans. In terms of restoration of public assets, about \$4 000 000 would be for the restoration of State assets and about \$1 200 000 for local government assets on present calculations. There is then a range of more minor payments. The payment of \$2 500 comes under a totally separately accounted fund of moneys raised by public appeal, being administered by a relief committee comprising representatives of the Government and some of the major appeal organisers, such as the Lord Mayor, channel 9, etc. All details are being published and are freely available. They separately, usually on a non-means tested basis in terms of some grants and for others in terms of means-tested hardship, are making supplementary grants to people who do not necessarily fit within any other categories. That amount of money is separate and additional to the \$37 000 000.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: In answering the question asked by the member for Davenport, the Premier referred to the Government and said, 'What we are doing is providing for . . .' We are happy to support the provision of \$81 000 000 for the three combined disaster areas. What is being questioned and asked is: where will it be physically as at 30 June 1983? We are aware that quite a lot of it is not going to be any possibility of handling, distribution or commitment as at 30 June 1983.

We are asking where it will be after 30 June 1983. It comes back to the question that I asked the Premier as to whether we are going to put some of these funds into trust accounts. If that will be the case it has the full support of members of the Opposition, because we want to see these people given every possible assistance. But, where will it be physically? Would the Premier have us believe that it will all be distributed by 30 June 1983? Against that, if we can come back to the present day, without asking for it to the last 10 cents, obviously, and within \$2 000 000 or \$3 000 000, how much money which is represented in this \$81 000 000 has been distributed for flood, drought and bush fire? What is the amount between now and 30 June which must be distributed or put away or whatever? We ask the Premier simply to advise us of what is to be done with the funds, where it will be appropriated (we are happy to appropriate it), and where it will be in this interim period.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thought that I had answered that question. I will try to answer it again. We hope that all of this money will be spent in this financial year. However, it may possibly not be, in which case we will have to carry it on into the next financial year. Where will that money be? The money is in two components: that which is to be provided by the Commonwealth and has been appropriated there by that Act which was passed at that sitting; \$58 000 000 is available and will be paid as required. We will not get a cheque for \$58 000 000 (I wish that we were; we could earn

some interest on it and thus boost the moneys that we had available to pay out). In the case of the State, an appropriation is being made, but that money, like the Commonwealth's, will be called on as required. We will attempt to pay out as rapidly and as efficiently as possible. A great deal depends on people getting their applications in and making sure that they are accurate in all particulars, and the pay-outs will flow from that. I cannot supply detail as to how much has actually been distributed as of today, but if the member is interested I will obtain it for him.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I am interested, although not to the last 10 cents. I accept the situation of the appropriation, that it has not necessarily been called in and is not in a bank account. That part is not in question, but I come back to the fact that it is inherent in statements made to the House by the Premier that this sum of money will be expended by 30 June.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It will be available for expenditure by then, if possible. That is what I have always said.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: We are moving now from the fact of its being available to that of its being actually expended. We are very keen to know that we are able to identify at the earliest possible moment this appropriation and the amount actually spent at 30 June.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is our hope to do so. But let us say, for instance, that only \$20 000 000 is expended for some reason. We still have identified needs or demands on present estimates for the further amount, and that obviously will have to be carried over to the next year. But, I stress again, let us try and get it spent this year when the people need the money. We are also cutting down on the financial penalty that we would have to incur.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The Premier in answering my earlier question gave details as to a very broad breakdown: \$37 000 000 for bush fires.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It would appear that the Premier does not believe that we have a right to question him on how he spends \$37 000 000.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am answering very carefully. Which one?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: If the Premier would listen I would like certain information. It is anticipated that there will be \$37 000 000 for bush fires of which approximately \$18 500 000 will go to primary producers. He said that, in addition to that, approximately \$4 000 000 would be for State assets and approximately \$1 500 000 for local government. That leaves \$13 000 000 unaccounted for. He did say that there was a list of other things, and I would like to know where that \$13 000 000 (which is a very substantial amount of money, for which he has argued so far that he will have to increase State taxes) is likely to be spent, and the breakdown of the individual items.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am reluctant to give precise figures because the figures themselves are not precise but are estimated—they may be under-estimates or they may be over-estimates. I can give the member those rough estimates, if he would find them useful (I am not quite sure why he would find them useful). I stress that they must be treated as rough and there will obviously be differences as between items—they may be larger or they may be smaller. This is our best guess at the moment, at a time when we have to appropriate and when we have money to expand.

I mentioned loans to primary producers being \$20 000 000. I mentioned the restoration of public assets at about \$4 000 000 for the State and a little over \$1 000 000 for local government. There are fencing costs at about \$2 500 000; transport of fodder at just over \$1 000 000; housing loans at around \$4 000 000; small business loans a little under \$1 000 000; personal hardship approximately

\$1 500 000; community facilities (loans for community-owned facilities that are not State or local government) around \$500 000; special Government costs (restoration work or whatever) around \$1 000 000. There would also be an added cost of the bush fire which is an estimated \$4 000 000 loss of revenue from the Woods and Forests. That last item is not included in the \$37 000 000. So we have actually a grand total of around \$41 000 000. If one adds up all those figures then one gets a total of around \$37 000 000 and that is the rough calculation on which we are working in these categories.

Vote passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, Miscellaneous, \$4 000 000.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I ask the Premier how far pensioner concessions have been extended and what are the specific categories of pensioner which were excluded from that assistance. I understand that supporting mothers, for example, are not included although that was one of the commitments that we had made when in Government. Are any other categories excluded from assistance, and what criteria are used in assessing the needs of those people as against the needs of the aged who are assisted under the community welfare assistance?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In terms of an announced categories, the Government scheme goes well beyond that proposed before the election by the former Government. As the spokesman for community welfare, I am somewhat appalled that the member for Mount Gambier has not got that information. There is, in fact, a detailed pamphlet setting out the categories and their eligibility, and I will arrange for my colleague, the Minister of Community Welfare, to send one.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I did ask what were the criteria being used in assessing the varying needs of the categories that were included, as against those which were excluded. They are all pensioners and, therefore, how did we come to the assessment that some need assistance and some do not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The criteria was a balance of need as against overall cost.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I wish to raise a point on behalf of the member for Morphett who addressed this matter earlier. I have looked at the criteria that has been laid down. If there is a husband and wife who are both pensioners, they receive the concession whereas, if there are two spinster sisters who live together who are both pensioners, they do not receive the concession and that appears to be a grave anomaly. On behalf of the member for Morphett, I ask the Premier or the Minister of Community Welfare to review that position, because it is a fairly serious injustice that should be removed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that the honourable member takes it up with the Minister of Community Welfare. He should put it in writing.

Vote passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$17 000 000.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As foreshadowed earlier, I would be grateful for the Premier's analysis of the factors making up that \$17 000 000 and, also, for his clarification of reports and statements by his Minister that the figure is greater than that. I refer to a statement in the *News* (19 January) headed '\$16 000 000 hospital deficit grows by \$2 000 000.' The lead paragraph states:

The threatened South Australian hospital deficit of \$16 000 000 has worsened by an extra \$2 000 000 because of an increase in bad debts.

Dr Cornwall stated:

Figures from the State's largest hospital, the R.A.H., showed that more than 30 per cent of patients were without health insurance cover.

The report then states:

The losses would be offset to some extent by the extra \$4 000 000 flowing on from hospital charges after 1 February.

That accounts for a slightly fluid situation in January and it would have been hard to have accurately forecast the outcome. However, on 11 April the *News* headline is 'Hospital deficit could hit \$20 000 000', and the report states:

The deficit faced by South Australian hospitals has worsened and could reach \$20 000 000 in this financial year. The threatened deficit reached \$18 000 000 in January, which was already \$2 000 000 more than the Government's estimate on taking office in November last year.

Further details were given and the following statement made:

The worsening deficit will be partly offset by the extra \$4 000 000 expected from higher hospital charges introduced on 1 February, but a \$16 000 000 deficit will remain.

The sum of \$17 000 000 is set out in the schedule. Can the Premier advise the Committee what has been the additional revenue from the additional charges and does the schedule correctly identify the deficit? What about the additional amount forecast? I refer to the reported deficit of \$20 000 000, give or take \$1 000 000 for journalistic licence. Further, what is the reason for the higher forecast as short a time ago as mid April of \$20 000 000 when the actual schedule figure is \$17 000 000?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was not clear from the second article whether the \$20 000 000 has to be reduced by \$4 000 000 to arrive at \$16 000 000; whereas the figure here is \$17 000 000.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Yes, but I wanted to know what was the revenue from the increased charges. What is that sum?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier is replying.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I was merely trying to clarify the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the member for Coles wishes to speak, she can do so when she obtains the call and not interject on a reply. I ask the Premier to reply.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The position is fluid, as the former Minister has said. As the former Minister, she would know that the figures can be revised almost daily: the differing returns from various hospitals, the large expenditures and receipts that are constantly occurring within the health and hospital sector, are subject to continued reassessment. The impact of higher hospital charges is obviously going to be a variable component, particularly in view of the problems that are being experienced with uninsured patients, as mentioned in both articles.

When this Bill was introduced, \$17 000 000 appeared to be the figure required and that is why it appears in the Estimates. At this stage it is the closest figure available. My second reading explanation outlines the elements involved. The overall figure of \$28 000 000 to be outlaid by the State is reduced to \$17 000 000 as a result of the cost sharing agreement. The rough estimate of about \$4 000 000 will remain unchanged at this stage. We believe that an appropriation of \$17 000 000 will be sufficient to take us through until 30 June.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: What component in that \$17 000 000 is due to bad debts, what component is due to staff increases and what component is due to the impact of the increased cost of living (which has the most impact on the health budget because it must contain increased costs for everything from electricity to food, drugs, laundry, medical supplies and many other factors which do not affect other departments)?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The only identified increased costs resulting from staffing levels and the inability of hos-

pitals to hold their originally budgeted staffing levels have resulted in the provision of an extra \$5 000 000, as detailed in my second reading explanation. The area we were discussing a moment ago, which represents a total amount of \$21 000 000 (also detailed in my second reading explanation), involves an increase in the number of uninsured patients receiving hospital care, a reduction in overall bed days utilised and, of course, uninsured patients are creating problems in relation to debt collection. I am advised that the Health Commission does not have a detailed breakdown of the figures involved in those two categories and neither does the Government. It is a cumulative problem and, in fact, it all relates to the same sort of problem. The sum total is of the order of \$21 000 000.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: What is the current level of activity in hospitals, which normally accelerate in the winter months with a consequential increase in costs? I refer to a letter to the Editor by the Minister of Health in April 1983, as follows:

There has been a slight drop in demand for inpatient/outpatient and casualty services.

I find it hard to reconcile the increased charges, which one would expect to offset any deficit (and admittedly the drop in demand could be seasonal) together with the fact that the Government has only been in office for six months. When the previous Government left office the Health Commission was running well within budget.

The week before the Tonkin Government left office, I was advised by a senior officer of the commission that the commission was running on Budget. The senior officer presumably—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Hadn't seen the hospital returns.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: My information was that a senior officer had consulted Treasury and had all the best advice available at the time. But, in the light of increases in hospital charges, \$17 000 000 seems to be an extraordinary over-run in the space of six months. I believe that the Premier owes the Committee an explanation of the components that go to make up that over-run.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sorry to disabuse the former Minister, but most of this over-run occurred in the period in which the member was in office and leading up to the election, and in the months or so after that. This Government has been able to rein it back quite sharply, because we took action, particularly in January, when we were appraised of the full impact and disintegration in the situation, to sharpen up and put considerable pressure on all those hospitals and components of the Health Commission to ensure that they somehow tried to come back to Budget.

Without that action this figure probably would have been double what it is. I do not know who the senior officer was who apparently did this detailed work and consulted. I can assure the former Minister that, whatever information she received then, when the detailed returns came in from the hospitals and when the detailed assessments of budgets were made, these costs had already been incurred. They were in place and were running very hard indeed within a few weeks of the Government coming to office. Indeed, they had been going on for some time. Far from being on budget, the Health Commission was disastrously over budget.

The information that the honourable member had obviously was inadequate in terms of its depth. I do not know that there is any great point in going into that, except to say to the member that in some way these over-runs occurred miraculously in the past six months. I can assure her there has been some considerable reining back, and it took place in consequence of over-runs that were taking place during the tenure that she had as Minister.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am left almost breathless by those extraordinary statements. How can the Premier say that he has reined back an over-run in the Health budget when his own Minister is on record in print as saying that, despite a slight drop in demand for outpatient and casualty services, the Government has increased staffing by 84 staff members over the past six months in terms of nursing positions and 47 in terms of medical staff positions. He calls that reining in.

I also ask the Premier whether he has forgotten that either he or his Health Minister (I think it was the latter, from my recollection) admitted that it was the prospect of a Labor Government that encouraged several of the teaching hospitals during the latter days of the election campaign, when they believed a Labor Government would come to office, to exceed their budgets—in other words, break out of the tight constraints that I, as the Minister responsible, had administered during the previous months since that Budget and, indeed, from the day we took office.

The Premier's own Minister is on record as saying that it was the prospect of a Labor Government coming to power which led to a prospective blow-out in the budgets for the month of November, but, for the month of October and for the months leading up to that, the commission's budget was balanced. So, I find the Premier's statement that the over-run occurred during the Tonkin Government term of office as being extraordinary. I find it equally extraordinary that, having said in Opposition that no additional charges would be raised and that his Government would not participate in any rip-off of the consumer, the Government, on coming to office, should virtually immediately increase health charges and then find that even that measure was not sufficient to contain the over-run of costs.

So, I refer the Premier to his own Minister's admissions within a month or two of coming to office, and he used those admissions of overruns because of the prospect of a Labor Government coming to power as justification for increasing hospital fees.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly, there may well have been an element of that involved in it. However, I do not see how the former Minister can thus excuse herself from administrative responsibility in that way. I find that extraordinary. In fact, if there were some overruns of budgeting in expectation of a change of Government (and that was a fact of life), the Minister was nonetheless in office and was nonetheless charged with the responsibility of trying to do something about it. Therefore, I do not see how, in the past few days of an election, all that much difference can be made. Certainly, there was probably an element of that in it. However, I really think that it is a most unproductive line, and it is quite extraordinary for the member to dwell on that. I do not really intend to pursue it any further.

Mr BAKER: I return to the figure of \$21 000 000, which is the estimate. I ask the Premier for a breakdown of the bad debts that have been accrued or are likely to accrue for the 1982-83 financial year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have pointed out to the member for Light when debate on the schedule began that under the Constitution we have to deal with it line by line. We are currently on 'Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$17 000 000'. Unless the member for Mitcham has a question or seeks information on that line, he is out of order.

Mr BAKER: I rise on a point of order. I am on the line of the Minister of Health. I talked about the \$21 000 000 which was quoted from the speech and which relates to the \$17 000 000 net figure that we have in these Estimates.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already answered that question.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In view of the serious situation outlined by the Premier and his Minister in respect

of bad debts in the hospitals, is the Premier satisfied that the accounting systems in the hospitals are satisfactory in terms of the accurate identification of the debts, in the first place, and the recovery of those debts? I ask that, particularly in the light of his Minister's statements last year before the Government came to office that the accounting systems in the hospitals were in chaos. Does the Premier believe that the accounting systems in the hospitals are in chaos and, if so, what action is he taking to overcome that situation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I believe that they are inadequate, and the Minister has taken considerable action in this whole area of hospital administration. It is currently being looked at in a number of hospitals. Therefore, the South Australian Health Commission, Treasury and the Public Service Board have moved in this area very rapidly. The situation is unsatisfactory. The Minister has taken action and is doing something about it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The particular criticism aimed at the then Government by the Hon. Dr Cornwall was in respect of computing systems that were due to be in place, up and operating well and truly by now. They were all but in that position when we left office.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There is nothing extraordinary about my raising this matter because I could, without any difficulty whatsoever, make the case that the Tonkin Government proceeded meticulously and vigorously to ensure that computing systems were in operation.

I do not believe that any Government, or any commission, could have taken more care to ensure that an extraordinarily complex and difficult challenge in terms of hospital computing was satisfactorily met. The fact remains that there was criticism by the then Opposition: first, that we were moving too fast and, secondly, that we were not moving fast enough. So, on the one hand we were acting too quickly, and on the other we were not acting quickly enough.

The computing systems, according to my memory of events, should have been in place and operating quite satisfactorily by now. If that were the case, and allowing for a lead-in period to get the systems operating and staff suitably trained, there should no longer be what is alleged to be chaos, and the inadequacy should have been largely overcome. Will the Premier advise the Committee whether these computing systems are now in place, whether he is satisfied that they are working satisfactorily, and, if not, what action he is taking in relation to this matter?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Minister has the matter well in hand.

Mr BECKER: I regret that it is taking such a considerable time for the Committee to obtain information. We are not getting much information. As I said earlier today, I take this as an important phase of the Government's legislative programme. We are dealing with the first Appropriation Bill introduced by the new Government at a time when the economy is at its worst. This is not the Government's fault; it is a matter of history. However, that is why we are endeavouring to obtain as much information as we can in an attempt to assist in rectifying this situation.

The money being allocated under this line amounts to \$17 000 000, which is to be transferred to the trust account to cover the net cost to the State of the South Australian Health Commission. It is interesting to note that as at 30 June 1982 there was \$153 318 000 in the trust and deposit accounts; at the end of September 1982 there was \$148 578 000 in those accounts; at 31 December the figure was \$132 266 000 and, as at 31 March, there was \$178 923 000 in those accounts. So, there was an increase of \$46 000 000 in the trust funds during the last quarter. Therefore, the balances in the trust and deposit accounts are increasing at a considerable rate.

I take it that there are sufficient funds in these accounts. However, I am concerned that the Health Commission now needs an additional \$17 000 000 allocated to it. I understand from the Premier's explanation that some bad debts have been incurred by various Government hospitals. I also understand, from what I heard on a radio broadcast in the past day or so, that a person claimed that he had received a summons for non-payment of medical bills and that he understood 9 000 such summonses for bad debts had been issued. How large is the bad debt component of this \$17 000 000? Has one, or all, of the hospitals issued these 9 000 summonses? I am alarmed at this number, but it does highlight the difficulties in the economy for those who need urgent medical attention provided by the public hospitals, which give care first and worry about payment later. I agree with this; it is something that they must do. Does the Premier have that information? If not, can he obtain it for us. I would like to know of the extent of the problem and whether there is any truth in the statement that some 9 000 summonses were issued.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I have suggested, the extent of the problem is quite grave, as indicated by both the Minister's public statements and the information given in the second reading explanation on the Bill. I do not have a breakdown on the exact amounts involved, as I have already indicated, nor do I have information on the number of summonses. I suggest that the honourable member either write to the Minister or check it out himself. I am not clear about the point that has been made about the trust deposits. Of course, there are many 'comings and goings' in any of those deposits, depending on when the money is paid in. The Appropriation Bill is dealing with commitment, that which is necessary to fund during the current financial year. I can assure the honourable member that in the current circumstances we are not seeking to appropriate more money than is absolutely necessary.

Mr BECKER: That is what I was getting at. There is a large build-up of trust money at present. I want the assurance from the Premier that money is simply not being transferred into the trust accounts now so that there is a buffer for problems that may arise in the future. I want an assurance that money is being allocated for purposes that are absolutely necessary right now. I am a little disappointed at the suggestion that I should write to the Minister of Health. I can do that, of course, but usually if the Treasurer does not have that information the Treasury obtains it for him.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That's a bit rough.

Mr BECKER: It is not rough. I think that the Premier should have this information, as he has made bold statements about there being bad debts.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr BECKER: I could well demand that. I am in a mood where I could just about not let the Government have some of this money. That is the way I feel about the whole situation. If bad debts are incurred in the Health Commission area or in the public hospitals and our Treasury officers are not concerned about the matter, they are not doing their job. The Under Treasurer and the Assistant Under Treasurer would be very concerned about the way the Health Commission has been operating and about the way other Government departments have over-run. If the Treasury Department is doing its job it would want to know whether the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals or the Flinders Medical Centre have large debts. I believe that there are Treasury officers who would be asking questions about why those bad debts have mounted up. That information should be within the Treasury. I would be disappointed to find that the Treasury did not have such information. In his explanation the Premier stated:

A further \$2 000 000 is likely to be required in this financial year for the settlement of past workmen's compensation claims which are being managed by the State Government Insurance Commission, as part of a new insurance arrangement entered into by the Health Commission from 1 July 1982.

I am concerned that the Government or the Health Commission must now find \$2 000 000. I would like to know how much has already been paid out in workers compensation and whether the spending of that \$2 000 000 means that it will now be the end of this saga. I would also like to know the number of people involved and whether one particular job classification of employees of the Hospitals Department is involved. I understand that it could well be the cleaners, the State Government Insurance Commission having recommended a new type of cleaning machine particularly for use at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but that the cleaners refused to use this machine, because with the current machines that they use it is quite easy to rick one's back and claim workers compensation. The new machines can be very easily operated with one hand, with finger tip control. It is a shocking allegation to make that people are injuring themselves on the job in order to obtain workers compensation benefits.

It is a bad situation when employees of the Government will not use a recommended piece of equipment to avoid workers compensation claims. I believe that these days cleaners are older, and that area is considered relatively dangerous in regard to workers compensation: there are a lot of injuries and accidents. All those things build up to a worrying situation, especially since the Health Commission is carrying its own insurance. The very department that should be concerned for the health, welfare and safety of its employees has not been successful in reducing workers compensation claims. It is an absolute disgrace, and it is embarrassing for the Government to have to come to Parliament to ask for \$2 000 000 to help prop up compensation claims in the health area. Fancy putting any employee in a situation where he could be subject to injury!

Over the years a lot of allegations have been made in this regard, and I am very concerned about the matter. How much research has been done by Treasury in this area? I believe it was found, when S.G.I.C. took over in this area, that some employees were receiving two compensation cheques. In other words, people had two jobs, and at one stage we on the Public Accounts Committee suspected that some people had three jobs. We suspected, for instance, that some people had a job in a factory, they were cleaning at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and spot cleaning at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The nurses quarters at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a seven-storey building, but only two storeys were occupied, yet it was stated that those unoccupied areas were cleaned. If a cleaner were to clean the area that was not occupied, he would be able to have a snooze.

It was alleged that some cleaners were subject to two claims, but S.G.I.C. was able to sort out that situation. Further, a lot of claims have been outstanding for many months, or even years. Thus, when people were called for further medical checks and specialist examinations, quite a few of them backed off from their claims. It is disgraceful that the Health Commission is not taking action to prevent the possibility of injury to people in its employ. I would condemn any employer who put his employees at risk. I am very worried about this matter and I would appreciate detailed information from the Treasurer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will see what I can ascertain from the Minister of Health in regard to the action that has been taken. The honourable member has made a number of allegations, and apparently he has undertaken investigations. This is not the time to refer to that issue in this way.

Much of what the honourable member said sounded like a grievance debate.

Mr Becker: I was talking about the \$2 000 000.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can assure the honourable member that action is being taken to ensure that the hospitals in this State are run efficiently and that wastage does not occur. It is in the interests of everyone that that does not happen. In the course of debate on an Appropriation Bill, I really cannot deal with the detailed matters and the allegations raised by the honourable member, and it is a little unreasonable for him to expect me to do so. I will see what information my colleague can provide on this issue.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As the Treasurer identified earlier, the health area is one of the most difficult areas in which to contain costs, partly because of the nature of the services provided and partly because of the emotion that surrounds the provision of health services, which can touch on every member of the community from birth to death.

That difficulty can be exacerbated if one side of politics chooses to use it in a political way and to indulge in what is described in the health services as 'shroud shaking', that is, creating alarm by virtually exploiting cases where care has been alleged to be inadequate in order to discredit the Government responsible for providing the care. The point of my preamble is to emphasise that the \$17 000 000 overrun in the health services which is occurring this year is likely to continue to occur unless careful and responsible steps are taken not only to contain costs which are occurring because of services presently established but also to consider the impact on the Budget of services which have been promised and which will develop in response to community need. In short, if new services are to be established without existing services being reviewed, the health budget is going to continue to blow out year after year.

On that basis, and in view of the Health Commission's report on hospital services in South Australia which was released by the Minister within the past two months and which recommended an overall reduction of 250 hospital beds in the metropolitan area, will the Premier, as a matter of policy, advise the Committee that no new hospital beds will be opened in this State without a concomitant closure of beds which have been identified as being excess to need in the metropolitan area? I refer particularly to the new beds proposed at Lyell McEwin and at Noarlunga and the additional costs they will impose on the health budget unless existing beds, surplus to requirement as demonstrated by lack of occupancy, in the Adelaide metropolitan area are closed. Can the Premier give that undertaking to the Committee?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It has nothing to do with this appropriation line.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I differ with the Premier. It has everything to do with this appropriation line. It deals with no less than \$17 000 000 extra which is needed for health services. It is abundantly clear to anyone who knows anything about health services that, if the kind of blow-outs that have occurred are permitted to continue (and clearly, as a result of the Government's proposals, they are not only going to continue but are going to get worse as numerous new additional services have been promised), this line not only is going to continue year after year but will become bigger until it imposes absolutely impossible burdens on the taxpayers of South Australia. I am saying that the South Australian Health Commission has identified an excess of 250 beds in the Adelaide metropolitan area—beds which should be closed.

As a matter of policy, the Premier announced before the last election that he would open additional beds at the Lyell

McEwin and Noarlunga Hospitals. In addition, he promised, quite properly, an expansion in various community health services. None of those things can realistically occur without imposing enormous additional burdens on the State Budget unless the Government takes action to close the excess beds in the Adelaide metropolitan area. The question is relevant to this line and is directly relevant to this line as it appears today and as it will appear this time next year, the year after and the year after that. Can the Premier give the Committee the undertaking that he will not embark on establishing additional hospital beds until he closes the equivalent number of unused hospital beds in the Adelaide metropolitan area?

Mr BAKER: In providing these Estimates, I presume that the Premier has followed a certain formula to arrive at the estimates of the over-run in each of these items. I know that we can all do our own budgets: we start off with the expenditure that we have incurred to date; we then look at any extraordinary circumstances that have affected the expenditure to date; we look at the seasonal conditions, we arrive at the components which have caused some deviation from our estimate, and then we arrive at a figure. In the process, we collect a number of figures, some of which are the components, where they should have been and where they actually are. We have not been able to get any detail on the health area today except those provided in the paper.

There are only two conclusions that one can draw: either the Premier has not bothered to find out what the components are, where the over-runs are, what is happening to the bad debts situation or, alternatively, the estimates are a stab in the dark. If that is the case, we should reject them as incompetent. If the Premier had looked at a number of speeches that were made in the debate he would have found that details would be sought on these matters. I would like to have seen some more information provided here than has been given. I ask the Premier: are the estimates a stab in the dark and, as such, incompetent, or has he not bothered to provide the necessary details?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Neither of those.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It should be placed on the record that the Premier declined to rise to his feet to answer the question that I asked about the Government's policy in relation to closing hospital beds in the inner metropolitan area prior to opening new and additional beds in the outer metropolitan area. This whole question is central to the issue of containing Health Commission budgets, not only this year but in future years. I ask the Premier again whether he will answer the question. If he will not, one can only take his silence to mean that he intends to guarantee an over-run in the health budget for the rest of his time in office. Right, confirmed!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have a further comment related directly to the opinions expressed by my colleague, the former Minister of Health. May I say that the Premier's reluctance to speak simply confirms a rather ludicrous statement made by the Minister of Health when he said in a country centre that that local hospital would have a major upgrading at low cost. Obviously, he is a magician.

Vote passed.

Works and Services (Payments of a Capital Nature—Woods and Forests Department), \$11 000 000.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The figure of \$11 000 000 that has apparently been promised by the Commonwealth is, I take it from the notes, to be paid directly to the Woods and Forests Department forthwith. Can the Premier then explain why in each of the three—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, it has already been paid.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN:—years (that is, 1983-84, 1984-85, 1985-86). Further down in the notes the Premier says that he does not anticipate receiving any revenue from

the Woods and Forests Department in any of those three years. Can we take it that the \$11 000 000, which may well have been available in ordinary circumstances from the Woods and Forests Department income and payable into consolidated revenue, will be otherwise used to repay that \$11 000 000 to the Commonwealth within or at the termination of the three-year loan period?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the member for Alexandra knows, the Woods and Forests Department is in fact a profitable operation when years are good. It was budgeted that it would return about \$6 000 000 this year and will in fact return nothing, and \$2 000 000 of that \$6 000 000 was obviously an over-optimistic assessment of the profitability of the timber industry and the return we were going to get. The other \$4 000 000 is accountable to the wipe-out of our forests by the fire. The \$11 000 000, of course, is going—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: What do you mean by 'wipe-out'?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: By that I mean that something like 20 per cent of forests in the South-East have been destroyed. The costs concerned in trying to salvage some of that are very great and that is what this \$11 000 000 accounts for. It would be shown in the Woods and Forests Department and until it repays that in whatever structured way is required, it will not be in the black again and will not be making a contribution to our general revenue. A lot of factors relate to that including a general economic upturn where that department could move into profitability immediately if it can get its timber on to the market and sell it. At the present time, as the member for Alexandra would well know, the Woods and Forests Department is going to be struggling to ensure that it salvages as much timber as it can and then finds a productive way of releasing that timber on to the market, financing the loans and making those repayments as well from its Budget.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: It is obvious that a lot of explanation is required by the Premier or the Director of Woods and Forests in this area because I find it incredible that the Woods and Forests Department this year is intending to make a profit (this is without the fire) of about \$4 000 000 in lieu of the earlier anticipated \$6 000 000.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It might have been even less. The fire has just simply—

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: That is the net result of the deduction made by the Premier that whereas in the Budget it was anticipated that it was going to make \$6 000 000 profit for payment into the—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That was the Tonkin Budget.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: It was \$9 200 000 the year before and then \$6 000 000 was anticipated for the 1982-83 year. That has fallen and there may well be good reasons for that to \$4 000 000. If that money is going to be absorbed in repayment of the \$11 000 000 loan, which is required for recovery from the fire—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: As the member for Mount Gambier quickly points out, the department would not even start to spend that money before this financial year was almost over. I cannot follow this.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It's the same as in 1981.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: It is a similar principle as the member for Light points out, to the other figure. In order to sort this out, can the Premier tell members how much the Woods and Forests Department will have expended between the fire this year and 30 June?

The Hon. H. Allison: The department has got \$4 000 000 profit and \$11 000 000, that totals \$15 000 000 and it has got to spend it pretty fast before the end of June.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The Premier said that it was anticipated that the Woods and Forests Department

would pay \$6 000 000 into the general revenue from its profit and that for reasons that are to be identified it will only pay \$4 000 000—but it will not be paying in anything at all because it will be meeting a repayment of a loan. The department will not even get around to spending any of that loan money.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a very curious approach to accounting. If we imagine the Woods and Forest Department as a company and that at the beginning of the year it was anticipated that it was going to make \$6 000 000. Market conditions and a major disaster—its factory or plant was burnt down which immediately affected its production and created other costs—meant that far from making \$6 000 000 profit it made zero profit.

Indeed, it was put in such a position that it had to raise funds, whether by shares or whatever, in the general market. The fact is that the department is not making any contribution in this Budget year to revenue, despite it being anticipated by the previous Government that it would be making a \$6 000 000 contribution. That is part of our problem with the deficit. As to the forest salvage operation, this is a special operation that has been worked out in conjunction with the Federal Government. It is an arrangement which any business would grab with both hands, especially the prospect of an interest-free loan to do this work. Without it, the results would of course have been calamitous.

There would have been widespread unemployment and closure of mills; the department would have effectively been put in such a position that its future effectiveness would have been curtailed severely and jeopardised. We believe with this forest salvage operation that it will not be and that it can come on strongly and take advantage of any increased market demand that there may be.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: This is additional labour. This is not the existing labour?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is in order to keep people employed in the department in a situation where there would be no work for them but for the forest salvage operation. It is as simple as that. I would have thought that the honourable member knows the position in the department. Perhaps if we could arrange some form of briefing for him it might be appropriate.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not need any briefing. I just wonder how the department is going to spend not only the \$11 000 000 that it has in an interest-free loan but also the \$4 000 000 that was going to be a reduced profit from the \$9 000 000 to \$4 000 000. There is \$15 000 000 that is to be expended in a short period. I can only conclude that, if that \$15 000 000 is to be expended—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Premier should listen.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: You should know what is happening: time is of the essence. The salvage project is scheduled to take about nine months; that is, about nine months from the date of the fire. Progress so far has placed about one per cent of the total estimated capacity of logs for Lake Bonney into that lake now, so nearly 100 per cent of the reclaimed logs are to be placed in the lake. Therefore, we can assume that the vast majority of the money to be expended in the salvage operation is still to be paid out.

It is now May. We have almost two months until the end of June in which to spend \$15 000 000. We were simply asking how that money will be spent. The salvage operation is important; it is important that that be achieved quickly. Time is of the essence because the timber will deteriorate and become unmarketable if it is not brought from the forests and placed under water in Lake Bonney, placed under irrigation or sawn up at the mills. All we are asking is how the \$15 000 000 will be expended: the \$4 000 000

that has not to be paid into State revenue and the \$11 000 000 that is being paid into the department by the Federal Government.

How will that be expended over the next nine or 12 months? Will part of that money be invested and return interest on an interest-bearing account, because it will not be expended completely in two months? The Premier is saying that most of the money will be expended quickly. The department will not be returning any money to general revenue for the next two or three years. Therefore, does that mean that the vast amount of money being expended now is creating work and that after that salvage operation the whole of the South-East industry is likely to collapse and the labour situation become even more acute than it was before the bush fire. That question and the Premier's response are really critical to the economy of the South-East.

We all realise the importance of salvaging the timber, but the Premier seemed to ignore also the fact that 20 per cent of the forests has been destroyed by fire and that 80 per cent still remains to be milled. There is still the possibility of long-term milling and, if that is so, the period during which the logs from Lake Bonney will be retrieved could extend beyond the three years that it takes to repay the \$11 000 000. The logs could still be coming from Lake Bonney in five or six years to enable the South-East timber industry to keep sawing timber that is still growing.

In other words, some salvaged timber and some growing timber will be brought into the mills together over a period of six years. The member for Alexandra and I would like to know how that money will be spent. How will the Woods and Forests Department repay the \$11 000 000? Will it be repaid year by year for three years or will there be no repayments for three years, waiting until full repayment is due in the third year? If the latter case will apply I find it hard to imagine that for the next three years the Woods and Forests Department will not be returning money to general revenue.

Will the department be making a contra entry and paying money into a trust account, drawing the \$11 000 000 and then paying profit back into the account so that in three years time it will be able to reimburse the Federal Government? I am wondering about the economics behind the borrowing of the \$11 000 000 and its repayment.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the honourable member's last point, it will be repaid in bulk when it falls due at the end of three years. Effectively, the Woods and Forests Department has the use of that money for the period of the loan. That is why it is being provided, and it will be expended for the purpose for which it has been given. Effectively, the Commonwealth is meeting the cost of the removal of trees from the forest and storage. That money is not available from other resources of the Woods and Forests Department. At the same time, the department's other operations are continuing. The department is incurring a lot of costs in cleaning up the forests and a lot of other ancillary work arising from the fire which must be done, including planting, and so on. That has swallowed up any possibility of gaining a profit or return from the Woods and Forests Department either this year or into the future. It is a total operation.

Obviously, the Woods and Forests Department must progressively devise ways within its budget of meeting its current needs and expenditures and repaying the loan at the end of the three-year period. Members will recall that a further \$22 000 000 is to be sought, with Commonwealth support, from the Loan Council in order to implement further phases of the salvage operation. The rate and detailed method of expenditure (how much on wages, equipment hire, and so on) will be determined by the Woods and Forests Depart-

ment, just as any other department, company or statutory authority does. The member need have no concern: the money will be used for the purpose for which it has been borrowed. If it was not, the Commonwealth would quickly call us to task.

Mr BAKER: As we have come to the last vote, I seek a point of clarification. A number of items were canvassed in the Premier's second reading explanation in relation to problems with the Budget. Am I to assume that the items that have not been included here today will be offset against the capital account—and I refer to an increase in wages and salaries of about \$14 000 000?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has been extremely reasonable during this debate. The line of questioning adopted by the member for Mitcham has nothing to do with this vote.

Vote passed.

Schedule passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (REGISTER OF INTERESTS) BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

There have been numerous attempts by the Labor Party in the past decade to establish a register of the interests of members of the South Australian Parliament and their immediate families. In September 1974 a private member's Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly to require all members of the State Parliament to disclose annually all sources of income in excess of \$500 received by themselves, their spouses and their infant children. The Bill lapsed.

The South Australian Government introduced a Bill on 30 November 1977 to establish a register of information relating to the sources of income and financial interests of members of Parliament and their immediate families which subsequently passed the House of Assembly in March 1978 but lapsed at the end of the session. On 22 August 1978 the then South Australian Government reintroduced the Bill in a modified form as the Members of Parliament (Disclosure of Interests) Bill. The Bill was passed by the House of Assembly in November 1978 but was laid aside in 1979 after amendments sought by the Legislative Council proved unacceptable to the House of Assembly and a conference of both Houses was unable to resolve the issue. The main problems revolved around the issues of who should be required to declare, what interests should be disclosed, and who should have access to the register of interests. In October 1981 the shadow Attorney-General reintroduced the lapsed Members of Parliament (Disclosure of Interest) Bill in slightly modified form. After protracted debate lasting many months the Bill was not passed.

The Liberal Party has previously refused to agree to any Bill which provides for the public disclosure of members' interests, an attitude out of keeping with developments elsewhere. The United Kingdom Parliament has had public disclosure since 1975 and the Victorian Parliament since 1978, but regrettably, although South Australia under a Labor Government was the first to propose such legislation, it has still not been enacted in this State.

The Labor Party believes that members of Parliament, as trustees of the public confidence, ought to disclose their financial and other interests in order to demonstrate both to their colleagues and to the electorate at large that they have not been, or will not be, influenced in the execution

of their duties by consideration of private personal gain. It is based on the Labor Party's belief that, in the exercise of their duties, legislators should place their public responsibilities before their private responsibilities.

In Australia in recent times, the Victorian land scandals have been the most obvious demonstration of the need for this kind of legislation and no doubt prompted the Liberal Government legislation in that State in 1978. The situation in South Australia at present is totally unsatisfactory. There is no obligation on members to make any disclosure. It is a poor argument which would claim that Standing Orders and the scant provisions of the Constitution are sufficient to make disclosure legislation unnecessary.

When previous Bills providing for the disclosure of interests have been introduced into this Parliament many of the arguments against them used by the members of the Liberal Party concerned the inadequacies of those Bills as compared with the Victorian legislation. The Bill now before the House is a modified version of the Victorian legislation. The differences are as follows:

1. No provision is made for a member declaring that he is not going to seek re-election to be thereby exempt from filing a return. A State election is not due for another three years and it is considered undesirable for a member to be able to sit in this Parliament without having made a declaration for such a long period.

2. The Bill provides for a member to make a declaration in relation to the interests of himself, his spouse (and putative spouse), and children under 18 living at home. More substantial declarations relating to spouse and children are required under this Bill than the Victorian Act.

3. Provision is made for the register itself to be open for public inspection as well as the publishing of a Parliamentary paper containing information from the register.

4. Provision is made for a wrongful publication of any information derived from the register or comment on such information to attract a penalty of \$50 000. Where a contravention occurs in Parliament and the statement would therefore be covered by Parliamentary privilege, provision is made for such a breach of the Act to be a contempt of Parliament.

The disclosure of interests by members of Parliament is a desirable and necessary step if the public are to be confident that their elected representatives are discharging the public duties without bias or the influence of personal gain. It is recognised by this Government that public servants and members of statutory authorities with influential positions should also be required to declare their financial and other interests. To this end proposals for obtaining declarations from people such as these are being examined. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides definitions of expressions used in the measure. Under the clause, the members of the family of a person required to disclose information under the measure are to include a spouse (including a putative spouse within the meaning of the Family Relationships Act) of the person and any child of the person who is under the age of 18 years and normally resides with the person. The clause provides that the Clerk of the House of Assembly is to be the Registrar for the House of Assembly and the Clerk of the Legislative Council Registrar for that House. The meanings of other expressions used in the measure will be explained as the expressions appear in subsequent clauses.

Clause 3 provides for the lodging of returns by each member of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. Under the clause every person who is a member on the first of September 1983, must, before the end of that month, submit to the Registrar a return referred to as a 'primary return', the required contents of which are set out in clause 4. Under the clause, every person who becomes a member of either House after the first of September 1983, and was not a member within the preceding period of 90 days must, within 30 days after taking and subscribing the oath or affirmation as a member, submit to the Registrar a primary return. Finally, the clause requires that every member must, on or within 60 days after 30 June 1984 and each succeeding year, submit to the Registrar a return that is an ordinary return in the terms of clause 4.

Clause 4 provides that a primary return must be in the prescribed form and contain the following information:

- (a) a statement of any income source that the member required to submit the return or a member of his family has or expects to have in the period of 12 months after the date of the return ('income source' being defined by clause 2 to mean a person or body of persons with whom the person entered into a contract of service or held any paid office, or any trade, vocation or profession engaged in by the person);
- (b) the name of any company or other body, corporate or unincorporate, in which the person or a member of his family holds any office whether as a director or otherwise; and
- (c) the information required by subclause (3).

The clause provides that an ordinary return must be in the prescribed form and contain the following information:

- (a) where the member or a member of his family received, or was entitled to receive, a financial benefit during any part of the return period—the income source of the financial benefit ('return period' being defined by clause 2 as the financial year preceding the lodging of the return, except where the previous return was a primary return, in which case, it is the period from the date of that return up to the end of the financial year; and 'financial benefit' being defined as any remuneration, fee or other pecuniary sum exceeding \$500 received in respect of a contract of service or paid office, or the total of all remuneration, fees or other pecuniary sums received in respect of a trade, profession or vocation where that total exceeds \$500);
- (b) where the member or a member of his family held an office as a director or otherwise in any company or other body, corporate or unincorporate, during the return period—the name of the company or body;
- (c) the source of any contribution in cash or kind of or above the amount or value of \$500 (other than from the State or a public statutory body or a person related by blood or marriage) to any travel undertaken by the member or a member of his family beyond the limits of South Australia during the return period;
- (d) particulars of any gift of or above the amount or value of \$500 received by the member or a member of his family during the return period from a person other than a relative;
- (e) where the member or a member of his family has had the use of any real property during the whole or a substantial part of the return period otherwise by virtue of an interest disclosed under subclause

(3) and the person conferring the right is not a relative—the name and address of that person; and

(f) the information required by subclause (3).

Subclause (3) requires the following information to be included in a primary or ordinary return:

- (a) the name or description of any company, partnership, association or other body in which the member required to submit the return or a member of his family holds a beneficial interest;
- (b) the name of any political Party, any body or association formed for political purposes or any trade or professional organisation of which the member is a member;
- (c) a concise description of any trust in which the member or a member of his family holds a beneficial interest and any discretionary trust of which the member or a member of his family is a trustee or object;
- (d) the address or description of any land in which the member or a member of his family has a beneficial interest other than by way of security for any debt;
- (e) any fund in which the member or a member of his family has an actual or prospective interest to which contributions are made by someone other than the member or a member of his family;
- (f) where the member or a member of his family is indebted to another person (not being related by blood or marriage) in an amount of or exceeding \$500 the name and address of that other person; and
- (g) any other substantial interest whether of a pecuniary nature or not of the member or a member of his family of which the person is aware and which he considers might appear to raise a material conflict between his private interest and the public duty that he has or may subsequently have as a member.

Subclause (4) provides that a member is not required to include in an ordinary return information included in a previous return. Subclause (5) provides that a member may at any time notify the Registrar of any variation in the information relating to him in the register. Subclause (6) provides that a member may include in a return such additional information as he thinks fit. Subclause (7) provides that a member may disclose the information required in such a way that no distinction is made between that relating to himself and that relating to members of his family. Subclause (7) provides that disclosure is not required of the actual amount or extent of any financial benefit, gift, contribution or interest.

Clause 5 requires each Registrar to maintain a register of members' interests and to enter in it all information furnished to him pursuant to the measure. Under subclause (2), a Registrar is to make the register maintained by him available for public inspection. Under subclause (3), each Registrar is, after his receipt of returns, to prepare a statement setting out the information in the register relating to the persons lodging the returns and to lay the statement before the House of Parliament for which he is Registrar.

Clause 6 provides that a person is not to publish (whether in or outside Parliament) any information derived from the register or statements unless the information is a fair and accurate summary of the information in the register or statement and is published in the public interest. The clause also prohibits such publication of any comment on the information in the register or statements unless the comment is fair and published in the public interest and without malice. Subclause (3) provides that any such publication

that occurs within Parliament is to constitute a contempt of Parliament. Subclause (4) provides any such publication made by a person outside shall be an offence and attract a penalty not exceeding \$50 000. Clause 7 provides that a wilful contravention of any of the requirements of the measure (other than clause 6) is to be a summary offence punishable by a penalty not exceeding \$5 000. Clause 8 provides for the making of regulations.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 May. Page 1055.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports this Bill. It is a Bill which traditionally is supported by both sides of the House because it provides for Supply to the Public Service during the interim period of time from 1 July in any year until such time as the major appropriations for the year can be considered. Although I indicate that the members of the Opposition support the Bill, it would not be right for the Premier or anybody else to believe that the Opposition is merely accepting it out of hand.

There is a great regret that there are one or two questions which we believe to be quite vital in respect of the sums which the Premier has done in relation to this matter. The Premier has indicated that there is an appropriation of \$320 000 000, a \$3 000 000 increase over what was appropriated last year, that appropriation having been \$290 000 000. The Premier indicates that that is approximately a ten per cent increase.

We are not quibbling about the slight variation from the 10 per cent. What I would like to know (and I am sure that other members of the Opposition and the public generally would want to know) is the basis on which the Government saw fit to write in a 10 per cent increase. Is it a reflection of its belief as to what will take place in respect of wage escalation? Is it a forerunner of advice to this House and to the people of South Australia that the Government wants no part of a continuation of the wage pause, which was the sum result of the recent national summit? Is it an indication that the Government will abandon attempts to control finance?

I do not want to suggest that the Government will be irresponsible in respect of financial management, because it is such a critical area and one which is under scrutiny from the Commonwealth scene as well as the State. Indeed, the word has gone out to local government from both the Commonwealth and the State that it, too, should be very careful as to what sort of costings and programmes it prepares for the next 12-month period.

However, the acceptance of a 10 per cent increase over the amount of last year would certainly accommodate some of the increases which took place before the recent wage freeze. Is it a realistic figure, having regard to some of the pressures on the industrial scene from the likes of the Builders Labourers Federation and others? Certainly, statements have emanated from the Public Service Association that it will not be satisfied with a continuation of the freeze and it will not be satisfied, in some circumstances, until there has been an adequate catch-up. It is on that basis that the Opposition would like additional information.

We recognise that the clauses of the Bill are precisely the same as those normally presented to the House in particular, the one which provides that no sum of money may be applied beyond the amount applied in the last full Budget,

that is, in the full Budget to 30 June 1983. This prevents any wild cat schemes or new initiatives being taken by the Government prior to a proper consideration in the full budgetary context.

That is a safeguard which has always existed and one which is quite important for the future. On that basis, we will, on all occasions, support the retention of that clause as a must; otherwise there is the possibility of a Government undertaking new initiatives and then, when they are a partial *fait accompli*, coming to the Parliament and saying it has advanced those initiatives so far that the Parliament will have to let it have the funds to continue. That is not an option that should exist, either now or in the future and is a just reason why this subclause appears. It is not a matter that requires any real involvement during the Committee stage but does allow a scrutiny of Government activity at the point the motion to move into Committee is put by the Chair. I support the Bill.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is: that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, is it not the custom that once second reading speeches have been concluded the Minister closes the debate? The second reading debate has not been closed.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The motion before the Chair is: that this Bill be now read a second time.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I hope you are not going to leave the Chair so that the customary grievance can be claimed by both sides of the House. I rise by way of grievance as we move into Committee. It is not my intention to speak for an indeterminate time on this occasion. However, I think it would be wrong if members of the Opposition did not say clearly to the Government that they recognise that there is an opportunity for grievance at this time and that some members will be taking that opportunity. I want to put on record (and this has now been fortified in my mind as a necessity because of the circumstances that have arisen) that the Opposition, having risen to support the Bill for Supply and seeking answers from the Treasurer (quite legitimate answers relating to the questions of how the Government arrived at this 10 per cent increase, whether it is going to support a wage pause into the next financial year, or what percentage of inflation it is going to accept) failed to get those answers.

I recognise the fact that the Treasurer has been in the House for a considerable time this afternoon. However, I suggest that there was no need for him to have been in the House for anywhere near the length of time that he was here this afternoon. Had he accepted the legitimate requests of the Opposition for provision of information relative to the financial matters which were before the Chair, the whole matter of examination of these estimates could have been concluded, I suggest, in one hour.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I suggest that the Minister's suggestion was that the Premier, as Treasurer, would get the information and provide it. Regrettably, that offer was not made and there was a significant evasion through lack of understanding or lack of knowledge of the Treasurer in regard to the Estimates that he placed before the House for scrutiny. The Minister present on the front bench (Hon. R.G. Payne) and I have been here for a number of years. In fact, we entered Parliament on the same day, and we

would both recall that it has been the tradition that in matters as significant as Appropriation the Minister involved, and more particularly, the Treasurer, have gone out of their way to ensure that questions asked, whether from Government back-benchers or from the Opposition, have been answered. In cases where it was not possible for questions to be answered the offer was made to obtain the relevant information for the honourable member who asked the question. I do not want to belabour the point any further other than to say that the Opposition wants to place clearly on record its disgust at the failure of the Treasurer to correctly attend this place today to give consideration to Appropriation.

If circumstances should arise again where the Opposition is frustrated in its receipt of information relative to appropriation, it is quite conceivable that the length of time applied for deliberations this afternoon will be only a very small part of the total time that will be spent on another occasion until such time as the information is forthcoming. This is an important matter, as important as any other issue in the entire Parliamentary calendar. That is why I am speaking at present.

Part of the importance of Appropriation is that no money will be appropriated until the problems of public and the taxpayer have been aired. That is what we are attempting to do at the moment. It is important for Government members to realise this, particularly the Ministers who have failed to get their act together in any proper and co-ordinated manner—witness the debacle of being here on a Friday afternoon! They should be getting their act together if they want to appear credible to the public and if they want the respect of Opposition members and the public generally.

It is important to recognise that there are two elements here: those who sit on the Government side and those forming the Opposition. The presumption that members opposite are of no importance and that they will do as they are told and follow suit at the whim of the Government is completely foreign to the best interests of the Westminster System.

Mr Lewis: Or any democracy.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly. The Opposition offers its full co-operation to the Government but that is subject to the Opposition being considered an equal part of this Parliament in regard to responsibility within the Parliamentary system. This may be taken as a warning, one that I suggest should be heeded. In regard to discussions that took place earlier today and the recognition that the workload placed before this Parliament for three days this week and three days next week was unrealistic, already the Government is talking about the Parliament's sitting for another week early in June, which is a fair indication of how unreal the programme was, and how unjustified the Government was in believing that it could force the Opposition into submission so that the Government could simply walk over the Opposition, and roll on in what we consider to be an impossible way.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Without proper scrutiny.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Without proper scrutiny of legislation, as the member for Coles has indicated. It is important that every piece of legislation that is brought into this House is scrutinised properly. On behalf of my Leader and other members on this side, I stress the responsibility of the Opposition to scrutinise legislation and to pursue matters as long as necessary to air them properly in the public interest. That is the contribution that I want to make in a very positive way, and I indicate that, because I might not take the balance of my 22 minutes and because all members on this side might not air grievances, that cannot be taken as a lack of responsibility or desire on our part, or a capitulation, and I stress that.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I refer to the staffing level of the Newland Park Kindergarten. This is an excellent kindergarten and is attended by 55 four-year old children. However, six children between the ages of three years and four years, nine children who are five years old, and two special enrolments also attend that kindergarten. I found out that the Kindergarten Union, in assessing staff levels, bases the level on the number of four-year-old children and does not take into account the children between three years and four years, those less than four years, or those more than four years old. Certainly, it does not take into account special enrolments.

Based on the enrolment of 55 four-year-old children, there is one director, one teacher, and one half-day aide. The kindergarten lost an aide last year, and I wrote to the Minister of Education and asked whether he would look at this case carefully, because 17 pupils were not taken into account when the staffing level was set. One can see that it is totally inadequate that only two people are looking after 55 children plus 17 children, two of whom are special enrolments (in other words, those who require special help).

I asked the Minister to ensure that the guidelines for staffing allocation are broadened beyond the consideration of four-year-old children so that the other 17 children are also taken into account. I received a reply that I suspect was prepared by a bureaucrat in the Education Department: it did not tackle the issues involved. The Minister simply stated that it was his Government's intention to increase the staffing levels in kindergartens but that funds were limited. It was stated:

I am advised by the Kindergarten Union that the most recent rationalisation of staff conducted in October was very marginal in the case of the restoration of the half-day aide initiative to exist. However, in the light of existing priorities in the Budget set by the then Government it did not rate highly enough to be considered to receive a share in the limited additional funds released by the rationalisation. I note that enrolment for the kindergarten continued to be maintained slightly above the numbers required for the position to be restored. My Government has given an undertaking to improve kindergarten staffing ratios over the next three years.

Thus you may be assured that, should numbers at Newland Park continue to be above those appropriate for the current level of staffing, funds will be made available as soon as possible and in any event we will be providing additional resources in the next Budget, the first fully under the control of the new Government. In the meantime, I will ask the Kindergarten Union to closely monitor the situation at Newland Park in order that I may be kept informed.

The Minister has ignored completely the pertinent point that I raised in my letter to him—to allocate some staff to the 17 children not included in the basis for determining staff. I am more concerned about the 17 students than whether or not there are one or two students over the 55 level which would make them eligible for another half-day person. If we look at the other students, we would have no doubt about ensuring that at least one half-day aide, if not further staff, was allocated to the kindergarten. I again ask the Minister to relook at this issue and tackle the real issue of the 17 students who are not even taken into account in the staffing calculations and ensure that some staff are allocated for those 17 people.

The kindergarten is in the position at present where, if an emergency occurred and it was necessary for a staff member to go off and take someone to hospital, the situation would arise in which there would be no manning, or totally inadequate manning, of the existing children. I am sure that if we were in Government now the Minister of Education would look sympathetically at the question of the 17 extra children.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: There is no question about that.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I have had an assurance from the shadow Minister that that is the case. I am not complaining about the staff ratio. I am complaining about the basis for which these 17 children are totally ignored when staffing levels are taken into consideration. I ask the Minister to look at that, as I believe it is a very legitimate case, and I am sure that other members of the House would agree with me.

I am disappointed that the member for Newland disagrees with the point that I am making and is not sympathetic to the cause of the people at the Newland Park kindergarten. I am disappointed that he is not sympathetic towards the parents, children and staff of that kindergarten. I ask the Minister's colleagues (as the Minister is not in the House but away on a conference) to draw this important matter to his attention.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I rise to endorse the statements of the member for Light in regard to rights and responsibilities of the Opposition in Parliament to scrutinise all legislation, in particular, money Bills, in the interest of the people whom we represent. As the member for Light said, the opportunity exists for members to grieve as we go into Committee on the Supply Bill. However, it is not customary to do so. However, I am resolved to taking every opportunity that presents itself in this Parliament to raise issues of concern to the tourism industry. That is why I will be using the time available to me for that purpose this afternoon.

I wish to continue with the issue that I was addressing yesterday afternoon when time ran out: that is, the various problems which confront the hospitality industry in regard to the existing Licensing Act. I was using the Old Clarendon restaurant, winery, convention centre and motel as an example of the problems which could arise.

The Old Clarendon complex is unique in South Australia because it embodies in the one complex a number of visitor facilities. It has a superb restaurant—the Winter Garden—and a second restaurant—Gillards. It has a small winery (what might be called a boutique winery), a convention centre, a motel, and art and craft shops. It also has a bakery, and I believe that a small plant shop and nursery will shortly be opened. In all, it features a great diversity of facilities for the visitor.

Because of the diversity of its facilities and the nature of its operation, the Old Clarendon complex has faced since its opening 19 months ago considerable difficulties because of licensing restrictions. If, of course, the complex were to be successful in its application for a tourist facility licence, some of those difficulties would disappear. Nevertheless, I highlight those difficulties because, as the Government approaches its review of the licensing legislation, all members of this House need to be made aware of some of the present difficulties.

Because the Old Clarendon holds a limited publican's licence and a wine licence, it is restricted in the amount of wine which it can sell on a Sunday. Because Old Clarendon is a tourist facility, its busiest time of operation is at the weekend, and yet its licence permits it to sell only a single bottle of wine to take away on a Sunday. On every other day of the week it can sell as many bottles as the customer wants.

In addition, the licensing situation at Old Clarendon means that they cannot sell beer in the Wintergarden, which is a very popular and well-patronised restaurant. The complex would have found difficulty if it had operated with a licence that would have enabled it to sell beer because they would have been required to sell meals with the beer that they sold. During the weekend, and indeed during the week, they want to provide visitors with the opportunity simply to

come in and have a drink without necessarily buying food to go with it—to taste a glass of wine—so in various respects its operation is not facilitated by the existing licensing laws.

These difficulties are very difficult to explain to the visitor who drops in during Sunday afternoon, who tastes wine with, perhaps, cheese and biscuits and thinks, 'I would like to buy half a dozen of that particular wine to take home with me,' fronts up to the bar and is told, 'I am sorry, Sir or Madam, you cannot; our licence permits us to sell only one bottle.' Obviously, the disabilities arising from that have a limiting effect on wine sales.

The complex at the moment carries three licences: as I said, a vigneron's licence for the sale of wine, a limited publican's licence and a wine licence. These issues certainly need to be addressed by the Government when it reviews the Licensing Act.

I raise the question of Old Clarendon simply because it exemplifies the growth in employment and opportunity which comes to a district when an excellent tourist facility is opened there. Members may be interested to know that since Old Clarendon opened 19 months ago it has developed to the point where approximately 3 000 people per week visit the complex. They serve 1 700 meals. They are open seven days a week, 24 hours a day, of course, in respect of the motel side of the operation.

The complex has, as I said, various services provided, and for those services they have to employ various categories of staff. They have the bakery, with staff who can both cook and serve the baked goods; they have kitchen, reception and management staff. This variety and diversity of services has developed opportunities for no fewer than 75 people to find employment in a small country town where 19 months ago no such opportunity for employment existed.

Of the 75 staff, 30 members are full time. When one looks at what can occur and the economic benefits that can accrue from a development like Old Clarendon in the comparatively short space of 19 months, one realises what enormous potential there is for economic development and employment in tourism.

The relationship of Old Clarendon with the Fleurieu Peninsula region is interesting, because Old Clarendon has adopted the admirable policy of trying to ensure that people visit not only that complex but also other facilities in the region. If motel guests are staying for one or two nights at Old Clarendon, the staff will take active measures to encourage them to take day trips to nearby wineries, or perhaps wineries further afield, to visit other tourist facilities and really get to know the region.

This has boosted visitation considerably. In fact, the South Australian figures for growth in the regions visited using the number of visitor nights as a base was that the Fleurieu Peninsula region increased its visitation from 1 262 000 visitor nights in 1980-81 to 1 443 000 visitor nights in 1981-82—a growth of 14.3 per cent, which is a very significant growth. That growth, of course, would have been caused partly through the opening of Old Clarendon, partly through the opening of the Hazelmere Estate of the McLaren Vale motel and of other new accommodation and visiting facilities on the Peninsula.

The point that needs to be made is that some of those operators are experiencing difficulties not only with the licensing laws but also with local government regulations. If we are to enable them to expand further and create additional employment and economic activity, we must take action at the State Government and local government levels to ensure that those disabilities are removed and that development can take place in a controlled way but without hindrance of the kind which is presently being experienced.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources):
I move:
That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.
Motion carried.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources):
I move:
That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 10 May at 12 noon.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): I put the question: all those in favour say 'Aye', against say 'No'. I declare it carried.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. If I am not mistaken, the prerogative for the declaration of the opinion of the House is determined only at a time when a division is called and the results known. I understand from previous practice that it is normal for the Speaker to say that he believes that the Ayes have it or he believes that the Noes have it, and leaves it to the House to test the assessment that he has made. I ask for your ruling on that, Sir.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You bloody—

Mr LEWIS: I take a further point of order. I take exception to the remark which was made by the Member for Elizabeth.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member will sit down, I will take his first point of order. I do not uphold that point of order. I accepted the sense of the House, and that is how I declared it.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a further point of order. I ask that the interjection, which was a term of personal abuse directed at me by the member for Elizabeth, be withdrawn.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear the interjection and I am asking the honourable member to tell me what you are asking to be withdrawn.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Yes, let's get it in *Hansard* properly.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Acting Speaker, I regret that the Chair finds itself incapable of hearing such abusive unparliamentary language. I will not give the terminology used any greater credence or permanence in the record and I will seek, if it is included by interjection, to explain it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking the honourable member to resume his seat. I cannot accept the point of order because I did not hear the interjection. The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): If ever there were a need for a school for politicians, the last two days have proved it. It is about time that someone taught politicians how to behave.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: The second point that I would like to make is that I believe that it is high time we considered a more equitable situation in regard to the sittings of the House. I would like the Government, and especially the Deputy Premier, to consider that Parliament sits on three days a week from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. In that way we could sit for 21 hours a week. Currently, the House sits from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. and from 7.30 p.m. to 10 p.m., and we are covering 17½ hours a week.

Mr Peterson: Move a motion.

Mr BECKER: In future, as the member for Semaphore says, we should move a motion on that matter. Certainly, we will give that consideration, and I will be pleased to have his support. The other situation is that there is a dispute as to how much time has been spent on certain financial matters this week. All this could have been avoided if we had formed a joint legislative or Budget committee, or if we had a House of Assembly Budget Committee. I want to use this debate to bring to the attention of Parliament

the annual report of the Legislative Analyst in the Californian Parliament. I obtained this report when I was in Sacramento in June 1981. It deals with the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, and I will refer to this explanation to give members some idea of what we could do. The report states:

The Joint Legislative Budget Committee, created by sections 9140-9143 of the Government Code and Joint Rule 37, is composed of seven members of the Senate appointed by the Senate Rules Committee and seven members of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker. During 1979-80, Senator Jerry Smith left the committee and was replaced by Senator Bill Greene. The current members of the committee are listed on the title page of this report.

Legislative Analyst: Chart 1 shows how the Legislative Analyst's Office is organised. The staff is divided among nine operating sections, each of which is responsible for a specific subject area. Each section is headed by a Principal Program Analyst who is responsible for training and supervising the work of the staff. Management of the office is provided by the Legislative Analyst, a chief deputy, and two deputies responsible for Bill analysis and Budget analysis, respectively.

I will not go into the finer details in that respect but, if any member is interested in the report, I have several of them. The staff activities set out on page 3 of the report are more interesting, as follows:

The seven principal functions of the office are to:

1. Analyse the Governor's Budget—

that would be the State Government Budget—

2. Analyse all Bills heard by the two fiscal committees,

3. Respond to inquiries from members of the Legislature,

4. Prepare reports on Budget and fiscal issues,

5. Analyse proposed changes to the approved Budget programme submitted under control section 28 of the Budget Act,

6. Prepare joint estimates with the Department of Finance on the State and local fiscal effects of proposed initiatives, and

7. Analyse ballot measures.

Budget Analysis: The principal report of the Legislative Analyst Office is the analysis of the Budget Bill, which is prepared in December and January of each year and is printed and distributed in February. This document is used by staff of the analyst's office and the Legislature during hearings on the Budget conducted by subcommittees of the two fiscal committees between February and May each year.

This could come under the umbrella of the Public Accounts Committee; or we could have a House of Assembly or Joint House Budget Committee. In any case, any financial legislation should be dealt with by a Parliamentary committee which could conduct the research and contact the respective organisations involved in and affected by the legislation. Such a committee could also cost out the impact of the legislation and supply a financial impact statement. I believe that would cut down some of the unnecessary trivia that goes on in this Chamber. I believe the time has come when Parliament must make greater use of the committee system, and this would be one of the best ways of doing that. I believe that, when it comes to the Budget or any financial document, the system must be improved. In actual fact, it should be streamlined.

Every member of Parliament should be able to go to a special office or use a special committee of Parliament to obtain financial information at any time. I know that both the present Labor Government and the Liberal Party support open government as a matter of principle. The Liberal Government was most generous in its supply of information to the Opposition. In fact, I often felt that members of the Opposition knew far more than did Government members. Far more information was readily available to Opposition shadow spokespersons on various subjects.

The Government should take further steps to ensure that all members of Parliament receive an equal distribution of information. It is not good enough that members of the Government can quietly approach the Minister and obtain confidential information while Opposition members are kept in the dark. Opposition members must obtain information

by asking questions in the House (and that opportunity arises only once every two weeks at the moment), through Questions on Notice (which take months to be answered) or by writing a letter to the Minister concerned. I have found that the new Government is taking up to three or four months to reply to correspondence. That is just not good enough.

In all the years that I have dealt with Labor Governments I have found that the Minister who was most prompt and efficient in relation to answering correspondence was the former Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr Chatterton. Mr Chatterton was the only Minister who would reply within a week, and certainly within a fortnight. I was very disappointed when I learnt of his resignation. Although I did not have much occasion to write to him, I found that the former Minister of Agriculture never held back any information from me. As a city member of Parliament I did not have to write to him very often, but I found him to be effective and efficient. I am sorry that some of the current Government Ministers are not as effective.

As a matter of fact, a constituent has informed me that he wrote to the Premier in early December and received an 'instant' reply two weeks ago. He telephoned the Premier's Department to obtain more information and was informed that the bush fires had intervened and that the department was flat out. Remembering that the bush fires occurred in the middle of February, I cannot see how they held up the reply to a letter written in December. There is no doubt that the administration of the Premier's Department needs a great shake-up. In fact, it can almost be said that it is coasting along. Certainly, the administration of some of our Government departments needs a fair sort of shake-up.

We have also had a lot of debate and discussion on the over-runs of the various Government departments. Of course, I believe that the Public Service has stepped in and taken control of the Government. That is why I believe that, if a legislative analyst operated within the realms of the Parliamentary structure, much time and effort could be saved. Certainly, the principles of open government would be enhanced, and it would mean that an independent person would be operating between the Public Service and members of Parliament.

There is no doubt in my mind that there are certain public servants employed at a very high level by this State who make sure that it is in their interest to provide the least amount of information they can, not only to the Government of the day but to politicians in general.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I rise on this occasion and once again I find that I have to defend what I believe is the importance of this institution and its capacity to ensure the survival of and respect for the rule of law and order in the broader community, before I can address myself to those particular questions that arise from that broader community where, in part, I represent it in the electorate of Mallee.

I am appalled at the way in which the House has been conducted by the Government during the course of sittings this week. The former member for Unley used to refer to some members in this Chamber during the time that he was in here, perhaps in jest or perhaps seriously (I do not know: I have never asked him) as either 'rubber ducks' or 'Mickey mice'. Of course, it would not surprise me if, one day, I see a complete line-up of such people in the Chamber opposite me, judging by the kind of behaviour that I have seen and have had to be subjected to during this week. It brings me to the point that has been made to me by a number of my constituents this week about the way in which the Parliament is conducting itself. I have had to explain to them that it is not the Parliament that is conducting itself in that way: it is the Government and the

members of the Government. I have had to break engagements which I had made in the course of consultation with members of the communities I represent in order to carry out what I regard as my prime duty and responsibility as a member of Parliament, that is, to be here in the Parliament when it is in session.

As the members for Hanson and Light have pointed out, the way in which the Government has conducted the affairs of Parliament in this Chamber this week is worthy of the highest contempt and deserves the greatest criticism, compared to any week's sittings in which I have participated since being elected to this place. Unless the Government realises fairly quickly that the general public is increasingly cynical about the relevance of this Chamber and the way in which its affairs are conducted, we can expect them in increasing numbers to continue to say that Parliament is a waste of time and an expensive piece of theatre.

The decisions made are not made here: they are made behind locked doors. They are not made in the same way by members of the Liberal Party as they are by members of the Labor Party.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That is rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: No member of the Liberal Party is bound in any way to do any particular thing. If a member decides to do what his conscience dictates, then he shall be personally responsible for that.

Mr Klunder: They just happen to think together.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: If that is so, it is a matter of judgment for them. On the other hand, every member of the Labor Party knows that, if he breaches a Caucus decision taken behind locked doors, he is automatically, without further consideration of the question, expelled from the Party. In view of that fact, it is understandable that we have the kind of behaviour from members opposite when this place is sitting.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I request that the words used by the member for Unley be taken down under Standing Order 167.

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear any words.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Unley referred to me as 'a rubber duck', and I take exception to that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He is perfectly entitled to ask that those words be taken down. However, I did not hear them. What did the member for Unley say, in fact?

Mr MAYES: The member for Mallee is completely correct in what he said. I said he is not a rubber duck.

The SPEAKER: Order! Under those circumstances, I cannot uphold the request.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. Apparently, the member for Mallee wants to admit that he is a rubber duck.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are at the end of a very long and difficult week and I ask members on both sides of the House to let the honourable member for Mallee put his case and his grievance before the House. The honourable member for Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: That remark serves to confirm the concern I am expressing to the Chamber: it illustrates the attitude of Government members to their conduct and to the Government's conduct in this Chamber, given the levity with which they are treating the concern I am drawing to their attention. It is reflected to me, so I reflect it to the Parliament. I do not like the way in which members of the general public in the district of Mallee point out to me that this Parliament is not working in a way that they would expect it to be capable of working to serve their interests and the interests of other people who believe in a democratic Parliament.

I support the remarks made by the member for Light. It concerns me that the Treasurer was unable, or unwilling (or both), to give specific answers to the questions he was asked during the Committee stage of this debate. Accordingly, he wasted the time of this Parliament this afternoon. It has been an extraordinary afternoon's sitting anyway.

I now refer to clause 4 of the Bill, because I want the Government to know that I do not consider that by approving this clause the Opposition agrees (or at least that I agree) that the Government is entitled to allow the guidelines of the wages freeze presently in force to be broken. It cannot be taken, nor will I agree at any time that it can be quoted, as indicating that members of the Opposition or I think that those guidelines can be breached blatantly or that it can be thrown back at us that we agreed to such a course of action by passing this Bill. Clause 4 (1) states:

No payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the moneys referred to in section 3 in excess of the amounts voted for similar establishments or services for the financial year ended on the thirtieth day of June 1983, but there may be paid out of those moneys increases of salaries or wages payable by the Government of the State pursuant to any return made under the Acts relating to the Public Service, or pursuant to any regulation, or any award, order, or determination of a court or other body empowered to fix salaries or wages.

If we agree to this clause and do not attempt to amend it to include the words that show our opinion on this subject is 'subject to and notwithstanding the guidelines of the present wages freeze', we are not agreeing that the Government has our support to break the wages freeze. I am not, anyway. I make plain to the House that, if any attempt is made by the Treasurer, or any other Government member, to quote that clause to us on some subsequent occasion, when, without the spine to oppose the Public Service unions, an increase per chance is granted outside the guidelines of the wages pause, I will deny that I ever gave that Minister that right or responsibility. I will make plain to my constituents that on this occasion I raised my concern about this clause being used hypothetically in that way. Let there be no doubt about that.

Such a clause is usually included in such a Bill, and is included on this occasion. Despite the fact that I believe that the Government at this time might be intending to stick to the guidelines of the wages freeze, nonetheless it may fail.

In fact, in view of the way Government members have behaved this week it would not surprise me if neither they nor the Treasurer realised that this clause was present in the Bill.

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to refer briefly to the effects on employment of the Government's decision not to allow the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium mines to proceed. Without a doubt this decision will have a great effect on future development in South Australia. There is no doubt that because of the Government's decision already a number of other mining companies have determined not to invest any exploration money in South Australia because they know full well that if, in exploring, any uranium is found, they will not be able to mine that ore. As a result, investment dollars are now going to the States where such decisions have not been made. Unfortunately, the number of States in that category is dwindling very rapidly indeed.

To support that point, I want to refer to various articles that show quite clearly that the new Government, which espouses that it is trying to do all that it can for employment, in one decision has shattered for many thousands of people the hope of obtaining employment. First, I refer to an article

that appeared in the *Advertiser* entitled 'Big South Australian uranium job loss', which states in part:

South Australia would throw away up to 4 650 jobs by turning its back on the uranium industry. This figure excludes employment stemming from the Roxby Downs project. Development of the State's Honeymoon and Beverley uranium deposits, a uranium conversion plant and an enrichment plant would generate between 3 750 and 4 650 new jobs through pilot, construction and full production stages and in related service industries. Roxby Downs, the future of which was secured by State Parliament last June, will provide an estimated 19 000 to 33 000 jobs.

That, of course, highlights the absolute hypocrisy of the Government: evidently, uranium mining at Roxby Downs is all right—that will not have any serious or deleterious effects anywhere—but uranium mining at Beverley and Honeymoon will have deleterious effects. If any member of the Government can explain to me why it is safe and perfectly okay to mine uranium at Roxby Downs, but why it is not all right in regard to Honeymoon or Beverley, I would be delighted if that member would care to do so during the 10-minute grievance debate (in which every member has the right to speak). The article continues:

South Australia is a rich uranium province. A uranium industry has the potential to generate several thousand jobs in exploration, mining and processing and in industries and activities that provide services to the uranium industry. A uranium conversion plant and a uranium enrichment plant would boost advanced technology in our State.

We now have a Minister of Technology, but obviously the Minister is interested only if technology is in certain areas. The article continues:

They would provide many jobs in precision engineering and opportunities for our work force to transfer their skills from obsolete or dwindling industries to new, high-technology operations.

'It would not all happen at once, but given quick, decisive action by Governments the uranium industry and mining generally could begin to play a major role in relieving South Australia's unemployment problems'. . . . while other countries mine uranium only Australia, Canada and South Africa have large reserves of high-grade uranium that they do not need themselves and could export.

'Meanwhile, 294 nuclear power stations are generating electricity and over 200 more are being constructed in over 30 nations in which three-quarters of the world's population live.'

How is it that the Labor Party only in Australia has got the bug that under no circumstances should uranium mining be allowed to proceed? Socialist countries throughout the world not only allow the mining of uranium but also allow the enrichment of uranium. They are building uranium plants to produce electricity.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: As the member interjects, the Government certainly does not care about the quality of life—the countries which do not have the fortunate advantages we enjoy in Australia. I have already placed on the record the tremendous effect that the decision of the South Australian Government is having on thousands of potential jobs in South Australia. So, just how sincerely does the Government wish to assist in getting jobs for people in South Australia? I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it, a purely statistical table from page 8 of the April 1983 issue of the journal of the South Australian Chamber of Mines which summarises many of the points which I have been making in relation to employment.

The SPEAKER: Do I have the usual assurance?

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

URANIUM PROJECTS	JOBS		
	CONSTRUCTION	OPERATION	SERVICE INDUSTRY
Honeymoon	Pilot stage completed	35 Pilot stage 70 full production	250
Beverley	100	100	400
Uranium Conversion Plant	200-300	200	600
Uranium Enrichment Plant	Up to 600 †semi-permanent	300-500*	900-1 500*
TOTAL	900-1 000	700-900*	2 150-2 750*
PLUS			
Olympic Dam (Roxby Downs)	9 000-18 000	2 000-3 000	8 000-12 000

† Uranium enrichment plants extend in modules enabling the construction work force to be employed on a continuing basis for many years.

* Depending on size of enrichment plants

Mr ASHENDEN: To indicate that the article from which I have just quoted does not stand alone, I refer also to another article that appeared in the *News*. Under the heading 'Nuclear Industry work for 55 000', based on a speech by Professor Ringwood, it states:

Participation in the international nuclear fuel cycle would have a 'substantial' effect on the Australian economy, a leading scientist said today. Addressing the South Australian Chamber of Mines, Professor E. Ringwood said a nuclear reprocessing plant and other facilities would command a 'ready market' all around the world.

'For a cost of about \$7 000 million, a reprocessing plant alone would generate 10 000 long-term high technology jobs and an additional 45 000 construction jobs over a five-year period,' he said. The Australian participation could involve mining, conversion, enrichment fabrication of fuel rods, reprocessing and waste solidification.

The article expands on the points made by Professor Ringwood. In other words, we have seen from those articles strongly supported evidence of points which the Opposition has made and which were also made by members of the present Opposition when in Government. I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that, when we are returned to Government after the next State election, immediate approval will be given for the development of Honeymoon and Beverley to proceed. I know that, unfortunately, it will come too late to help in regard to thousands of jobs over the next few years, but at least in the long term those jobs will be assured. At the next election, members of the public will have a choice: they can return either a Government that will allow those developments to proceed, which will provide the thousands of jobs referred to, or one that will continue to disallow something which occurs in every other country in the world and which is accepted and encouraged (again I make the point) by socialist Governments throughout the world—but not accepted in this country. Hopefully we will return to the mainstream of life and realise that the mining of uranium not only provides jobs but also provides a source of electric power which has resulted in far fewer injuries, fatalities or anything negative than any other system of electric energy production.

Again, I invite members opposite to stand up and explain their stance on this. Why do they say that they want jobs for South Australia and then turn them down? Why do they say that they want investment in South Australia and then chase it away? Why have they refused two mines permission

to go ahead, an action which will not only cost the State those jobs but also mean that recompense will have to be made to the mining companies? How can they explain this? How can they explain that uranium from Roxby Downs is okay, but from Honeymoon and Beverley it is not? I only wish that members opposite would stand up and answer those questions.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Issue and application of \$320 000 000.'

Mr BECKER: The information that I seek from the Treasurer relates to the amount of money now allocated, some \$320 000 000. I take it that in that allocation of money the State will continue to pay interest on the loan borrowings. On 29 March I put a Question on Notice to the Treasurer:

How is the current Budget deficit being funded?

The Treasurer replied:

By the use of general Treasury funds.

Another question was:

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

The answer was:

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

As the amount of money now provided enables the Government to carry on for the rest of the financial year and the commencement of the new financial year, how much additional interest is the Treasury required to pay on the amount of borrowings or short-fall on the recurrent Budget? On the latest figures I have for the month of February 1983 (I have not got the March figures, although I have the Crown funds for March), the excess of payments over receipts for the eight months ending 28 February was \$55 200 000. The Treasury has had to bear some very heavy borrowings, in the last four or five months at least, because of the excess of payments over receipts; this amount varies between about \$25 000 000 and \$50 000 000. This must have a tremendous impact on the interest commitment. Could the Premier, therefore, tell the Committee the amount of this interest component?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not have the figures to hand. I am not quite sure of the nature of the question, but

I will certainly seek the information requested by the member and advise him.

ADJOURNMENT

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 6.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 10 May at 12 noon.