

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 August 1983

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

PETITIONS: MEAT SALES

Petitions signed by 172 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat were presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon and Mr Olsen.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MARIHUANA

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation which will legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana was presented by the Hon. G.F. Keneally.

Petition received.

PETITION: RENTAL AGENCIES

A petition signed by 291 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to prevent rental agencies from charging people looking for a place to let any money except for bond and advance rent was presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WITHHOLDING TAX

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.D. WRIGHT**: In reply to a question from the member for Davenport yesterday, I indicated that the Public Buildings Department had informed me that an exemption from the new withholding tax would be granted to State Government departments. Officers of the Public Buildings Department have now been able to confirm that an exemption will be available with respect to all payments under \$10 000. This will reduce the impact on the department to a level manageable by existing Public Buildings Department staff and, accordingly, the cost to the department of implementing the withholding tax will be minimal.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1982-83.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on the Leader, I indicate that, in the absence of the honourable Minister of Community Welfare, questions for him will be taken by the Premier.

UNSOLVED MURDERS

Mr OLSEN: Has the Premier raised with the Police Commissioner the possibility of offering a pardon as a means of obtaining further evidence in relation to the murders of Alan Barnes, Peter Stogneff, Mark Langley, and Richard Kelvin? On 2 August the Government offered a substantially increased reward for information that would lead to the conviction of a person or persons responsible for those four murders. The Opposition, and I particularly, commended the Government for that action. I understand, however, from media reports yesterday that despite the increased reward the police have not been able to advance their inquiries in any significant way.

Honourable members may recall that last July, in the case of the murder of a woman at Beaufort, as then Chief Secretary, and acting on the advice of the Police Commissioner, I announced an undertaking to a man police were seeking for questioning that he would not be charged with any offence in connection with the murder provided he was not directly implicated in any way. It is possible that an announcement of an undertaking in this form, or of a pardon to anyone not directly implicated in these murders but who may be harbouring information about them, may produce some further evidence. Has this matter been discussed with the Commissioner, and, if not, will the Premier raise it with him?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Some time ago there was open discussion in the press about the appropriate means by which the particular offender or offenders (in this case it is the Kelvin murder, but since this others have been linked together) should be dealt with, and the question of rewards and pardons was raised in that context. I indicated then that the Government stood ready to respond to any approach that the Commissioner made in respect of those matters.

Bearing in mind that the police are the professional investigators in this area it has got to be their judgment as to whether or not it is appropriate either to offer rewards and indeed to suggest the sort of level of reward and, secondly, whether or not pardons are appropriate. So, that position is well understood by the police.

Let me say that I think it is most regrettable that the Leader chooses to raise speculation about this issue in this way in the public forum. It would have been far more productive if he had communicated his concern or his request to either me or the Chief Secretary privately. I will explain why. In doing so I would hope that the media would treat this particular question and answer with some sort of care. If the police are pursuing a line of investigation in any case (and I am not making any particular reference to the investigations in the cases at issue as I am not in receipt of any up-to-date information) into criminal activity and are attempting to follow up leads, it may well be that speculation about the possibility of a pardon being given causes persons who might assist the police in their investigations to hang back, to wait and see whether or not that sort of exoneration or protection will be offered. Now, in that case one could understand that if there is speculation about a pardon it could well impede the progress of inquiries.

That is why I stressed, when the matter was raised with me by the press some weeks ago (and I am very surprised that the Leader seeks to raise it again publicly in this way), that we must rely on the advice of our professional Police Force in terms of whether or not this becomes an issue. It is not desirable to speculate about it. At the appropriate time I would hope that, if the police feel that this is what is necessary to try to break a deadlock, or if all leads have been exhausted, they will come to the Government.

The Government, as I indicated, will respond to whatever request is made, but speculation about it could well impede

investigations. Therefore, I ask that this matter be dealt with a bit more discreetly and carefully. If the Leader has any future suggestions to make, rather than getting up at Question Time and asking a lead question about it in the full blaze of the public and press, I suggest he writes to me or contacts me privately, and I will be quite pleased to talk to him about it.

STEEL INDUSTRY PLAN

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Premier draw to the attention of the Prime Minister during his proposed discussions tomorrow the reported attitude of the Manager of B.H.P., Whyalla, in respect to the assistance to the B.H.P. steel industry proposed by the Federal Government? In so doing will he request the Federal Government to have further discussions with B.H.P. and that if the proposed assistance will not help Whyalla, then that assistance be withdrawn or reappraised?

The Premier would be aware that the Federal Government has announced a \$350 000 000 package deal in an attempt to save the steel industry, and part of the deal is designed to assist the City of Whyalla. I am concerned over the reported remarks in an article in last Monday's *News*, under the heading '\$350 million steel plan "no help" to city', made by the General Manager of the company's operations in Whyalla, as follows:

The Federal Government's \$350 000 000 five-year plan to help the steel industry would do nothing for Whyalla, a top B.H.P. official said today. Mr R.M. Chadban, B.H.P. Whyalla steelworks general manager, said the company would still reduce its workforce by 350.

The number proposed to be reduced in the work force may seem insignificant but, although the proposed reduction is to be achieved over a period, it represents about 8 per cent of the present work force—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is now debating the matter.

Mr MAX BROWN: I did not mean to debate the matter: it is too important for me to be doing that. I point out to the Premier that the company has decided to reduce its work force, and that will occur regardless of any assistance.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was surprised when I read the report of the remarks attributed to Mr Chadban, because I understood from a contact that had been made with B.H.P. Whyalla before the announcement of the steel industry plan (about the time that the details were being released) that this plan was very welcome, indeed. I have not yet had an opportunity to discuss any specific terms with the Whyalla management as to how they see the impact of that plan. It is a little hard to base one's assessment in terms of Whyalla on the statement as attributed to Mr Chadban, as it certainly, in some respects, did not seem to tie in with conditions that were laid down in the steel industry plan as announced last week by Senator Button. That plan has been put forward for further discussion with the company, interested community groups in the steel region, and the State Government, so there is much detailed work to be done between now and the actual implementation of that plan on 1 January 1984. However, I will discuss this matter with Senator Button in Canberra, and go through in some detail not only the details of the steel plan for the industry as a whole but also its particular impact on Whyalla.

It may be that, because Whyalla is geared to certain products and because a certain level of investment has been made over the past five years, the specific bounty assistance measures announced in the steel industry plan will not apply to the Whyalla operation. However, there are other features of the plan, such as an undertaking (as I understand it)

from the Government in relation to job security, and to the continued operation of the three integrated plants which includes Whyalla. Another feature of the plan is the provision of \$100 000 000 by the Commonwealth over the next five years on training and employment initiatives in the steel regions, which includes Whyalla. These features suggest that there must be benefits for the Whyalla operation that go beyond the response that Mr Chadban would suggest.

I will discuss this as a matter of urgency. Commonwealth and State officers will meet on Friday at Whyalla to discuss the assistance package and will be doing that in conjunction with the company. I hope that the result will be to get a somewhat more considered view of the actual impact of the steel industry package. I understand that Whyalla will be greatly assisted by this, and that whatever impact there is on employment will depend, to a great extent, on demand. Whyalla should be well placed to secure its future and take advantages under the scheme. Let me not accuse the company of taking a negative attitude without having the opportunity to discuss it with them. That may well have been the way in which the article was framed. Certainly, I will be taking up the matter with the Federal Government and with the company over the next few days.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Deputy Premier advise when the Government will take action to reduce the cost of workers compensation in South Australia? A report in yesterday's *Advertiser* quotes the Deputy Premier as saying that the South Australian workers compensation system was too expensive and that, if allowed to continue unchecked, the escalation of premiums would have more dramatic adverse effects on employment in South Australia. The statements indicate a complete change of attitude by the Deputy Premier because, earlier this year, he introduced amendments to the Workers Compensation Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is debating the matter, and he full well knows it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am reciting the facts to the House. The Deputy Premier admitted during the debate on workers compensation in this House during the previous session that there would be an increase in premiums as a result of that legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are faced with the same difficulty that we have had through numerous Governments. The difficulty is that the Ministerial reply, according to the practice up to date (and I add that I am giving this matter careful consideration), is completely unfettered, whereas the explanation given by the Opposition member (or, indeed, by any member) is fettered by rules. I pointed out last week that a skilled operator—to use an Americanism—would manipulate the system to get around it. All that is required is, in fact, a recitation of the facts. However, what one cannot do, at least under the current guidelines, is to debate the matter. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The last thing I would want to do is debate the issue or manipulate the system, as you well know, Sir. I seek to give the House facts. One fact is that the Deputy Premier stated earlier this year that the amendments which he and his Government introduced would increase premiums. We read yesterday with some interest that the Deputy Premier is now concerned about the increase in premiums for workers compensation. When will the Government take action? To quote his words, the Deputy Leader told this House:

Later this year I will be establishing what I hope will be some new fundamentals dealing with workers compensation.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Talk about leading with the chin! That is the best opportunity I had had for a long time. Let us cast our minds back to 1978, when I went on public record making the point that I thought the workers compensation in this State and in Australia was heading down the wrong road. I remember the words I used at that time in the public debate: I stated that the system was almost on the verge of collapse. Hence, I was responsible for setting up the Byrne Committee. Unfortunately, when that committee reported, it was to the then Minister, the member for Davenport. I do not know what his Government did about it, but I know that he did not do much about having that report and its concepts and fundamental principles accepted by the people of South Australia. In fact, I believe that in those days the member and the Government kow-towed to the insurance companies, the lawyers, and probably the medical profession as well.

They see no interest for them in the single channel philosophy enunciated by the Byrne Committee. I believe that that scheme evolved from the Canadian and New Zealand systems, with some combination, I imagine, from Queensland as well. Having got the report, the Minister or the Government of the day decided not to follow that course, which I think ought to have been done at that stage. Here was an opportunity for the Government in power to change the concept of workers compensation, which I sincerely believe needs changing. I do not think that there is any question about that. There is a fair bit of public debate about it at the moment.

What did the Government of the day do? The Government of the day hid behind the report. It did not come out and try to sell the report at all. In fact, there was very little public debate about it. As a consequence of that, what do we have? We saw some patchwork amendments by the Minister about two years later which I am told by the insurance companies of today actually increased the costs. They were the amendments that actually increased the costs. I do not have the figures in front of me, but I can provide them for the honourable member if he wants them.

In some areas, the increases have gone up by 200 per cent and 300 per cent. That is the sort of increase that I believe could have been avoided, at the very least, had the previous Government attempted in any way to try and have people accept the new fundamentals and principles in the Byrne Committee Report. It did not do that and I believe that it has a responsibility to the people of South Australia to try to influence those people to accept a new concept.

On coming back to office, I found that there were no copies of the Byrne Report, which I wanted to revive. I wanted to at least get it into the public debate situation so that people would have an opportunity to contribute. I have had more copies printed and they are being posted to people. I am asking opinion makers in the community, such as employers, union organisations, and all sorts of people, including insurance companies and the like, to comment on whether or not they believe the Byrne Report is a good one, whether or not they want to have a single channel operating, and whether or not we need to change the whole conceptual arrangement regarding workers compensation.

I have made two public speeches about this matter, one as recently as Monday night, when some 150 people listened to my speech; I think that most of those people are thinking about it. What I am about at the moment is to catch up on three lost years. Three years were lost by the Liberal Party in this State in attempting to come to grips with this very serious problem. I may say this: it is not only this Government in Australia that is looking at making changes in this regard or testing the water anyway. We are certainly doing that at this stage. All the State Labor Governments have met and are determining a course to follow, and they are

getting out discussion papers similar to the Byrne Committee Report.

I am not in a position to directly answer the member's question and so put an exact date on when we will be able to reduce costs. However, I can say that there will be a very fierce public debate about this matter in the next few months, looking into people's views and comments and acting accordingly.

I want to finish on this note: I have also been to New Zealand to look at this system. I met the architect of the New Zealand system (Owen Woodhouse, now a principal judge), who has offered to come to South Australia at any time we decide to have a seminar. I will certainly be making some arrangements for him to come here and explain this system to interested parties in South Australia, because I believe that it is the right road to follow.

The SPEAKER: I would like to make a very brief comment, so that I do not interrupt Question Time. In the three years that I was on the Opposition benches and playing a role as one of the Whips, it was perfectly apparent that there was a clear discrepancy, as I am able to recall, between the capacity of a questioner to explain and that of a Minister to reply. That can be seen by anyone who is interested in the Parliamentary process. If people are interested, the appropriate way of getting that interest through is to write either to me, or through their Whip, to their representative on the Standing Orders Committee. Apart from that, I must uphold the Standing Orders.

MORPHETT VALE SHOPS

Ms LENEHAN: I direct my question to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Can the Premier tell the House when the report from the working party into shopping centre leases will be released? The urgency in receiving a reply to this question arises from a recent situation which has occurred within my electorate and which has been reported recently—in fact, in this morning's *Advertiser*—as follows:

Shopkeepers at Big Y fear dispute lock-out.

A Morphett Vale shopkeeper spent her seventh night guarding her shop last night . . . The shopkeepers . . . of the Big Y Shopping Centre, South Road, claim the landlady, Mrs Hetty Verolme, of Bedford Park, is trying to close their shops, despite rents being up to date. Mrs Barton . . . said she had been unable to enter her shop—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. The honourable member for Mawson.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I take this—
Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LENEHAN: I take this as a very serious matter, the substance of which will unfold as the contents of the article become apparent. It continues as follows:

Mrs Barton [who owns a shoe shop in this centre] said she had been unable to enter her shop on Friday because Mrs Verolme had changed the locks. A locksmith had subsequently opened the shop and installed new locks.

She [Mrs Barton] said she had arrived at work on Monday to find another set of locks fitted and a security guard inside her shop. The guard had refused requests from her lawyer and police to open the door.

And indeed they have refused requests from me to open the door. Another constituent, who is also a tenant at the shopping centre, a Mrs Schroeder, has stated that a lease on her shop had expired about 18 months ago and that she had tried to get a new one. The article continues:

Mrs Verolme had agreed to a new lease about six months ago, Mrs Schroeder said.

'I paid \$300 to her solicitor to get the lease registered. Then she asked that it be backdated to last February with an increased rent and with 18 per cent interest.'

Mr Dennis Taylor [another proprietor within the centre] said he had been threatened with eviction over maintenance and cleaning charges he believed were unreasonable.

And so it goes on. I have asked this question on behalf of those constituents and on behalf of other tenants and shopkeepers in South Australia. My constituents have asked me how much longer they have to put up with the oppressive and unjust practices of unscrupulous and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is obviously now debating the matter: she must come to order.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! I take that as a reflection on the Chair.

Ms LENEHAN: With respect, Sir, my constituents have in fact expressed much stronger language to me, and I have tempered my use of language in deference to this House. What I am stating is that my constituents—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have explained before that rank or Party will make no difference, and words such as those used by the honourable member do not go down well with me. I will simply leave it at that.

Ms LENEHAN: I apologise, Mr Speaker. I would like to conclude my question by asking the Premier, on behalf of my constituents who have put the question to me, how much longer they have to sleep in their shops.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As to precisely when the report on the working party will be available, I will have to refer that question to my colleague in another place for his response. It is certainly being treated as a matter of some urgency. Members will also recall in the previous session the legislation proposed by the member for Hartley which covered aspects of this situation.

There are clear gaps and problems in the law in this area, and it has to be worked through. Of course, in this current dispute there will be no quick remedy for the constituents to whom the honourable member has referred because, having received the report, there will no doubt be legislation and other implications in it, all of which will take time to prepare, to consult with interested parties and place before the House for debate. There will be no quick remedy.

The urgency suggested by the honourable member is, I think, very apt and is responded to by the Government. The plight of so many small business retailers, particularly in the current economic climate where we have a situation of declining real value of sales, is an acute one. It is one that affects not only their livelihoods as individuals but also, I suggest, the community in terms of its accessibility to goods and services at appropriate prices and in regional locations, and it also has an impact on the general level of economic activity and on employment and unemployment. It is a cause of grave concern; indeed, I imagine that all members in some way or another are confronted, if not with the problems in the stark way the member for Mawson has put before the House, certainly with related problems from constituents, on a regular basis.

The problem is there, and it has been with us for some considerable time. It has been worsened by the economic climate, and I believe that the working party established by the Government and the resulting recommendations from it will at least provide some way in which we can resolve these dreadful disputes and do something about providing some security and economic rationality to this whole field. I thank the honourable member for raising the issue. I will refer the substance of the question to my colleague.

CASINO

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Premier say whether the Government has yet appointed members of the Casino Supervisory Authority and, if so, who they are and, if not, when does the Government intend to establish the authority, and when does the Government anticipate that the public inquiry to determine the purposes, terms and conditions of the casino licence will be held?

Following the Premier's statement upon the passing of the Casino Act that a casino could be established in South Australia this year, and in view of the discussion in tourism circles of the number and nature of submissions which are currently being prepared by intending applicants, I have been approached by people seeking details of the Government's intentions regarding the timing and the implementation of the provisions of the Casino Act.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I welcome the question, not so much for the substance of it but for the belated recognition perhaps by the former Minister of Tourism and now the shadow Minister of the support for the casino within the tourist industry and its implications for that industry, bearing in mind that, both as Minister and subsequently in Opposition, the honourable member has steadfastly opposed a casino and its establishment and discounted totally the benefits that it might bring.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That's her right.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As in so many areas—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —it may well be her right, but the hypocrisy that is being evidenced in suddenly becoming a fervent advocate of this venture is interesting indeed and ties in well with the current Opposition.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg will definitely come to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I welcome the interest that the honourable member is showing and I hope that it indicates some show of heart and support for the project. To come to the question itself, I hope that the Government will be announcing very shortly the membership of the supervising authority provided under the Act. Members may recall that, following the passage of the Bill, I announced that the Government had established a small working party to analyse the Bill's provisions and make recommendations to Cabinet on the procedure to be implemented in order to have those provisions enacted. That has been done, and that report has been delivered. As I say, shortly I would hope to make an announcement on the composition of the supervising authority. It is then, of course, turned over to them completely in terms of deciding when, how and on what timing they conduct their hearings.

MODBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL BUSES

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Transport take into consideration the parking needs of school buses that service the Modbury Primary School when Golden Grove Road is widened to a four-lane highway? This road widening will take place in the near future, between North-East Road and Grenfell Road. Since the Golden Grove Road passes close by the Modbury Primary School, it will take up space much closer to the school and remove part of the school parking space. As the school is built well below road level, the grade of the road into the school will be much steeper and school buses will no longer be able to move in and out of the limited parking spaces available.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation.

Mr KLUNDER: Rather than the buses parking on the roadway close to the North-East Road intersection, with all the dangers inherent in that situation, I ask the Minister to investigate the possibility of constructing a bus parking bay as part of the new roadworks so that children can board and alight from the bus safely.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I understand that officers of the Highways Department have been speaking with the principals of the two schools involved in this matter and that at this stage no special arrangements have been made regarding parking bays for the school buses. The road construction should allow for standard kerbside drop-off zones to operate efficiently and effectively. However, if there are problems with regard to school buses I will undertake to take up this matter with my colleague the Minister of Education to make sure that satisfactory provisions are made to accommodate the school buses. I am aware of the very strong interest that the honorable member shows in transport matters in his area, and I thank him for bringing this matter to my attention.

CONVENTION CENTRE

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Seeing that the Premier has just expressed his strong support of the views of the tourist industry on a proposed casino in South Australia, is he aware of the strongly held view, notably by the convention centre sector of the industry, that an international convention centre is essential for South Australia's tourism development and that the licence for a casino in South Australia should, as a matter of employment policy, be used as a catalyst to attract investment capital for the construction of such a centre? Does the Government share this view and, if so, will it be conveyed as a matter of policy to the Casino Supervisory Authority or, alternatively, will an announcement be made at the time of the referral of applications to the Casino Supervisory Authority?

I have been informed by those in the tourist industry that, whilst the granting of a casino licence to an existing establishment might create tens or possibly scores of new jobs, the construction of an international convention centre incorporating a casino would create hundreds of jobs directly, and many hundreds more indirectly, by the multiplier effect of convention visitor expenditure. I have also been informed that delays in the announcement by the Government of the proposed international convention centre could be indicative of difficulties in attracting investment capital. Such capital would be more likely to be attracted if revenue from a casino could be guaranteed to help offset the operating costs of a 3 000-seat convention centre, which the tourism industry believes is a must for South Australia.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member did vote for a casino. While in practical terms an argument could certainly connect these two issues (that is, their impact when these projects are finally approved), they cannot be connected in terms of policy or legislation. It is open to the Government to make a submission to the supervising authority but it is up to the authority, of course, to make its decision as to the location of the casino, and I feel sure that the Government would be making such a submission. However, that cannot, of course, precede the establishment of the authority. It is up to the authority itself, which has powers under the Act, to determine the location of the casino.

As to the convention centre, as the honourable member well knows, this is a project that is being pursued very

vigorously at the moment. I am not in a position to make announcements about it. I have been questioned in this place on a number of occasions about it, and I will say again, as I said then, that as with any project of the size and scale of this project there is that final hurdle to be jumped. There is always a point at which, a lot of the finances and plans having been put in place, the final decision itself has to be made. We are close to that final decision and have been so for some two or three months now, but it is not an appropriate subject of announcement.

Throughout that time the Government has made clear that the pursuit of the project for a convention centre, particularly in relation to the Adelaide railway station project, must be seen as separate from a casino. If, in fact, a casino is associated with that development, it can only be because the supervising authority has so deemed in the face of applications for a casino. That exercise is a separate one which under the legislation must be conducted separately. Any developer who attempts to raise finance or sell the development on the basis that that developer can guarantee a casino being associated with it is simply barking up the wrong tree if the convention project takes place before that. That is the position at the moment. We do have active propositions being pursued in relation to a convention centre, but we do not have any propositions being actively pursued in relation to a casino, because that is the responsibility of the authority yet to be established.

WATER BORES

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Water Resources inform the House whether the sinking of bores and the use of underground water for domestic purposes is permitted in the Adelaide metropolitan area? I have recently noticed newspaper advertisements in which a drilling organisation is offering to sink domestic bores for home-owners in the metropolitan area. The advertisement claims that most of the metropolitan area has reserves of underground water at shallow depths. I would like to know whether this claim is true and whether there are any definite advantages in the sinking of bores and the use of underground water.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The sinking of bores and the use of underground water is permitted in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Generally, underground water is available. However, there are certain pockets where no such water is available. For this reason, I believe that the matter of sinking bores should be approached with caution. The depth of drilling can extend to 100 metres in some cases. Even then, there is no guarantee that water could be found and, if found, the quality of water could be poor. I would also suggest that householders and property owners look closely at the costs involved with sinking a bore and consider how long it would take to recover their capital costs.

The E. & W.S. Department conducted the Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study in 1978 and found that there are relatively limited underground water resources in the metropolitan area. Members would appreciate that there is considerable use of water by local government and by schools and, for that reason, the E. & W.S. Department has begun a study to further assess the use of underground water and to monitor such use in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

ON-THE-SPOT FINES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does the Premier still consider that on-the-spot fines are a type of revenue collection through the back door, and, if so, will he reverse the Government's decision to increase on-the-spot fines by 20 per cent? In

this House on 25 February last year, the Premier described on-the-spot fines as 'a type of revenue collection through the back door'. He also referred to 'the revenue rip off in on-the-spot fines'. On the same day, the present Chief Secretary stated:

We have no objection to an on-the-spot fines system that is not used as this one is as a revenue raiser.

Despite these statements, the Government yesterday announced that on-the-spot fines would increase by 20 per cent and it is estimated that this will boost Government revenue by \$1 000 000 in a full year. In view of his earlier statements, and those of the Chief Secretary, about the revenue implications of these fines, will the Premier review and, in fact, reverse the decision announced yesterday?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am amazed that the honourable member has the gall to raise this issue when one recalls the circumstances under which that speech occurred. I remind the House of the circumstances, as the honourable member has not done so: if he has forgotten, he is a foolish man and, if he remembers, he is a very devious one. When on-the-spot fines were introduced, certain questions were asked in another place of the then Attorney-General about the possible revenue implications of those fines and the scheme that had been introduced, and he denied point blank that there were any revenue connotations whatsoever. It was plain for all to see that there must have been some connotations and, indeed, the cost of general police services require that offenders pay fines not only as punishment but also to defray the cost of enforcing the law—on the roads, in this instance. The Attorney-General said that it was out of the question.

In fact, that Attorney-General had been in possession of a report that clearly spelt out to him the revenue implications. Indeed, the statements that he made—compared to the actual facts and basis on which that decision was made as revealed by the Opposition—clearly showed a major breach of Parliamentary tradition, to the extent that no-confidence motions were moved. It was during the course of that debate that these statements were made. In the light of the goings on in this place over the past week or so on a matter totally trivial and also fully explained, it is extraordinary that that matter should be raised again in relation to the previous Attorney-General and his total misleading of Parliament over this issue.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Will you reverse the decision announced yesterday?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A level of fine was established by that decision and is now in operation. The police have recommended an adjustment to it: the Government has accepted that recommendation, and put it into operation.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr PETERSON: Can the Deputy Premier say whether, in the present review of the Workers Compensation Act, provision has been made for an amendment to the Act to enable payments to reach the injured person in a shorter time than now seems to occur? The Deputy Premier indicated today that there will be a review. In yesterday's *Advertiser* he stated:

While retaining the no-fault concept of workers compensation, we must devise ways of cutting costs and . . . improving the certainty, equity and speed of delivery of the benefits available.

Yesterday, I received a telephone call from a former constituent who has now been waiting for about three years to receive payment of a compensation claim. He has been forced to move interstate to live with relatives in order to economise on his living expenses.

I understand that the payment was made to his lawyer in 1981, and that he is still waiting for payment from his lawyer. Every time he rings his lawyer, he is told that the money is on the way and 'You will get it shortly.' I know that he is not the only person who has had to wait, and I wonder whether we should look at this aspect of the legislation in any serious review of the Act.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for his question. As I understand it, it seems to me that some law firm is holding up the actual payment of the workers compensation lump sum settlement claim. I think that that is the situation to which the honourable member has referred. The Act makes it an obligation (and I am quoting from memory here) for the lawyer to settle in the State Industrial Court the amount that has been awarded within 28 days. The member shakes his head. I am not quite sure of the reason for the delay. However, it would seem to me that the lawyer (whoever he may be) has been quite negligent regarding his client. I would like more details from the honourable member. If he is able to provide the names of the client and the lawyer, I will certainly take it up with that lawyer, because he should have paid the money long before now.

I reiterate what I said earlier in answer to the question from the Deputy Leader. The whole of the Workers Compensation Act is being reviewed. All matters are to be referred to, and in particular the speed with which benefits ought to be sent forward to people who have had an accident will certainly be one aspect that will be considered. However, I should like the honourable member to realise that the review will be a comprehensive one and will take into consideration not only the aspect to which he referred but also many other aspects.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

Mr BLACKER: Will the Chief Secretary ask the Minister of Health how many voluntary workers of the St John Ambulance Brigade will be affected by Cabinet's recent decision to require volunteers to enter into contractual agreements to work with the ambulance service? Secondly, was the St John Ambulance Brigade consulted before this decision was made by Cabinet and, if so, was St John in agreement with the Government's decision? Thirdly, is it expected that such a change will increase the cost of ambulance services?

In last Thursday's city edition of the *Advertiser* an article under the heading 'Ambulance volunteer role may be axed' indicated some concern by members of St John about the likely effect of such actions. The article states:

'This new plan will mean that trained and qualified volunteer ambulance crews will become stretcher bearers, because that is all we will be allowed to do.

'And of course it will increase the cost of the service to the taxpayer.

'The ambulance service as we know it will go down the drain.

'This is just a mechanism for the Government and the two unions to get rid of us.

'We are sunk if they go ahead with it.'

From a discussion with some members of St John, it is obvious that they consider this proposed action to be a massive slight on the integrity, efficiency, credibility, and dedication of so many excellent community-minded citizens.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague. I should remind the House that the Minister of Health has made clear publicly that it is not intended to do away with the volunteer aspect of St John, nor is there any slur or reflection upon those people who are providing voluntary service. I am surprised that the honourable member has raised this matter again.

Although most of the matters to which he referred have been covered by subsequent statements made by the Minister, I shall obtain a report for the honourable member as quickly as I can.

SCHOOL WORKSHOP INSPECTIONS

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Education say whether there is an industrial inspector of school workshop equipment and, if so, how often is industrial school equipment inspected? I have been approached about this matter, and I believe that the public is unaware of the situation that exists in relation to industrial equipment safety in workshops in schools.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Within the Education Department we do not have industrial inspectors, because in 1976 schools were registered as industrial premises and, consequently, the inspection of workshops or canteens within schools came under the responsibility of the Department of Labour. Inspectors of that department have the right to enter and inspect schools whenever they see fit and choose to do so. Many official inspections have been made across the State at schools in various localities. Wherever shortcomings are found it is up to the school to comply with any direction it receives in the case of minor matters: in the case of major matters, it is up to the Education Department to fix such shortcomings.

Although some 700 schools exist in the State, an attempt is made to inspect every site once every two years. However, country schools might not be inspected quite as often. If the honourable member has a particular problem in mind, could I ask that she bring it to the attention of the Education Department. I refer her to Mr Glen Stevens, Principal Education Officer at the Education Centre, or Malcolm Hatherly, Subject Consultant at Wattle Park Teacher's Centre. That advice is for other honourable members in case matters of this nature should arise in future.

To both me as Minister and departmental officers safety considerations are of prime importance for two reasons: first, because of the inherent virtue of safety in its own right to prevent injury and, secondly, because educational institutions are places of inculcating ideas and attitudes in young people, and we certainly want to inculcate safety attitudes in students at schools. One way of doing that is by means of having safe premises. I thank the honourable member for her question, and indicate that the Government is very concerned about these matters and accordingly, in consultation with the Minister of Labour, we have appropriate mechanisms.

NATIVE VEGETATION CLEARANCE

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say how many applications have been received from landholders seeking Government approval for native vegetation clearance under the new native vegetation clearance controls? How many were made pointing out the need for urgency in obtaining a decision for the applicant? How many decisions have been made by the department, and how many personnel are handling these applications? Further, what is the estimated cost of handling each application?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for that question. What has happened since the regulations were brought down has underlined the need for the action taken by the Government. More than 500 applications have been made, and they would represent, if clearance was allowed totally in regard to each of them, 15 per

cent of the remnant native vegetation in the agricultural areas of this State.

Mr Lewis: How many acres?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I could get that information for the honourable member. I do not have it with me.

Mr Lewis: Don't you think—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a coffee shop, and if there are additional questions they should be put in writing to the Minister.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Sir, but I certainly can provide that specific information to the coffee shop proprietor if he requests it. I would have thought that the figure of something in excess of 15 per cent of the remnant native vegetation of the agricultural areas of this State would be more graphic than a meaningless totalling up of all the applications. It certainly underscores the situation.

If this is in fact what primary producers have in mind, it simply makes clear why it is necessary that these controls were brought down, and so it is important, therefore, that the controls be maintained. The position is, of course, not only that a regulation has been brought down which has been subject to review by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation but also in addition a supplementary development plan has been prepared for the guidance of the Planning Commission where applications are referred to it and also eventually for the tribunal in cases where appeals are referred to it.

The honourable member by implication raises the matter of delay in the processing of these applications. I would make certain points. Under the Planning Act, if there is a delay of more than three months in the processing of an application, it is deemed to have been refused and the applicant then has automatic right of appeal to the Planning Appeals Tribunal. That situation is in that respect no different in essence from what has obtained for many years under the soil conservation legislation.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! And, in particular, 'Order' to the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member of course was a former Minister of Agriculture, and he demonstrated—

The SPEAKER: That does not excuse him and it does not excuse the current Minister from commenting on it. The honourable Minister for Environment and Planning.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will ignore the honourable member and return to the member for Mallee, who originally asked the question. The processing time for applications as set down in the Statute is no different from what has obtained for a long time under the soil conservation legislation, and there is no reason why those two processes cannot be carried out in tandem. I do not have the specific information as to the numbers of people working on these applications. I can say, to be fair to these people, that we have taken on additional staff in that portion of the department which is processing the applications so that these matters can proceed expeditiously. In addition, as the honourable member would know, it is not necessary for all the applications to go to the commission. The department has powers delegated to it from the commission to negotiate with landholders and come up with some sort of agreed scheme which can then proceed.

I have some figures before me as at 29 July 1983. More recent figures are available which I had with me as recently as yesterday, but I do not have them with me in the Chamber. As a general guide to the honourable member perhaps I can quote these figures: 482 applications to that point had been received, of which 60 had been approved though not necessarily in the form in which they were originally placed before the department; two applications had been forwarded

to the South Australian Planning Commission because there was no negotiated settlement possible between the applicant and the department; one applicant had appealed against the decision of the South Australian Planning Commission, but whether that has yet gone before the tribunal I do not know.

I reiterate the points that I have made. This system is a flexible one. It is not a system of prohibition. It does allow for approvals to be made and, in the light of the number of applications, it underscores the necessity for the regulations.

Mr Lewis: What about the urgent ones?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Certain categories of application have been regarded as urgent—cutting of mallee, broom and that sort of thing. They have been handled, as I understand it, expeditiously. I will endeavour to get more specific information for the honourable member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: MISREPRESENTATION

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ASHENDEN: Last evening the member for Hartley made completely false allegations about members of the Opposition generally and me in particular. I would like to quote some of his remarks to the House. He said:

... honourable members opposite (in particular, the member for Todd who I thought had spoken in this debate but who apparently has not) have seen fit to suggest (and I hope it is not the view of all honourable members opposite) that some 2 000 people should be put out of work in the public sector... Yet, we see honourable members opposite getting up in this House time and again asking why we are not reducing the number of jobless. Here they are saying that 2 000 people should be axed from employment... I know that this is painful to members opposite. If they look at *Hansard* (page 137), they will see that the member for Todd has quite clearly stated that 2 000 jobs should be axed.

This is absolute nonsense. At no time have I made such a statement, and it is to be regretted that yet another member of the Government has had to resort to untruths in an effort to denigrate the Opposition. I would invite the member for Hartley to make the statements I referred to earlier away from the protection of Parliamentary privilege.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the business of the day I again point out that a personal explanation is another of those areas like the explanation of questions and Ministerial replies. Until it is sorted out it will never cease to be a source of alarm sometimes, annoyance very often, continual criticism, and one might almost say irrationality in the whole of the Standing Orders, and I hope something can be done to remedy that matter.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr GROOM: I entirely refute the allegation of the member for Todd, and I quote his exact words that appear on page 137 of *Hansard* of 10 August 1983. He said, regrettably in answer to an interjection from me:

I am very happy to answer that interjection. For one, I would not have employed 2 000 additional public servants which this State cannot afford, as this Government has done.

That speaks for itself.

Mr Ashenden: You are taking it out of context, and at no time have I suggested sackings.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Todd will come to order. All members will come to order.

Mr Mathwin: No wonder he can't make a living out of the courts.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

At 3.9 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 August. Page 211.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): In his second reading explanation the Premier said that the expenditure to be authorised by this Bill was expected to be sufficient to enable the Public Service to carry out its functions until the end of November, by which time it was expected that debate on the Appropriation Bill would be completed and assent received. The Opposition assumes, from that statement, that the Government has already set a time table for introduction and debate of the Budget. Why, therefore, was the Premier not prepared to give us yesterday the date on which the Budget will be introduced when the member for Hanson asked him to do so? According to tradition, the Budget should be introduced into this House by 1 September to give all honourable members the time to analyse it fully during the Adelaide Show week recess. I therefore ask the Premier to confirm whether his Government will follow that tradition this year. If he does not give that confirmation in his reply to this debate, his failure to do so will only add to comment being made within this Parliament, and throughout the community, about the general disarray of the financial management and planning of South Australian finances.

On the first day of this session, the Premier announced a series of revenue raising measures without any proper consultation with those industries and businesses to be affected by them. For a while, the Premier tried to hide the fact that one of those measures, to increase fuel taxes, was being introduced in a way which completely reversed the basis upon which those taxes were originally levied—to pay for road construction and maintenance. This week, the Premier has attempted to maintain that he does not know yet at what rate the new financial institutions duty will be levied. This new tax will be the largest of the Premier's revenue raising measures.

Clearly, in advising the Government to introduce this new tax—a tax which will affect all South Australians—Treasury officers would have provided information on its revenue raising potential, and in deciding to accept that advice, the Government must have based this decision on end of year Budget targets and expenditure projections. Based on projections made by the Victorian and New South Wales State Governments at the time they introduced this tax last year, for each .01 per cent of rate of application of this tax in South Australia it will increase State Government revenues by about \$10 000 000 in a full year. Yet the Premier is asking this House to accept that, with the Budget only just over a fortnight away, if it is introduced at the traditional time, he has not yet set the rate of a tax which will have a very significant impact on revenue raising and therefore on the end of year Budget result.

Mr Speaker, it is time the Premier came clean on this tax. I have been very reliably informed that the rate has been set already and that it is to be applied in South Australia at .04 per cent. This will mean that our rate will

be the highest in Australia—33½ per cent higher than the current rate in New South Wales and Victoria. It would be intolerable if South Australia became a pace-setter in rates of State taxation. Alternatively, the Premier may be in collusion with his Party colleagues in those other States to apply the higher rate uniformly across Australia.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, the trade practices authorities would be interested to know that the Premiers have put their heads together to fix the tax rate that applies across Australia, as indeed applies to commercial enterprises across Australia.

Whatever the position, the Premier owes it to this House to tell us at what rate the tax will be applied. He announced his intention to introduce a financial institutions duty 13 days ago. His announcement has prompted enough confusion and uncertainty, without his allowing prolonged speculation about the rate of the duty to cause even more.

I have made a public statement about the matter in the earnest hope that it will bring sufficient pressure to bear on the Government to minimise the impact of this new tax—both in the rate at which it will be applied and those who will have to pay it. I intend to say more later today about State finances, but at this stage I want the Premier to give this House more information about the date on which the Budget will be introduced and the major revenue raising measure it will contain—that is, a financial institutions duty.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I covered the question of the Budget date in answer to the member for Hanson yesterday. The Leader can contain his impatience. All will be revealed at the appropriate time. I can assure the Leader that he will have adequate time to analyse the Budget in order to make his considered reply.

The question of f.i.d. is a complex one. The Government intends to discuss the measure quite widely in order to ensure that the shape of that legislation is both workable and effective in South Australia, and understood by those who have to operate it. As I said in my statement in announcing the revenue raising packages, there has been no final determination on the rate of that tax. Obviously, there is a range of options in terms of a rate, but there are also considerations relating to f.i.d. which could affect the value of collection. One of those is the nature of the exemptions granted under it which could affect the yield. Another is the taxes that are repealed in consequence of bringing in the f.i.d. Again, that will affect the yield because it must always be remembered in relation to a financial institutions duty that the total tax collection of the duty does not represent the net gain to revenue, because in the course of introducing it some other taxes can be remitted or displaced by the f.i.d. That is one of the advantages of the financial institutions duty as a tax: we can simplify what is at the moment a fairly cumbersome and, in some respects, elaborate network of transaction type taxes.

Again, until the legislation is finally shaped we are not in a position to give full details to the House, and it will come in the form of a Bill. In terms of Budget planning, obviously we have got a net figure of collection in mind but that net figure of collection is not just effective, as I have explained, by the rate at which the f.i.d. will be levied. I do not really believe that anything else the Leader has said calls for further comment. I have answered the two specific points that he wanted covered, and I simply commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Thirteen days ago the Premier announced to this House a series of revenue raising measures which will increase State Government revenues by at least \$84 000 000 in a full year. Already, the Government has imposed higher State charges which will bring in another \$90 000 000 in a full year. The Government's actions have been unprecedented, both in their impact on all South Australians and the extent to which they break promises made by the Premier less than a year ago.

Let me deal first with State charges. The Premier's audacity apparently knows no bounds. It was the Premier, on 27 August 1981, who called on the previous Government to implement a 12-month freeze on State charges. He said (and I quote from his statement of that date):

Charges that have been increased include electricity, water and sewerage levies, hospital charges and bus, tram and train fares.

Here, he was referring to action taken by the former Government in its first two years of office. Yet in less than nine months, this Premier has increased all the charges he wanted the former Government to freeze, and many more.

Bus, tram and train fares have been increased by an overall average of 47.6 per cent, water and sewerage rates by between 22 per cent and 26 per cent, electricity tariffs by 12 per cent, with the possibility of another rise of up to 6 per cent, and hospital fees by 20 per cent. In all, during the past eight months at least 27 State charges or cost items have been increased—this, during a period when most South Australians have been subjected to a wage pause.

It goes without saying that had the former Government heeded the Premier's call to freeze all charges in August 1981, the rises to which I have just referred would have been much more severe. The former Government did not, at any time, resile from the fact that State charges needed to be set at levels which covered the cost of providing services. Apparently, the Premier has only recently discovered this principle.

Certainly, it was a principle which he completely ignored during his period in Opposition. I will have more to say later about that hypocrisy, but first let me trace the development of the Premier's taxation policies. On 27 May 1982, he released his economic development strategy which had this to say about State taxes (indeed, the editorial in today's *News* summarises the Government's performance on taxation measures extremely well):

Labor believes that it would not be appropriate to change the rate of or to abolish any existing State tax or substitute new taxes until a thorough and wide-ranging inquiry has been conducted into the way the State raised its funds.

Pressed by the media to say how long such an inquiry would take, the Premier said this (and I quote from an interview on A.B.C. television news) on 27 May:

The inquiry will be established by the next Government, by us in Government. Obviously, if there are any major changes to be made to our tax structures, they will be put to the people at an election and they will know precisely what they are.

Here, the Premier made a specific commitment not to increase existing taxes or introduce new taxes during his first term in office. He did this not knowing how the State would fare with the Commonwealth in tax-sharing arrangements for the following financial year, or the position of the State Budget for the 1982-83 financial year. It was a blind promise but, once made, the Premier was locked in, and so he repeated it at the election with these now immortal words:

The A.L.P. will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.

It is now clear that this was a completely dishonest promise—the Premier made it well knowing that it could not possibly

be honoured. He knew it was the fundamental difference between Labor and Liberal policies—between Labor's big government, big spending, high taxing approach and our proven approach of sound financial management and a less interfering, efficient Public Service. So the Premier fudged this difference in the only way he knew—he misled the people of South Australia.

To justify breaking such a fundamental promise made at the last election, the Premier has since attempted to introduce his tax measures by stealth. We have had a long softening up exercise.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Stealth!

Mr OLSEN: By 'stealth', I refer specifically to E. & W.S. rates, ETSA rates, and the like. There is plenty of stealth in those areas which the Premier has announced publicly. It began on 17 November—only a week after the Premier took office—when he referred in a statement in the *News* to financial dilemmas he was facing. It was, in fact, to be a carbon copy of the Victorian Government's strategy. One wonders whether this Government has any new ideas or any new initiatives—it is a carbon copy of Wran/Cain. This was confirmed on 1 December, when the Premier issued a statement saying that he had been misled about the state of Government finances. The words were identical to Mr Cain's when he increased Victorian State taxes by 32 per cent in his first Budget after saying before the election that he would not do so.

Since December, we have had endless statements from the Premier about the difficulties that he faces. According to him, the former Government had a comparatively easy time and left him with all the hard decisions. Apparently, it was easy for the former Government to adopt a course of reducing the size of a Public Service which had grown significantly during a decade of Labor excesses, despite all the opposition from the Public Service unions, encouraged and supported by the A.L.P.

It was also easy, according to the Premier, to seek improvements in the efficiency of the Public Service—again, after a decade during which Labor ignored the fundamentals of responsible financial management. I suggest that, far from facing hard decisions, the Premier has taken the easy way out. While the former Government made responsible decisions to reduce the size of the public sector and make it efficient, the Premier has taken a completely different approach—the much easier approach in that he has burdened all South Australians with his problems by making them pay. In doing so, the Premier has continued to misrepresent, to mislead, and to proceed with stealth.

Members will recall that in Opposition the now Premier constantly claimed that South Australia was a high tax State. His document, released in May 1982, said this of the former Government (at page 49):

It is in fact a 'high tax Government'.

The Premier has since confirmed with his own words that this was yet another of his dishonest statements made in Opposition about taxes. The admission is contained in the press statement he released on 4 August to announce his revenue-raising measures. In this statement, the Premier drew attention to the fact that the latest available figures show that under the former Government State taxes were reduced to the lowest in Australia. What absolute hypocrisy by the Premier! I quote his press statement from a fortnight ago, which was in quite significant contradiction to his statements made last year, as follows:

Mr Bannon also drew attention to the latest available figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, comparing the tax burden borne by residents in the various States of Australia. The figures were for the financial year, 1981-82. They showed Victoria had the highest taxes followed by New South Wales, Western Australia, Queensland, Tasmania and South Australia. In the previous year,

South Australia had been third lowest, with Tasmania and Queensland below.

The Premier's release last week clearly identifies that under a Liberal Government South Australia had the lowest taxes in Australia.

Far from our State taxes increasing significantly in 1981-82, taxes actually reduced by 5.4 per cent, and the Premier cannot deny that. That is what Liberal Government meant to South Australia. That is what was achieved by taking hard decisions and ensuring proper, responsible management of the State's finances. In the Premier's press release to which I have just referred there was another blatant misrepresentation, as follows:

He [the Premier] pointed out that the State Opposition had supported the need for higher State charges, through a statement on 4 May by the Leader of the Opposition, who recommended an increase in the petrol level of 1.5 cents per litre.

This statement demonstrates that the Premier does not know the difference between a tax and a charge (he attempts to confuse the purpose of his release). The fuel levy is a tax. It is totally misleading in suggesting that I have advocated Government revenue raising in the manner adopted by the Premier. I remind the Premier that my statement to this House on 4 May referred only to revenue raising in the context of covering the cost of the natural disasters, while he is clearly raising revenue to pay for election promises.

While the Premier has attempted to use the disasters as one justification for significant increases in taxes and charges, their total impact on the State Budget may account for as little as 10 per cent of the total revenue raising undertaken and foreshadowed by this Government since it came to office. Further, while the Premier has attempted to use these disasters as a major justification for increasing taxes and charges, their original cost to the State has been reduced at least twice—and we still do not know what the impact was on last financial year's Budget.

The Premier went further this week in his misrepresentations when, in a report in the *News* on Monday, he claimed that Opposition demands on the Government would cost South Australian taxpayers an extra \$160 a year. Let me deal, first, with the Premier's arithmetic. He has added up the cost of a number of capital works projects which he says Opposition members have demanded and reached an estimate of \$90 000 000. In projecting the cost to taxpayers, he has based his estimate on these projects being paid for in one year which, as all members of this House would know, is a nonsense calculation. Projects such as the Finger Point sewage works, the Cobdogla irrigation scheme and country water supply projects, which account for most of the estimated cost to which he has referred, would be constructed and paid for over a number of years—not in one financial year. The Premier, in his statement, also ignored the fact that forward estimates drawn up by the former Government took into account funds for the development of these projects. These are not new demands by Opposition members. In most cases, they represent commitments already made—commitments that the Labor Party promised to honour before the election.

The Premier's statement also reveals some naivety about one of the vital functions of members of Parliament, as he well knows: that, is, to raise with the Government of the day claims of constituents for Government funding of projects. It is the responsibility of the Government to make decisions on those claims based on its priorities and the availability of funds. The Premier seems to be suggesting by his statement that the Government should abdicate to Opposition members of Parliament responsibility for making decisions about allocation of the State's resources.

While this is a responsibility we on this side of the House will be pleased to assume after the next election, I hope the

Premier will not continue to argue in this vein during the remainder of the life of this Parliament. It is a nonsense argument, and he well knows it. He has the responsibility; he gladly accepted it at the last election, and he cannot evade it now. Of course, one of the problems the Premier is now facing is that before the election he made extravagant promises and raised expectations about what his Government could and would achieve. Because he cannot deliver, he is simply seeking to put the blame elsewhere.

The Premier continues to blame the former Government for his mismanagement of the economy. He has ignored calls from the Opposition to justify, for example, why he introduced these highly significant revenue-raising measures before the State Budget. Does this mean that South Australians are to be hit again in the Budget? Or does it mean that he wants to get in before his Federal counterpart, Mr Keating, brings down his savage Budget next week?

The Premier gave no valid reason why revenue raised from the amended Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act will be paid into general revenue rather than into a fund specifically for roads—a move attacked very forcefully by the general manager of the R.A.A., Mr Waters, last week. The two Bills debated by this House last week, which relate to revenue from taxes on tobacco and petrol products, were ill researched, and their possible effect on South Australians was ignored by the Government.

While the Premier admitted that increased revenue from fuel would inevitably have some effect on the consumer price index, he was unable at any stage to quantify what effects the increased tax will have. I believe that that is an amazing set of circumstances: the Premier introducing a new measure and not being able to explain to the House the impact of that measure. All he was able to say was that the revenue measures as announced would have an effect on the c.p.i., but that he was not sure whether or not companies (in the case of increased fuel levy) would pass on the cost to consumers. How naive can the Premier be? He obviously does not understand the problems facing companies and business enterprises throughout Australia.

In introducing these measures, the Premier is directly inciting increased inflation. He has ignored the multiplier effect that these measures will have. This is at a time when neither the consumer nor the producer can afford to pay more. The Premier said that it is the impact on the community as a whole which matters. He feels that the cost is sustainable by the community yet is unable to say specifically how much that cost will be.

His defence (or rather his lack of it) in the House last week of the latest savage increases was based on trying to pass the blame on to others, namely, the former Government and the Federal Government. What is clear is that the Premier is under the impression that the average South Australian can afford what they have been asked to pay. Simply, that is not the case.

I referred earlier this afternoon to the Premier's words in Opposition. In a statement on 30 September last year—less than 12 months ago—the Premier asked the former Government for an assurance that it would not introduce a new tax on financial transactions. In doing so, he said:

Political Parties should not be allowed to get away with imposing new, unannounced taxes straight after an election.

Not only was this tax unannounced by the Labor Party at the last election: it was unannounced as recently as May this year.

At a Labor business luncheon sponsored by the Premier, he was asked specifically whether he would introduce such a tax. He said that he would not. He cannot hold his word even for three months. The Premier has tried to maintain that at issue is not his credibility but the difficult financial position that the State faces. He uttered many pious words

in his statement to this House which announced these latest revenue-raising measures.

For example, he said that unfortunately South Australia, like other States, suffers from the dual problem of an extremely restricted revenue base and the reliance on revenue measures which either directly affect employment, such as pay-roll tax, or impact unevenly on the community. He said this as though it was a new difficulty confronting State Governments. Yet, when the former Government confronted the same difficulty by responsible management of the State's finances, the Premier moaned and wailed for more spending, for more Public Service appointments and, by implication, for lower State taxes and charges. He did so, despite an economic climate as difficult as any experienced for 50 years.

During his period in Opposition, and more so since the election, the Premier has utterly debased public debate about State finances. He is now attempting to deflate those expectations by blaming the former Government. It is time the Premier admitted his dishonesty before the last election. It is time he started implementing the most important promise he made before the election, namely, to pursue policies which would not cost South Australian taxpayers more. Of course, he has already broken that promise once: he must not do so again. It is time he started demonstrating some good faith by announcing that there will be no further tax and charge increases this financial year and that the lid will be kept on any further public sector employment this financial year. I challenge him to do that today.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to raise one matter in this debate relating to the operation of S.G.I.C. I will read a letter which I received from one of my constituents, as follows:

Dear Mr Goldsworthy,

I would be pleased if consideration could be given to the matter of an S.G.I.C. claim of costs against myself. A brief history of the situation is as follows:

Motor accident—4 January 1977.

D. Hersey sustained whiplash—neck injury.

Signed discharge from S.G.I.C. on 25 July 1978—based on the only options offered by S.G.I.C. of—

- (1) sign discharge and accept \$100, or
- (2) sign an authority to enable S.G.I.C. to examine medical records.

That was the only advice given to my constituent. The letter continues:

However, medical records to that stage were only two consultations with a local G.P. and therefore I thought that this was not a viable option). Two or three months after signing discharge neck pain became pronounced and consulted G.P. again who then referred me to a specialist for X-rays. This was followed by extensive physio treatment over three years. I still visit physio on occasion. Following the discharge S.G.I.C. refused any payment of medical costs, which led to a Supreme Court case on the 17-19 March 1982.

I will leave out the name of the solicitor representing my constituent. The letter continues:

Judgment was not in my favour. My signature was regarded as binding—

that is, on the discharge—

However, the judge stated that had it not been for my signature he would have awarded me \$17 000 plus costs. I was obliged to pay my own legal costs of \$3 746. My solicitor thought that, after speaking with the S.G.I.C. solicitors, S.G.I.C. would not in fairness pursue their costs against me. On 5 July 1982 I was awarded \$3 500 in the Industrial Court as workers compensation since the accident happened on the way home from work.

However, as may be appreciated, this amount did not cover my legal costs, and I am left with the loss of sick leave entitlements and continuing medical costs. I still suffer with neck pain and since the court case have visited a physiotherapist 16 times at my own cost. Nearly 17 months after the court case I received a letter on 29 July 1983 advising that S.G.I.C. are now going to claim their costs from me of \$5 200. My solicitor suggested I speak to my local member of Parliament, as he together with

myself believe that the action of S.G.I.C. in seeking their costs is grossly unfair. He supports me in that I had no idea of my rights when asked to sign the discharge. I was unaware of the pitfalls of signing, particularly without independent advice.

Not at any time did S.G.I.C. advise me to seek independent advice. My solicitor, in fact, stated that as a lawyer he would be bound by his legal profession to refuse the right of anyone to sign such a release without them seeking advice independently. My solicitor offered the opinion that the judge in the court was legally bound to uphold the discharge signed by me but he did not go into the morality of the process that it was not his function to question the system of S.G.I.C. But, certainly, it would appear that any sense of fair play in this instance has not been adhered to by S.G.I.C. I would be most grateful for representation. . .

I made that representation on behalf of my constituent and have approached S.G.I.C. I have had a response stating that, as the judge awarded costs, they were claiming them some 17 months later from my constituent. I have also had a conversation with the legal firm—the lawyer who represented my constituent on this occasion. He also holds strong views about the way S.G.I.C. has operated in relation to this matter. As we all know, S.G.I.C. has a monopoly on third party bodily injury.

As I understand it, this is not an isolated incident. Officers of S.G.I.C. urge people to sign a release, in this case for the sum of \$100, when no such claim need be made within three years of the injury. In my view, and according to the conversation with this legal firm, S.G.I.C. is operating in a most unethical fashion. It has lawyers and others on its staff whose function it should be to give proper legal advice to people who are injured, or in circumstances such as this.

Of course, S.G.I.C. is in a completely anomalous situation. Obviously, it is to its distinct advantage in a commercial sense not to tender advice. However, as my constituent points out in his letter, any lawyer or solicitor is bound by law to advise a client of his rights and to advise him to seek independent advice. S.G.I.C. is doing neither, to its own advantage.

The solicitor concerned feels very strongly about this matter. He and I believe that an injustice has been done, because my constituent signed a release form not knowing of his rights or the consequences of signing this release form, and not having that advice tendered by the representative of S.G.I.C. or the opportunity of obtaining independent advice. It is a disgraceful situation that the so-called people's insurance company (the company set up by the Labor Government to provide a superior or at least competitive service to the public in competition with the private sector) is operating in what I believe is an unscrupulous fashion. I do not believe that that is too strong a word because, if this commission is depriving people of proper advice (advice which in other quarters must be legally given) for commercial advantage, as I say, that is a completely disgraceful situation.

Returning to this specific case, I believe that an injustice has been done to my constituent on two counts. First, he was not proffered sufficient or proper advice, and the consequences of his signing this release for \$100 were not pointed out to him. Secondly, in pursuing the costs awarded as a matter of law by the judge, it seems to me that the commission is going back on an undertaking, or at least what approaches an undertaking, from the solicitors in relation to these costs such a long time after the actual event. The first count is the more serious one, but the second is particularly serious for my constituent, because he is now faced with a bill of \$5 200 which he had been led to believe in good faith would not be claimed.

It is my strong view that officers of S.G.I.C. need a firm instruction, from whoever is in charge, of the type and the sort of stricture that applies to the legal profession. Some circular or instruction should be issued indicating that any officer of the commission who seeks to get a release from

an insured person in relation to bodily injury must, as a matter of course, point out to that person his rights in law and the consequences of his signing such a release, otherwise situations such as this (and as I am informed, in other cases) will continue to occur, and injustices will continue to be done.

I raise the matter because I think that the general principle needs to be raised. I mentioned my constituent in particular because, as I say, I have made approaches on his behalf specifically to no avail. I would have raised the matter anyway, but I raised it in this forum hoping that it would get some publicity and that, in this way, some pressure will be brought to bear by people in charge of S.G.I.C. to ensure that this sort of practice does not continue. As I said, the solicitor in question has had experience over several years in these matters and feels quite strongly about it. I know that my constituent is quite happy to talk to anyone in relation to this matter, and I hope that action can be taken to ensure that it does not occur again.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): In this grievance debate I wish to deal with the Government's action in increasing rents by the Teacher Housing Authority by 19 per cent. In particular, I refer to a reply given to my colleague from Goyder in the House the other day by the Minister of Education.

It is very important that we deal with this matter because I think that I will show that the Minister has not been entirely forthright in this place in replying to the question ably asked by the member for Goyder. In his reply the Minister attacked the member for Goyder and members on this side of the House for daring to criticise the Government for increasing charges and, at the same time, petitioning the Government for increased services in the community or within their districts. In fact, the Minister mentioned in that debate certain amendments that were before the House at that stage. He criticised the Opposition quite trenchantly for daring to question the Government's motives and the fact that the Government had had to increase taxes to bring into effect some of its election promises.

As I have said before in this place, it is about time that members opposite realised what the nub of this question is: that is, before the election shadow Ministers in the present Government were making promises to the people of South Australia to extend services and the like. At the same time, the Premier (the then Leader of the Opposition) was saying to the people of South Australia, 'We will not increase taxes.' That is the nub of this question. The present Opposition will retain its right and will not resile from questioning the Government about when it will introduce its promises, why it is not introducing its promises, and the costs of introducing its promises, because the Government made promises and, at the same time, promised that it would not increase State taxation. As I have said before in this place, it is a confidence trick perpetrated on the people of South Australia.

In dealing with the Minister's reply to the question in relation to increases in the Teacher Housing Authority rentals, the member for Goyder quoted a statement that the Minister made some time ago. I repeat that quote, as follows:

The Minister agreed that the Government had an obligation to provide housing assistance to its employees in the country.

The Minister further stated:

Rents will not be increased while the wage pause is on, and also until significant progress is made on the T.H.A. maintenance backlog. The method for determining any future rent increases would be negotiated with S.A.I.T.

Mr Lewis: So much for another promise.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, so much for another promise. The Minister of Education castigated the member for Goyder because in his explanation the member

for Goyder said that the Minister was breaking a promise. However, the Minister said that he did not say to the South Australian Institute of Teachers that he would consult with it about the amount of the rental increase, but that he would consult with it about the method of bringing about the rental increase. On the face of it that seemed to be a reasonable answer. However, this morning I checked this matter with the South Australian Institute of Teachers: I thought that I would go to the source.

I was assured by the institute that the Minister had not consulted with it concerning the amount of the rental increase or, more importantly, about the method of bringing about the rental increase. That represents dissimulation by the Minister because, on the one hand he castigated the member for Goyder and other members on this side of the House for not getting the exact nuance of the question right, yet on the other hand, upon checking the matter, we found that the Minister had not consulted with the South Australian Institute of Teachers on either matter.

Mr Meier: They are not too happy about it, either.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, they are not too happy. I asked them whether I had permission to relay this information to the House today and they said, 'Certainly.' The next point that the Minister made was that rentals would not be increased during the wage pause, but that it would be increased as from October. Therefore, the Minister believes that his statement that the Government would not increase rentals during the wage pause is not relevant, because the Government is not intending to increase them until October, as members opposite seem to think that there will be a wage rise before October. However, I have heard nothing of this, and I do not think that Justice Moore has heard anything about it, although it is considered by members opposite that there will be a wage increase by October.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The wage pause is certainly on at the moment, as the member for Henley Beach knows. But what sort of commitment to the wage pause has the Government given having regard to the fact that it has announced these increases in charges and State taxation in the middle of a wage pause? What hope do the workers in this State and in this country have while Governments are announcing increases in charges (and implementing them in some cases as is the case in regard to water rates) to come into effect immediately at the time when the Government thinks that the wage pause will finish? It is anticipated that if there is a wage rise teachers will get a 2 per cent to 3 per cent (to a maximum of 4 per cent) increase.

Mr Ferguson: How do you know that?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The South Australian Institute of Teachers told me that if country teachers receive an increase at the maximum of 4 per cent they will lose the whole of the increase except for about 40c or 50c a week because of the increase in Teacher Housing Authority rentals.

Mr Meier: Another disincentive: so much for their promises.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, as the member for Goyder so rightly says. That highlights the hypocrisy of the Government and the confidence trick that it has played on the people of South Australia. The final matter on this point that I want to canvass concerns the fact that the Minister said that no increase in Teacher Housing Authority rentals would be made until significant progress has been made on the backlog of maintenance. Time does not permit me to canvass this matter at length as I would wish, because there are many figures to quote.

Suffice it to say that the annual maintenance requirements for Teacher Housing Authority houses is about \$1 000 000 a year, and it is true that this year the Government has

allocated \$1 300 000 or \$1 400 000 for that maintenance. This is for ordinary maintenance—not emergency maintenance, so there is a credit of \$300 000 or \$400 000 in regard to money for maintenance. I wish I had more time to pursue this matter, but the pertinent point that I want to make is that I understand that \$600 000 of that amount has been transferred from another line in the Budget, namely, the line for upgrading and modernisation. Therefore, in fact what the Government has done is take it from one basket to put into another.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): What concerns me above all else in regard to the Government and the manner with which it has adopted the financial management of this State is the hand-to-mouth approach that it has adopted with no long-term planning associated with it. What concerns me is that the long-term objectives and capital cost planning that must go ahead and the long lead time in many of the major projects needed to safeguard the interests of all the people of South Australia, particularly those in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, have virtually been thrown out of the window.

I refer in particular to the long-term projects required to maintain a reasonable quality of water in South Australia for the people of this State. One proposal that I put forward during the time of the Tonkin Government was that there be an extensive study undertaken into the quality of water of Lake Albert. Many people would be aware that the quality of the water in Lake Albert is only half that of the water in Lake Alexandrina. In other words, when Lake Alexandrina has in the vicinity of 1 300 e.c. units, Lake Albert has in the vicinity of 2 600 e.c. units.

The attitude of the Government to this problem is that the value of the lakes, Lake Albert in particular, is pertinent only in regard to the benefit and needs of some 40 irrigators around Lake Albert. However, nothing could be further from the truth. Although there are 40 irrigators in that area who are vitally dependent on the quality of water in Lake Albert, I point out quite clearly that the real importance of Lakes Albert and Alexandrina to South Australia is that they are the major fresh water reservoir of this State.

It is a major back-up source of water for the metropolitan area of Adelaide. The Government has not come to grips with or realised the importance of those lakes to the security of the water supply to metropolitan Adelaide. At the pool level with the barrages closed, at the standard pool level in the lakes, the water will back up the Murray River well past Murray Bridge and Mannum, which enables the water of those lakes to be pumped back into the metropolitan supply.

What has been suggested in the report into the Lake Albert salinity problem, which has just been released by the Government, is to take what one could describe as the soft option, that is, to improve the situation by fluctuating the levels of the water in Lakes Albert and Alexandrina during periods of free flow, and thus significantly reduce the amount of salinity in Lake Albert. That would partially do the job, but the option of a 25 gegalitre capacity a month channel, which would produce a maximum present value net benefit of \$2 400 000, would cost \$2 700 000, being the total present value cost of such a channel. That is the logical and responsible option that should be adopted by South Australia for the protection above all else of the metropolitan water supply. Also, there would be a fringe benefit to the irrigators on the shores of Lake Albert.

To opt for the soft option of fluctuating the levels in Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert is only a half measure, for two reasons. One is that it will not do the job as well as the channel from the bottom of Lake Albert into the

Coorong and, secondly, it means that vast quantities of water will have to be taken out of the lakes to remove a portion of the salt. The channel can and will be operated when the lakes are at full capacity because the only time free flows will be available is when the lakes are at full capacity and surplus flows will be going through the barrages out to sea.

It would mean that the levels of the lakes would not vary, but it would dramatically improve the quality of water. The report indicates that such a channel would largely bring the quality of the water in Lake Albert up to the standard of the water contained in Lake Alexandrina, and this would mean that there would be this tremendous back-up supply and reservoir of water for metropolitan Adelaide. That is the key to the whole question and that is what is vitally important at a time of restricted flow in South Australia. If we drop below the restricted flow allocation to this State in the critical months of December, January, and February, then the water going over Lock 1, and available to the pumping stations at Mannum and Murray Bridge to pump the needed water for Adelaide, would not be enough. I think it is readily acknowledged by the Government that in the past 12 months about 90 per cent of Adelaide's water supply has been pumped from the Murray River. If insufficient water is coming over Lock 1 to meet that pumping demand, there is only one place from which that water can be obtained, and that is for it to be drawn back from the lakes to Mannum and Murray Bridge.

The lakes can provide that back-up and guarantee but, if the water quality in Lake Albert is 2 600 e.c. units, that will dramatically reduce the quality of water available to metropolitan Adelaide. Any suggestion in the report that any benefits would largely be derived purely by the 40 irrigators in that area, and therefore if a channel is to be put in it should be paid for by those 40 irrigators, is absolutely ludicrous. The 40 irrigators are a small part of the total project. We are talking about 1 000 000 people in the metropolitan area of Adelaide who could be vitally affected if this project is not proceeded with as quickly as possible. The cost benefit is extremely good, but it means that the project will have to be built into the capital works programme in South Australia quickly.

It is short-sighted of the Government and it is gambling with South Australia's future water supply and the well-being of the people in the metropolitan area of Adelaide in particular if it does not grapple with this problem quickly and implement this project soon. The Minister for Environment and Planning is now talking about a further 10 year study to determine what effects it will have on the Coorong, to have this 25 gegalitre a month flow from Lake Albert into the Coorong at various times. I suggest to the Minister that at present that type of flow going through the barrages is a massive amount of water that would be flowing down the Coorong in a completely uncontrolled way.

It is readily acknowledged by all concerned that fresh water flows into the Coorong are vital for its survival and for the survival of fish life and wildlife in the area. To say that there now needs to be a 10 year study of the environmental and ecological effects of a regulated flow such as is proposed in this report from Lake Albert into the Coorong is absolutely ludicrous. One reason for this study has been suggested, and that is to make sure the project will not get off the ground for another 10 years, and that the Government will not be committed to that capital work. The Government needs to grapple with this problem urgently in the interests of the people in metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I bring to the attention of the Minister of Transport certain problems within the transport industry. The transport industry is seething

with anger at the *ad hoc* manner with which the Road Traffic Board grants permits for over-dimension and overweight loads. The industry is deeply concerned at the inconsistency in granting permits, the lack of consultation with the industry before changing the basis for administrative decisions, and the failure of those granting the permits to understand the commercial conditions under which the transport industry must operate. It operates in a real world.

Numerous groups have complained about the granting of such permits. My experience of Government is that when so many people complain about the administrative decisions of a Government body, then something is obviously seriously wrong. Let me outline some of the complaints that have come to my attention. A company carting substantial quantities of large round bales of hay has complained about the changing rules of granting permits. Last year this company was allowed to transport these bales two deep across the tray of the truck. Permits were granted for loads 11 ft wide.

This year the company has been refused permits to carry the same load. The reason given for the refusal was that the drought is now over. There was no consultation before changing the rules and, frankly, whether or not there is a drought does not alter, I believe, whether or not it is appropriate to carry such an over-dimension load. Another complaint was raised at the 1983 annual conference of the United Farmers and Stockowners. The following motion was passed at that conference:

That this conference views with concern the discrepancy of information available from regional offices of the Highways Department on the transportation of tractors (on trucks) over 2.5 metres in width and urges the U.F. & S. to approach the Road Traffic Board to instruct officers to issue clarification of the Act, and be uniform from office to office across the State.

The mover of that motion pointed out that two different opinions were given by the board in respect of the road transportation of over-width vehicles involving exactly the same load. The member for Light last week gave details to this Parliament of how a company that manufactures pre-fabricated houses found that the rules for transporting those houses changed overnight and without warning. That administrative action added \$500 to \$600 to the cost of moving just one house. Similar problems arose when many transportable houses were sold recently at the Woodside Army Camp. Dozens of people bid for those houses, having received quotations from transport companies to move the houses. The day after the auction, people were bewildered to find that suddenly the rules for granting permits to transport the houses had changed.

Recently, I sat around a table with a group of transport operators who had case after case to tell me of where the decisions of the board were inconsistent and lacked commercial considerations. I am surprised to find that the Heavy Vehicles Advisory Committee has not been called together since this Government came to office almost one year ago. The Minister of Transport should be ashamed of such a record. The Minister must investigate how such permits are granted and ensure that in future there is close consultation with the transport industry to establish guidelines. The public servants issuing these permits should be asked to ensure consistency and to take into account commercial considerations.

Another related area of considerable dissatisfaction concerns permits granted for the operation of road trains within South Australia. Again, there seems to be an inconsistency and a failure to consider commercial aspects of the operation. The operation of road trains in South Australia has generally been confined to low population areas north of Port Augusta to the Northern Territory border and the Cooper Basin; west of Port Augusta to the West Australian border, and on the Eyre Peninsula, with shorter road trains for the grain

season, and between Port Lincoln and the Western Australian border. In addition, a triple road train is allowed to operate in the extreme north in an east-west operation, criss-crossing the Northern Territory/South Australian border. This is the only triple road train operation permitted in South Australia. Although the Northern Territory and Western Australia have road train routes, there is an obvious reluctance by the South Australian Road Traffic Board to accept road trains, in a controlled manner even, whilst the other States have expanded road train routes.

I give some examples. First, Western Australia has recently opened a new road train route to Albany. Secondly, the Northern Territory runs road trains right through the city of Darwin to the port area; thirdly, whilst South Australia has allowed road trains to the West Australian border some inconsistencies have occurred—doubles south of the Northern Territory border, while triples are allowed north of the border; in other words, one can take a double road train to the border, then it can become a triple road train. Of course, that really means that it is impossible to take the benefit of that because one cannot suddenly pick up an extra trailer in the middle of nowhere. Inconsistencies include the lack of continuous routes for road trains from Queensland or New South Wales travelling through to either Western Australia or the Northern Territory.

During construction of the Moomba liquids pipeline, road trains were allowed north of Quorn. However, although other construction work is still proceeding at Moomba, road trains may now only travel north of Lyndhurst. Originally 35-metre road trains were allowed between Port Lincoln and Whyalla. However, this permit now allows only 28-metre road trains. The use of road trains is one excellent way of reducing transport costs in a large country such as Australia.

Certain special conditions apply to their use and there is acceptance that that should be the case. The prime movers of road trains must be inspected annually to ensure safety, and they are restricted to 85 km/h. The Minister of Transport should investigate this problem immediately. He should establish a working party with representatives of the transport industry to review existing operation procedures for road trains and to establish general guidelines for their future use. I specifically request that he establish a consistent, coherent and logical route for road trains use that should be followed for the whole of the State where it is appropriate that road trains should be on the roads.

There is one other matter I wish to take up briefly. That is the withholding tax imposed by the Labor Federal Government to be implemented from 1 September. Yesterday I asked a question of the Deputy Premier in this House specifically requesting that he take up the matter with his Labor Party colleagues in Canberra to ensure that, first, the introduction of that withholding tax is deferred for at least another three months and, secondly, that during that three-month period there be a complete review of the procedures for that withholding tax.

Let me say from the outset that I would be the first to say that the cash economy must be brought under this nation's tax laws. The cash economy has operated and flourished, in fact, when it needed action taken to stop it. But, at the same time, it is quite clear to anyone who has looked at the procedures established by Mr Dawkins, and I think now taken up by the Treasurer, Mr Keating, that those procedures will cause immense problems and damage to the transport, building, construction and cleaning industries. It will cause severe liquidity problems. Imagine imposing a 10 per cent tax on an interstate long distance road

hauler when in fact the total labour component and value paid for that trip would be only about 15 per cent. So, in effect, he is being taxed for two-thirds of the money that would be received for his labour component.

That not only will cause severe liquidity problems within the industry, but it is likely to increase the cost of transport in Australia, which would be most unfortunate, and cause immense administrative problems. I was disappointed that the Deputy Premier would not give an undertaking to even approach his Federal colleagues in Canberra. I now ask the Minister of Transport to take this matter up on my behalf.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I want to speak about the way in which the State Government has conducted, or rather failed to conduct, its alleged campaign against a possible Federal wine tax, and to stress the adverse effects that such a tax would have not only on the wine industry in South Australia but on the tourism industry. Tonight's *News*, on page 3, carries a headline, 'Last ditch wine tax fight by Bannon'.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: It's a bit late, isn't it?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is more than a bit late. The Federal Budget would be well and truly set. Nevertheless, I suppose this would be described as a public relations exercise by the Government. The article states:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, still fears a wine tax may be imposed in Tuesday's Federal Budget. He will fly to Canberra—

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As my colleague says, I suspect that he has already been told. This is what you call the naked emperor putting on a few clothes, getting ready for a press conference after the Federal Budget. The article continues:

He will fly to Canberra tomorrow to make a last effort to avert a tax. Mr Bannon will meet the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, the Treasurer, Mr Keating, and the Industry and Commerce Minister, Senator Button. He will tell them the ailing South Australian wine industry can not afford the imposition of a wine tax.

That article, and paragraphs in the article which follow, demonstrate some interesting things about this Government. First, it demonstrates either the complete naivety of the Premier in assuming that any action he could take at this late stage of the game, less than a week before the Federal Budget is announced, could possibly have any effect on Budget papers which are already printed and stored. Secondly, if that is not the case, if he is not naive, then he is downright deceiving the people of South Australia in trying to pretend that he is embarking on a last ditch wine tax when he knows already that the game may well be up.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: I think he is both naive and dishonest.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That could well be an accurate analysis. Not only the Premier is involved in this; the Minister on the front bench, the Minister of Tourism, is placed in a very difficult position by the action of his Leader, who fears that a wine tax might be imposed, because on 6 June the Minister of Tourism is reported in the *News* of that day as stating that the Federal Government has guaranteed it would not introduce a wine tax. The report states:

The South Australian Tourism Minister, Mr Keneally, contacted the Federal Primary Industry Minister, Mr Kerin, as fears grew. After speaking with Mr Kerin, Mr Keneally gave an unequivocal assurance no wine tax would be included in the August Budget.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Like he did on the Berri bridge.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Indeed—like he did on the Berri bridge. The Minister of Tourism is accustomed to giving unequivocal assurances to the tourism industry and subsequently seeing those assurances broken. 'The tax is definitely not on,' Mr Keneally said. How can one reconcile a Minister in a Cabinet stating on behalf of another Government that no tax is going to be imposed, and then that Minister's Leader making a deputation to that other Government seeking assurances that such a tax will not be imposed? It is clear that there is either a total lack of consultation in the Bannon Cabinet and that the right hand does not know what the left is doing; or, alternatively, that the Minister of Tourism has been making unauthorised statements; or, alternatively, that his Premier rejects the Minister of Tourism's unauthorised statements; or, alternatively, that this is a good publicity exercise designed to create an impression in the minds of the people of South Australia that the State Government is indeed fighting for the rights of the wine industry in South Australia. I doubt that the latter is the case.

An honourable member: Do you think they are dishonest?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I think indeed they are dishonest. It is interesting that on the same day that the Minister of Tourism stated unequivocally that there would be no tax, I received a telegram from the Federal Minister of Primary Industry which states:

The Commonwealth Government will not contribute to any speculation about a wine tax, speculation raised in the first place by members of the Federal Opposition. The concern of South Australia and its tourism industry are well understood by the Commonwealth.

Subsequently, from the Minister assisting the Prime Minister, I received a letter stating that as this was a matter for consideration in budgetary deliberations it would not be appropriate to comment at this time. Later still, I received a letter from the Minister for Tourism, Mr John Brown, stating that he was aware of the close interconnection between the wine industry and tourism, and particularly of the importance of wine growing as a regional tourist attraction in many areas of Australia, including in South Australia. Mr Brown says:

I will have your representations very much in mind during any discussions held in Budget contexts.

Of course we all recall that the Federal Labor Party promised—that at least was unequivocal—that there would be no wine tax. I also received a letter from the Treasurer, who asked his secretary to thank me for bringing my comments to his attention. If there is to be no wine tax, why then did not all those Ministers reject out of hand the possibility, draw my attention yet again to their Party's solemn undertaking not to introduce a wine tax, and leave the matter at that? But no, here, on the eve of the Federal Budget, we have the Premier allegedly making a last ditch attempt to persuade the Federal Government that there should be no wine tax. Indeed, it must be rejected as nothing more than a publicity stunt.

Having said that, I want to stress yet again the relationship between the profitability of the wine industry and its capacity to provide facilities for the tourism industry in South Australia. It is well known that 60 per cent of Australia's wine production and 80 per cent of Australia's brandy production is grown in this State. Six tourism regions and at least seven areas of the State (spread over a wide area) are dependent upon wine in their regional economies. Those areas include the Southern Vales, known as the Wine Coast, the Adelaide Plains, the Barossa Valley, the Clare Valley, the Riverland,

the Coonawarra District, the Padthaway-Keppoch District, and the Bremer-Angas Valley which embraces the Langhorne Creek wine growing area.

Each of the wineries in those areas provides visitor facilities that are not only geared to wine sales but which are also regarded as part of the tourism infrastructure of the area. If one looks just south of Adelaide at the most recent and spectacular example of a wine company putting considerable capital investment into facilities for the benefit of tourism, one looks at Thomas Hardy & Sons, at Reynella, a company which has just spent \$8 000 000 on its winery; \$500 000 of that \$8 000 000 has been spent on making things attractive for tourists. It is expenditure that the company need not have undertaken in respect of its sales, because cellar door sales are not a profitable part of the wine industry. However, they are an integral part of the tourist attraction of the region. Invariably, they provide a pleasant place for visitors to spend an hour or two. They provide a focal point for the region, and invariably lift the standard of facilities. In all, they provide a basis and an infrastructure which gives a particular glamour and attractiveness to the total region.

If a wine tax were to be imposed, the capacity of those companies to continue to provide those facilities would be adversely affected. For example, none of the producers are making sufficient margins at present to enable them to continue to provide those facilities.

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

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Consistent with remarks from my colleagues on this side of the House about their concern over Government taxation and the breaking of promises, I too would like to place on record a matter which is not only of concern to us as a Party but is clearly of great concern to the public generally. On page 21 of his policy speech (in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition) on 25 October 1982 the Premier said:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow State charges like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of backdoor taxation. The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes or increase existing taxes during our term of office.

Subsequent to that statement, as we all know, the Bannon Party was elected to Government and has proceeded in the interim period to date to introduce a whole range of taxes, details of which have been referred to, as I indicated, by a number of members so far during this session, and, indeed, during this debate. I do not propose to read the significant list of taxation increases introduced by the Bannon Government during the period in question, but I seek your leave and that of the House to have the statistical detail associated with those increases (some 24 items in total) inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure the House that it is purely statistical?

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Yes, I have checked with the staff of the Chamber and I can give that assurance.

Leave granted.

Increased State taxes and charges during term of Bannon Labor Government

Chronological order

2. 20.11.82 Electricity charges—tariffs to increase by 12 per cent from 1.12.82.

Domestic consumers average of 11.8 per cent

Commercial users average of 10.3 per cent

Most industrial users 11.3 per cent

High volume users under contract 18.0 per cent

(Advertiser 20.11.82).

3. 25.11.82 E. & W.S. Department—provision of certificate of charges to land agents and land brokers from \$3 to \$4—up 33 per cent (*Government Gazette* 25.11.82 page 1698).
4. 25.11.82 E. & W.S. Department—
 - Fees for well drillers licence from \$15 to \$30—up 100 per cent.
 - Variation of meter test fee.
 Proclaimed watercourse and wellhead from \$10 to \$20—up 100 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 25.11.82 page 1699).
5. 1.12.82 Hospitals Fees—increased by 20 per cent (*News* 1.12.82).
6. 16.12.82 Veterinary surgeons registration fees—increased from \$20 to \$25—up 25 per cent (*Government Gazette* 16.12.82 page 1903).
7. 23.12.82 Hairdressers registration fees—Annual fee increased from \$18.50 to \$19.50—up 5 per cent (*Government Gazette* 23.12.82 page 1941).
8. 23.12.82 Waste management fees—
 - Licensing of depot from \$25 to \$31.25.
 - Transport of waste from \$5 to \$6.25.
 - Each vehicle fees from \$20 to \$25.
 - Each prescribed waste producer fees from \$10 to \$12.50.
 All of the above have increased 25 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 23.12.82 page 1944).
9. 23.12.82 Architects fees—
 - Subscriptions increased—Natural persons \$25 to \$27.50—up 10 per cent. Company \$60 to \$65—up 8 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 23.12.82 page 1934).
10. 27.1.83 Hairdressers Registration Board
 Board fees: Chairman increased from \$1 080 to \$1 200 p.a.—up 11 per cent. Members increased from \$900 to \$1 020 p.a.—up 13 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 27.1.83 page 211).
11. 23.2.83 pastoral leases—Rentals up 50 per cent (*News* 23.2.83).
12. 3.3.83 Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act fees.
 - Taxi licence fees up by 18 per cent.
 - Taxi driver permits from \$11 to \$20—up 82 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 3.3.83 page 532).
13. 14.4.83 Racing Act—Trotting Control Board fees.
 Schedule of fees increased between range 7 per cent to 71 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 14.4.83 page 887).
14. 19.5.83 Number plate fees.
 Price of number plates increased 10 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 19.5.83 page 1196).
15. 19.5.83 Government supervisors at race meetings.
 Fees payable by clubs increased from \$30 to \$50—up 67 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 19.5.83 page 1195).
16. 26.5.83 Trotting stewards fees.
 Increase of fees payable up between range 15 per cent to 30 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 26.5.83 page 1235).
17. 2.6.83 Nurses Registration fees—
 - each certificate from \$3 to \$15—up 400 per cent.
 - Duplicate certificates from \$1 to \$5—up 400 per cent.
 - Rentation fees (per annum) \$1 to \$15—up 1 400 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 2.6.83 page 1583).
18. 16.6.83 Chiropodists annual licence and subscription fees.
 Increase from \$75 to \$85—up 13 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 16.6.83 page 1683).
19. 30.6.83 Fishing licences.
 - A class up from \$60 to \$80—increase of 33 per cent.
 - B class up from \$20 to \$30—increase of 50 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 30.6.83 page 1795).
20. 30.6.83 Post mortem fees.
 - Full examination from \$50 to \$65—up 30 per cent.
 - External examination from \$12 to \$15.60—up 30 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 30.6.83 page 1767).
21. 30.6.83 Physiotherapist licence fees.
 - Annual fee from \$18 to \$20—up 11 per cent.
 - Licence retention from \$5 to \$6—up 20 per cent.
 (*Government Gazette* 30.6.83 page 1773).
22. 30.6.83 Bus fares.
 - Two sections adult fare from 40 cents to 60 cents—up 50 per cent.
 - Two zone adult fare from 70 cents to 90 cents—up 29 per cent.

Three zone adult fare from 90 cents to \$1.30—up 45 per cent.

Day tripper from \$2.50 to \$4.00—up 60 per cent.
 An overall average increase of 47.6 per cent.
 (*News* 30.6.83).

23. 1.7.83 Water rates.

Price of water from 37 cents to 45 cents kilolitre—up 22 per cent.

Minimum water rate from \$52 to \$60—up 16 per cent.

Minimum sewer rate from \$60 to \$76—up 26 per cent.
 (*News* 1.7.83).

24. 15.7.83 Housing trust rents.

To rise by up to \$7.50 a week in two stages.

First increase up to \$5 a week to apply from 1 October, remainder to be applied in February 1984.
 (*Advertiser* 15.7.83).

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: The next matter that I want to raise during this debate is one which likewise concerns me and a number of the community at large, particularly those who are dependent upon services from the departments that, under the Bannon Government, are apparently subject to seeking to produce better value for money, and, indeed, demonstrate efficiency within their respective roles within the department. Set before the Chamber today have been some examples of gross inefficiency, causing quite extreme delay to constituents and costs, unnecessarily incurring frustration, and, I believe, retarding development in a number of areas where, if efficiency was demonstrated at departmental level and swifter action taken by the Public Service in those respective departments, not only would the delay be avoided but there would be prompt attention to the development and associated matters, thereby creating jobs and, in all, being beneficial to the community.

The first such bungle that I wish to refer to is picked up in a letter I received from the Acting Minister of Marine, dated 5 July 1983, when, after a long saga of attempts by a constituent of mine from Kangaroo Island to obtain a position with the Marine and Harbors Department at Kingscote, we finally learnt that one of the officers of the department (and I name him, Mr Bateman) had exceeded his authority in discussions with my constituent (in this instance, Mr Boxall), and a clear admission of that exceeding of authority is made by the Hon. Ron Payne. He went on to say, and I quote from the letter that he wrote to me, as follows:

This occurrence is regretted and whilst the officer concerned obviously exceeded his instructions . . .

The person ultimately was left without a job and very hot indeed on the department for its role in that matter.

The concern of the constituent obviously became my concern. Indeed, I have taken up the matter with the department over the period in question, but to no avail for the constituent. For me there was plenty of explanation, admission of error and of erring within the departmental structure and by the officer as named, but the constituent missed out. He is without a job into the bargain. Mistakes can be made—I agree. Unfortunately, as the system works, mistakes made within the department are paid for by the public. However, if a member of the public makes a mistake, it is, from time to time, exploited by the department.

I could refer also to another matter but, as it may be *sub judice*, I therefore cannot raise it. However, it involves the Minister for Environment and Planning over a gross delay in his department and, it was admitted by the Minister himself in a recent interview, that little of a tangible nature is being done about it in the meantime. I know that that is a very vague allegation, but I am purposely vague in this instance for two reasons. First, apparently somewhere down the line some legal inquiry is involved. The Minister will know that I am referring to a development subject which

his department has unduly delayed. The other reason I am reluctant to raise the details and am being vague is because the constituent involved is scared stiff that, if I raise the matter in the Parliament or say too much publicly, that department, with which he is bound to deal by virtue of his business, might further discriminate against him in future attempts to develop and have his applications processed by the department.

This constitutes a disgraceful situation where we have developers out in the field, people who are prepared to raise and spend money without Government assistance, getting on with the job of developing, while the blasted Department for Environment and Planning and those associated with it are holding up the works right, left and centre, destroying the incentive for people to develop and driving investors out of the country. Who is paying? The public is paying! The same public servants are getting their wages.

On plenty of occasions in the past I have heard it said in this place that members of Parliament raise matters and hide behind the walls and ivory towers of this place for protection. However, public servants are totally protected for life, for as long as they want to stay in the job. They can make all the mistakes in the world. They can cost the community, constituents and applicants a fortune in the meantime. What do they do about it? They go to work at 9 a.m. and knock off at 5 p.m. and let someone else pay for the mistakes, including flexi-time.

I also refer to another absolute bungle under the portfolio responsibility of the Minister of Lands. Constituents of mine applied on 29 October 1980 to have land freeholded on the south coast on the Fleurieu Peninsula. There has been a long delay and fooling around with this matter—albeit in the period that we were in government. However, it finally went through. On 21 June this year I was advised by the department, when acting for the constituent, that the land grant or title was finally ready for collection. I advised constituents. They came some 60-odd miles to Adelaide to pick up their land grant or title from the relevant department, only to be told that it was not ready. So, back they went to the south coast. After a further series of phone calls they ultimately came to Adelaide and picked up their title on 28 June 1983.

Believe it or not, on 6 July 1983, an officer within the Department of Lands (whom I will not name in this instance as I am not sure that it is entirely his fault), referring to file number 5378/80, sent another letter to the constituent stating:

To obtain the land grant, Treasury receipt No. 11228 for the purchase money of the land, with the purchaser's signature endorsed on the back thereof, should be sent to:

The Registrar-General, Lands Titles Office, G.P.O. Box 1354, Adelaide 5001.

This was for the purpose of collecting the title, but that title had been collected a fortnight beforehand. That demonstrates another classic example of Public Service bureaucracy.

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

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: I've got a bagful of them yet and I'll unload them—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Flinders has the floor.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I take this opportunity to continue on from the comments made by the member for Davenport when he was talking about the effects of road trains and their application in this State. I did not intend to speak about the matter but, as the shadow Minister has raised the question in the House, I believe it would be appropriate that I raise the issue as road trains are used within my electorate. Road trains have been operating in

my area for four or five years. In effect, a road train is a prime mover with two trailers principally a tandem-drive prime mover with a tandem or bogie trailer at the rear of the first trailer and a bogie dolly and a bogie at the rear of the second trailer.

These road trains were initially approved to cater for the grain industry, and particularly to service grain silos not serviced by rail. Permits given for the grain cartage were to carry grain from the Mangalo silo, from Cowell, Arno Bay, Port Neill, Tumbly Bay, Elliston, and at that time the Witera silos, near Port Kenny. These road trains have been operating effectively on Eyre Peninsula, and are well accepted by the bulk of the community. They are a very well-constructed machine, not just any sort of semi-trailer put together. They come under very stringent requirements and inspection by the Road Traffic Board and by officers of the Department of Transport. As such, they are probably the safest vehicles on the road. It is true that they carry heavy tonnages but the braking capacity of these trailers makes them probably safer, and certainly more effective, for transporting bulk cargo than any other conventional means of road transport.

The subject was raised some years back when road trains wanted to enter Port Lincoln. The Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln was contacted by the Road Traffic Board which, at that time, virtually put words in the mouth of the corporation to say that road trains should not enter the city. People who are familiar with access and egress to Port Lincoln would know that all transport to the eastern side of Eyre Peninsula travelling into Port Lincoln must travel through Liverpool Street. To do so one has to negotiate two roundabouts. In order to fully acquaint themselves with the matter, the councillors of the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln arranged for a demonstration, which was subsequently carried out using the then approved 29.1-metre road trains.

It was demonstrated quite clearly that the road trains which were properly designed and constructed did not have the cutting in on turning the roundabout of a conventional semi-trailer unit. In fact, the demonstration was most obvious when viewing a road train going around the roundabout. It was immediately followed by a conventional semi-trailer. The semi-trailer mounted the roundabout but the road train maintained its normal course. It is fair to say that that road train (29.1 metres long) in fact only cut in about 15 inches to 18 inches in negotiating that roundabout, whereas the semi-trailer cut in more than 1 metre.

Approval was given by the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln to allow road trains to enter and travel through the main commerce centre of the town. It was recognised as being a central part of industry in Eyre Peninsula and, as such, had met with the approval of the Chamber of Commerce, the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln and all other bodies involved in industry in the area. Therefore, it had ready acceptance from all sections of the community.

However, in more recent times and upon the completion of the standard gauge line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook, a request was made to run road trains from Whyalla to Port Lincoln. This request was made for an extended length to a maximum of 35 metres. The reason behind this is that a considerable amount of freight and general cargo is taken from Adelaide every night: about nine semi-trailers leave Adelaide every night to take produce to Port Lincoln.

The concept in the request was that, if road trains could be used which could collect from the rail two 40-foot containers on each day that, in effect, would take from the roads on the eastern side of the gulf two semi-trailers up and back. Therefore, it would considerably lessen the hazard (if you like) to the population. The request was made by the company concerned in order to negotiate the road-rail freight to carry two 40-foot containers. Permission was

granted on a six-month basis. It was not until four months later that anyone knew that 35-metre road trains were in fact being used. It had never been raised by anyone, and there had never been any concern expressed.

However, the Road Traffic Board again contacted the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln, virtually put words in its mouth and said, 'You know you cannot have these road trains running through.' The corporation then arranged for another demonstration using two 40-foot containers, and again proved quite convincingly that the road trains could negotiate the commercial centre of the city of Port Lincoln quite adequately and in complete safety.

Of course, the alternative to that is running a double lot of trucks in order to carry the same freight tonnage. Of course, the 35-metre permits that had been approved for travel from Port Lincoln to Penong on previous occasions were granted on the basis that the prime mover was a bogie drive with a tri-axle trailer with a bogie on the dolly of the second trailer, and with a tri-axle on the rear of that. Of course, the company concerned undertook not to exceed the tonnage of a normal bogie trailer during the trial period. That was quite a feasible thing because, nine times out of ten, the general freight being used and freighted in the containers did not exceed the tonnages required. Therefore, the 16.4 tonnes limit on the bogie was accepted by the company as a fair and reasonable thing, and approval was given for that to take place.

We now find that the Road Traffic Board has suddenly decided that road trains are out, and has adopted the attitude of trying to completely do away with road trains, despite the fact that in the Northern Territory triples (which, in effect, is three trailers) travel through Darwin. Tri-axes are used through the centre, and I do not think that anyone would argue about taking a tri-axle through a built-up area: in an open area that is acceptable. Doubles are being used in many other parts of Australia: they are safe vehicles, and are subject to specifications to which no other road vehicle is subjected.

We find that the Road Traffic Board has not only ruled out 35-metre trailers but also wants to cut the 29.1-metre road trains back to 28 metres. I am not quite sure how somebody can cut 4-feet off the back of a road train. One obviously cannot shorten the drawbar, lop a bit off the back or take the bull-bar off the front of the truck. It is a ridiculous situation, and I believe that the Road Traffic Board has been deliberately frustrating the transport industry in an endeavour to get its way and get the doubles and triples off roads in South Australia. In the economics of the situation, I believe that these vehicles should not only be allowed but also encouraged to operate in order to keep the freight rates of bulk commodities to an absolute minimum, because it is another section of the community that will go to the wall unless this policy is approved.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I am most concerned and, like other members of the Opposition, I believe that the Government stands condemned in many areas during its nine months of office. I am pleased that the Chief Secretary is present this afternoon, because within his portfolio comes the position of Auditor-General. On 24 June this year, Garth Tattersall (the Auditor-General) quietly and peacefully retired. I say 'quietly and peacefully', because there was no announcement and nothing said about Garth Tattersall retiring as Auditor-General.

Mr Lewis: He could have acknowledged it, couldn't he?

Mr BECKER: I agree with the member for Mallee. The Minister could have acknowledged it, and could have paid a tribute to Garth Tattersall's service to the State in a position that this House regards in very high esteem.

The Auditor-General is a most important person, is answerable to the Parliament, and reports on the accounts of the State. Therefore, I consider that, when the Auditor-General is due to retire, the Government should plan ahead to seek his replacement so that, if that person does retire there is somebody there to take over the job, because the Auditor-General's Report to 30 June will be presented in Parliament soon. I think that is unfair that at this stage we still do not have a person permanently appointed to the position. I have no argument or quibble with the Acting Auditor-General, and I think that it is only fair to him that he should have the opportunity of knowing whether or not he will be made the next Auditor-General.

This Government has to learn that it is necessary to make decisions, and here is a classic example of the Government not doing something that has been proved most valuable overseas. If an Auditor-General has not been appointed, then I think the Government should advertise the position throughout Australia, not merely within the Public Service. We do not want some buddy-buddy coming up through the Public Service to be the next Auditor-General. I believe that the position should be advertised throughout Australia, and that it should be on a contract basis for five years.

Mr Ashenden: Would you apply for it?

Mr BECKER: My chances of getting it under the present Government are not very high at all. However, I would dearly love to have the job.

Mr Oswald: You would do a good job, too.

Mr BECKER: If the offer was made, I would take it up. I think that a contract should be offered so that the person could opt out at any time if he wanted to. However, I think that we should start the system of appointing the heads of our various Government departments on a contract basis. Therefore, the Government has the opportunity to ensure that the position of Auditor-General is purely apolitical. It can bring in somebody from outside the Public Service and start practising what it has been talking about for many, many years (certainly during the Dunstan decade) about accountability. I do not think that the Government would be averse to that suggestion regarding accountability. However, I believe that it is such an important role that we should go even further and that the Audit Act should be amended and that the appointment of Auditor-General should be made in consultation with the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as is the practice in at least one State in Canada.

I believe that this is a valuable adjunct to the role of Parliament's scrutiny of Government accounts. The idea would be to bring together more closely the operations of the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor-General's Department. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, in conjunction with the Public Service Board and the Government, having a say in regard to the appointment of the next Auditor-General would result in the strengthening of the bond and co-operation between the two. I am not saying that there has not been co-operation between the P.A.C. and the Auditor-General's Department, because there has been. During the three years when I was Chairman of the committee we frequently discussed matters with Garth Tattersall, and the co-operation between him and the Public Accounts Committee and his department was exceptionally cordial.

I was very pleased with that co-operation and understanding. The new Government now has a chance to cement that relationship even further by advertising the position of Auditor-General Australia wide. Naturally, I would prefer that a South Australian be appointed to that position. I believe that there are people within the Public Service who would be quite capable of doing the job and who should have an opportunity to obtain the job. I make this appeal

to the Minister who is not listening at all to the debate; he appears to be more interested in talking to the back-benchers. If that is how he attends to the affairs of his portfolio, I can understand why the shadow Chief Secretary is concerned about proper attention being given to problems within our prison system.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: He does not listen to advice that is given from there, either.

Mr BECKER: No, that would not surprise me. We will not remind the present Chief Secretary that he was a member of the Public Accounts Committee when it visited Yatala in the course of investigating the operations of the canteen some three years ago when we were advised of the problems that were coming up at Yatala. Quite honestly, Yatala Labour Prison would be the worst institution of any kind that I have seen in the world. It is atrocious.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It is not the result of mismanagement by the Minister, of course.

Mr BECKER: It is something that has developed over many years. Previous Governments in office prior to 1979 must take a considerable amount of blame for lack of foresight and planning.

Mr Ashenden: Didn't Mr Dunstan say that there were no votes in prisons?

Mr BECKER: Yes, he did. However, at the same time, I always believed that that was supposed to be a humane Government. The Chief Secretary of that time, Don Simmons, in regard to being known by the public, had one of the lowest ratings of any Minister. No-one knew who he was except those in his immediate neighborhood, which was probably due to good luck more than anything else. He was not well known and was not known to be a forceful Minister. During his term in office it appeared that nothing was being done: nothing evolved, and so the problems relating to the prison came to a crescendo when the Liberal Government came into office in 1979 and during the years that followed, 1980 and 1981, following the Public Accounts Committee's investigation into the canteen—a very small part of the correctional services system.

I am realistic enough to understand the problems out there, and they are not just within the prison itself. There are certain factions within the staff that are causing problems that the Minister must get on top of. He knows that it is not practical to have the operation of two unions in the management and control of one institution. They are some of the problems that the Minister has inherited that exist within the Department of Correctional Services. What bothered me when we went out there and met the officer in charge was a response to a comment I made about expecting a few mistakes to be made during the rehabilitation programmes: the response that I received was, 'Rehabilitation be damned.' At that stage there was no rehabilitation programme as far as the Yatala Labour Prison was concerned.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I want to refer briefly to definitions given in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* of the words 'consult' and 'consultation'. The definition given for 'consult' is 'have deliberations; seek information or advice from (person, book); take into consideration (feelings, interests)'. The definition given for 'consultation' is 'act of consulting; deliberation; conference'. Having said that, I refer to the complete and deliberate failure of many members of the present Government to enter into consultation even though they have given public utterances about their intention to do so. I will outline a few clear examples. Earlier this afternoon the member for Torrens, the shadow Minister of Education, clearly indicated that the South Australian Institute of Teachers is currently most incensed because

consultation in relation to the Teacher Housing Authority rental increases did not materialise. The Minister of Local Government during that now famous meeting at the Festival Hall advised local government members at their annual general meeting of how he was intent on consulting. However, on a number of vital occasions he has failed even to mention to local government the actions that he was embarking upon.

Further, I refer to the debacle that occurred during the last session of Parliament when the Minister of Water Resources gave notice of, and subsequently introduced, a Bill in relation to drainage. It concerned a vital matter which was to involve consultation with local government. In fact, there had been no consultation. The Local Government Association had had prior discussions with the previous Minister and had entered into an arrangement with the then Minister of Water Resources (Hon. P.B. Arnold) and the previous Minister of Local Government (Hon. C.M. Hill) resulting in a proposed course of action consistent with those discussions and acceptable to local government and to the E. & W.S. Department which was to be processed and brought before the House.

However, without consultation the two present Ministers proceeded to bring into this House a measure that was against the principles that had been agreed to between the Local Government Association and the former Ministers, which sought to put all power in relation to drainage matters in the hands of the E. & W.S. Department. The end result was that the Bill was allowed to lapse. It was read a first and second time, was placed on the Notice Paper, but it was not proceeded with. The Government has withdrawn it. I am led to believe that subsequent to those events, which the President of the Local Government Association very forcibly brought to the attention of the Premier, consultation has taken place, and further, the Governor's Speech made at the recent opening of Parliament indicates that we are soon to have a Bill which is consistent with the consultative process between the water resources people and local government.

The Minister of Local Government again at that meeting indicated his intention to consult the Local Government Association and local government generally in relation to the rewriting of the Local Government Act. Whilst I am the first to admit that that consultation has taken place, it was clear in the statements that were made at the annual general meeting that consultation was by no means other than a front and that the decisions on what action would be taken would eventually be the decisions of the Minister. Consultation was to be a farcical situation of giving the opportunity to comment but, regardless of what the comments were, there was to be no consensus of opinion; there was to be a decision which truly reflected the Minister's particular philosophy.

Again without consultation with local government, or with some of the councils involved, Caucus had raised in another place (this Minister certainly did not, the decisions were taken away from him because of his inability to perform in a select committee situation) two issues which relate to the Kadina/Wallaroo/Moonta area and the Gawler area with an impact on the district councils of Light, Munno Para and Barossa, but without any consultation, without any prior warning, without any indication to the other three councils that they would be embraced within the decision-making which was going to come from that select committee.

Again, within the area of the Minister of Local Government, we have the decision which was outlined last week in relation to an expenditure raising exercise by the Libraries Board which took an additional \$90 000 from the people who provide library services, a decision which again was made without consultation. Indeed, in a letter to my colleague

the member for Fisher, the District Council of Meadows said:

It has been generally understood that the average book price took into consideration the costs involved in cataloguing, acquisition, book furnishing and issuing. The proposed book processing charge of 80 cents per book relates to all hard-back books but no charges will be made for central collection material. It is proposed that the charge will be shared equally between the State and local government. There has been no consultation . . .

The letter goes on to point out that they had been permitted to determine a budget for the 1983-84 year which has in fact been impacted upon by the action of the Libraries Board without any opportunity for increasing the income to the library which inevitably means a decrease in the service which that local government body and, indeed, other local government bodies, can give to their ratepayers.

We have the Minister for Environment and Planning who has failed to consult in relation to vegetation regulations. He went to a national meeting of Planning Ministers and indicated that he was going to be a consultant in so many matters of planning and in actual fact he was not proceeding to do those things which he suggested he would.

We have had the Deputy Premier failing to consult with the Opposition in relation to the proper planning of the business of this House. Fortunately, he has seen the error of his ways and consultation is now taking place. I want to go back to the definition of 'consult'. Consultation is an important part of the Parliamentary system. It is an important part of a Government's interaction with its community and I would stress that the Government which is on the benches should mend its ways quite dramatically and get on with the consultative process.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): Last week I raised the issue in the House of the fact that my conversation with David Combe had actually been bugged on a telephone call which I made from this Chamber. I think that was a scandalous situation and I want to say something about that this afternoon because I think that this whole sorry episode has raised a great number of questions which ought to be aired in this place. Particularly this afternoon I want to speak about what I see as the double standards in the area of privacy and the protection which has occurred in this whole sorry affair which should in my view frighten and shame every Australian citizen.

I am referring, of course, to the matter surrounding the Combe/Ivanov events. My interest in those proceedings is motivated by my deep personal knowledge of the two principal victims so far—David Combe, a former South Australian, and Mick Young, a distinguished citizen of this State. We have now a situation where, on the evidence presented, Combe has been disclosed as having done nothing wrong. Yet, in the interests of national security his livelihood has been stripped from him, he has not been able to work for three-and-a-half months, the phones of his family have been intercepted on the basis of a request from ASIO which contained three major factual errors. He himself was under personal surveillance; he and his family lived for weeks in the belief that their home was bugged and indeed went outside their own home to converse on sensitive matters in the fear that they were being bugged.

The nation has been subjected to the very baring of the soul of this man and his family as we have been regaled with verbatim transcripts of his late-night inebriated dinner ramblings with a person he regarded as a friend and with the detailed verbatim contents (with all of ASIO's inaccuracies) of his telephone conversations during the period his phones were bugged.

I believe that this is the most massive invasion of privacy of an Australian family seen in our history. This was in respect of a man who had not even, on the evidence of

ASIO or an increasingly besieged Prime Minister Hawke, committed any offence. He may be deemed by some to have been naive, stupid, a target or whatever, but no-one has been able to say he committed any offence or breached Australian security.

In the case of Mick Young, he has been stripped of his senior Ministerial post, in pursuit of which he served his country with distinction and which he richly deserved, because he did a favour to his best mate by tipping him off about a potentially dangerous situation in which he might have found himself. There is a common factor in the demise of both of these men. His name is Laurie Matheson, a man who has now been shown to be nothing but a scaramouch and a nark for ASIO.

Neither Combe or Young has even been allowed to be told what Matheson has said or alleged against them, on the basis of which both have been sentenced. At the same time as the privacy of Combe and his family has been infringed in a way unprecedented in our history, as I said earlier, Matheson is protected from any scrutiny of his rotten dealings and those things which he has told to his ASIO masters, because of what is laughingly referred to as his 'cover'. Matheson's cover is the reason for the farcical situation where this royal commission jumps in and out of camera with Combe not being allowed to be present and his barristers not even being allowed to tell him what occurs.

I am informed that Matheson approached ASIO about Combe before Christmas. I wonder whether he was assigned to set Combe up when he first consulted Combe shortly before Combe's departure for the Soviet Union in November. It is Matheson who consistently reported on Combe to ASIO. Matheson was one of those whom Combe informed about what Ivanov told him on 3 April concerning the bugging of his phones and suggested that they not make telephonic contact with each other but visit each other's homes if contact was desired. It was Matheson's distorted version of this (an account which would have been told to him in the same way as it was told by Combe to many people as revealed by Combe's telephone transcripts) which led to ASIO in advance claiming Combe had acted in clandestine fashion, which of course is nonsense.

There never was a bug outside Ivanov's home when that conversation took place, which was referred to as the 'clandestine conversation'. The 'record' of the conversation which the Attorney-General, Senator Evans, referred to was the coloured Matheson account of what Combe had told him. It was Matheson who gave Combe documents for the specific purpose of passing them on to Ivanov, and yet, when Combe did what he was asked to by his client, he was accused of having taken a further step towards 'entrapment'.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Are you saying that Evans lied?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am not going to comment on that. What I am saying is that Mr Matheson has been the basis of all this sorry event. I think a lot more needs to be said about Mr Matheson's activities in this whole episode. It was Matheson, and nobody else, who informed ASIO of what Mr Eric Walsh told him Mick Young had said about the discussions of the Government about Ivanov and Combe on 21 April, and yet, even when he gave evidence before the royal commission, Young was never allowed to be told that it was Matheson who had informed on him, and what particular distortions of Walsh's account of the Young/Walsh conversation Matheson put to ASIO.

I assert that it is a national disgrace, a national shame, and the greatest justification yet seen for the adoption of the South Australia A.L.P. proposal that ASIO should be abolished in the interests of the rights of all Australian citizens and that, at the same time as Combe and his family have been all but destroyed professionally and personally by the assaults upon them, this man Matheson's cover is

given a higher priority by Justice Hope and the Federal Government than the basic civil liberties of Australian citizens, the denial of natural justice and the denial of due process which are inherent in Combe's treatment are to be deplored.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Is the Prime Minister implicated?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member can draw his own conclusions from what I have said earlier on that. I am appalled that it is necessary for Combe to approach the Government for an extension of the terms of reference of this commission just so that the question of whether he was afforded natural justice before in the decisions of the National and International Security Committee of Cabinet, the Cabinet itself, and the full Ministry can be determined. I am appalled that Combe's counsel was denied the right to cross-examine the Attorney-General yesterday on matters pertaining to natural justice because of Hope's narrow view of his commission's being limited to national security matters.

It is interesting to note the relative ease and convenience with which Matheson was able to off-load the company, Commercial Bureau, to Elders IXL for a seven-figure sum. Elders obviously already has a very large segment of the Australia-Soviet trade and it seems strange in light of this that the Elders management felt the need to add to its stable Commercial Bureau at a time when Matheson's company was weak as a result of significant losses from its management team and when Matheson himself was coming under something of a cloud.

This acquisition is doubly strange when one considers the fact that it took place after Matheson had become aware of the fact that the Prime Minister at least was proposing the establishment of a Government trading corporation to handle Australian trade with the centrally planned economies, such as the Soviet and China. In normal commercial circumstances one could have at the very least expected Elders' chief executive, John Elliott, to complain bitterly and seek legal redress having been sold a company in such circumstances.

It seems, however, that to unravel the background to such a cosy deal we must look elsewhere than normal commercial considerations. John Elliott is of course a doyen of the Liberal Party, being a some-time Treasurer of that Party and it may well be no coincidence that Commercial Bureau was sold by Matheson to Elliott's Elders IXL. No doubt, at the appropriate time Elders IXL shareholders will want to ask penetrating questions about the commercial wisdom of Elders' cosy purchase of Commercial Bureau. The community at large, however, may care to ask whether this cosy deal is not another example of the security establishment's extraordinary protection of Matheson and his cover. The performance of people like Laurie Matheson in pimping and informing on Australian citizens in a way which leads to them being convicted and sentenced without charge or trial is justification alone for the abolition of this incompetent organisation, ASIO.

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): That is a very hard act to follow. I had intended saying a great deal about the Government's economic policies this afternoon, but as I have already made my thoughts known in a recent grievance debate it is not my intention to go into great detail, other than to reiterate what so many of my colleagues have said in condemning the Government for the action it has taken in very recent times, particularly in the breaking of so many promises. It would seem that that is about the only action that the present Government is capable of taking. It is

certainly not being seen in the electorate as a Government of action.

Talking of financial matters, I was rather interested when walking down North Terrace this morning to have a piece of paper put in my hand by a person whom I do not know very well. It turned out to be a copy of a letter that this person had received during the term of the previous Liberal Government. It came from the electoral office of the member for Gilles, the Minister of Water Resources.

It is interesting that the letter goes into much detail in regard to increases in State charges by the previous Government. I want to talk a little about this because one of the paragraphs states:

The major impact of increased State charges falls more heavily on the middle and lower income earner, and, in particular, on persons on a pension or fixed income.

This is the present Minister of Water Resources, talking to his electorate. He goes on to list some of the increases that came about during the term of the Liberal Government. For example, he states, 'Look at these figures—bus and tram fares,' and complains bitterly about an increase of up to 25 per cent in bus and tram fares.

As has been pointed out on numerous occasions in this House recently, members would be aware that, under the present Labor Government, we have seen an increase of some 47 per cent in bus, tram and train fares in a period of only eight months. I would suggest that the Labor Government, under Premier Bannon, has increased its bus, tram and train fares more in eight months than the Liberal Government in three years. Also, of course, he refers to water and sewerage costs, and complains bitterly about an increase of 12½ per cent.

It has been brought to the notice of this House that we are experiencing increases in costs of water of between 22 to 28 per cent, and it shows the absolute hypocrisy of the present Government, particularly of one of its Ministers, when they can forward this information while in Opposition and then come in, after having made promises that they would not increase State charges or taxation, and dish up to the State what they have done in the past few months. As I have said, unfortunately the majority of the people believed the hollow promises that were made at that time and, of course, are now starting to realise they were 'sold a pup'. I reiterate that we have the Minister stating in his letter at that time that there was no doubt that the financial bungling of the Tonkin Government was having a disastrous effect on the quality of life in this State, and that the major impact of increases of State charges fell more heavily on the middle and lower income earner, and particularly on persons on a pension or a fixed income. We now have a situation where the complaints being made by the then Opposition member were nothing in comparison with what we have seen under the present Government.

While on the matter of finance, I would again refer to the matter that I raised in Question Time today, and the hypocrisy of the Premier when he condemned the previous Government for bringing down on-the-spot fines, and accused it of introducing a type of revenue collection through the back door, yet only yesterday we saw that the Government have accepted that form of fine (and that is fair enough) and have now increased them by some 20 per cent.

In the few moments I have left I want to refer to a matter of concern in my electorate, and a concern of all the members of the C.F.S. brigades, particularly in the Adelaide Hills. It has been stated very strongly by members of the brigades in the Hills district that they will no longer spend their spare time building up fire units, unless they can be assured of receiving Government recognition for their contribution.

A recent meeting of delegates from brigades throughout the Hills called for increased funding for the C.F.S. in the

field, for the abolition of the \$7 000 maintenance subsidy limit and, particularly, the recognition of the value of voluntary labour. Anybody who has had any association with the C.F.S. (particularly in the Hills area, which is prone to bush fires) would recognise the enormous amount of time that is given on a voluntary basis by members of the C.F.S. They are particularly concerned in the Hills because brigades are being disadvantaged by the \$7 000 limit per council area, and by the fact that volunteers have been willing to contribute, as I said before, hundreds of hours to help build up vehicles. The strong feeling expressed by the meeting and shared by many people throughout the Hills and other Hills brigades was that funding priority should be given to the C.F.S. brigades instead of the headquarters. Special reference was made to the amount of time being given by members when they had purchased, for example, cab chassis and pumps and then put many hours of voluntary labour into building up those units.

The present Government policy means that the subsidy is only about half of what it would otherwise have been. All agree that the total cost, including value of voluntary labour, should be assessed by a Government appointed valuer and subsidised. They believe that subsidies should recognise the considerable value of the work carried out by volunteers on converting conventional vehicles into effective fire-fighting units. The level of the maintenance subsidy payable to councils was another matter of grave concern to the delegates. At present, the maximum is \$7 000 per council area regardless of the number of brigades in the unit. It was strongly indicated that that limit should be abolished immediately, because it is seen as unfair to councils such as those in the Hills which have a large number of units compared with others which have only one or two, and the \$7 000 subsidy has to cover fuel and tyres as well as repairs and maintenance.

This matter has been brought to the attention of the C.F.S. Board and the Minister responsible for the C.F.S., the Minister of Agriculture, and I sincerely hope that the Minister takes action and takes on board the points raised at that meeting, and recognises the concern being expressed by a band of people who contribute a great deal to the safety of the people, particularly in the Hills area, but throughout the State. It is a real problem which is causing a great deal of concern in those areas.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I would like to refer to the apparent change in the Government's taxation policy, and particularly its effect on elderly people and on small business. First, I would like to talk about some of the concerns of the pensioner and fixed income groups in relation to dramatic increases in taxation and charges. The two most significant increases are those of electricity charges and the most recent increase in water and sewerage rates. One of the major concerns in my electorate is that the water and sewerage rates include a property value component. In the area of Bragg property values have not been increased for four years; therefore, the increases in water rates at this time are of the order of 50 to 60 per cent and not 22 per cent, as has been stated by the Government.

I believe there needs to be a change in the property value system which recognises more clearly changes that occur. These changes ought to occur much quicker. I believe that its property value function should be reduced considerably and more emphasis placed on the user pays principle. The fact that these people are on fixed incomes and are pensioners is very significant to their weekly purse. Other areas that have increased are taxi-cab fees, petrol tax, and of course, the bus fares, which have risen by some 47 per cent. In an electorate which is considerably aged, like Bragg, this sort of increase is very important to the people.

The other area of concern is the increase in taxation on small businesses. First, I would like to quote from the editorial of the Institute of Public Affairs on taxation, which states:

The pre-eminent task of government at this point of time is to promote the recovery of the private sector of the economy and to increase employment: upon this all its energies should be concentrated. The key importance of the private sector in the process of recovery was indeed recognised in the final communique of the summit.

The communique interestingly enough involved this current Government. The report continues:

The communique stated:

'The preservation of the private sector as a profitable operating sector is essential to Australia's well-being and to encourage job-creating investment both from within Australia and abroad . . . To achieve the growth in G.D.P and employment on which the nation's prosperity will depend, increased profitability is now essential if new investment is to be created at an effective level.'

But until these wise and good intentions are given expression in practical policy measures, this essential part of the communique will amount to no more than a pious declaration. Four fundamental steps are necessary if business investment is to be stimulated and unemployment reduced. These steps will also help put the economy in a position to take full advantage of the world economic recovery, when that occurs.

They are—

- a continuing freeze on money incomes;
- substantial tax reductions;
- cuts in public expenditures;
- the reduction of penalty rates . . .

By far the most important single step the Government can take to assist the unemployed is to remove the dead-weight burden of taxation from the community's back. Instead, quite incredibly, the Federal and State Governments are devoting a large part of their time to thinking up ingenious ways to increase the burden still further.

I repeat that: inevitably Governments are devoting time to thinking up ingenious ways of increasing taxes. The paper further states:

With the economy deep in recession, profits possibly at an all-time low and unemployment at a record post-war high, this amounts to economic insanity. It goes to show how remote governments and their armies of bureaucratic advisers have become from simple economic realities and the needs of the market place. There can be no strong and lasting improvement in the economy unless the enormous load of taxation and the multiplicity of bureaucratic regulations, which are suffocating the economy, are reduced.

The paper further states:

The incontestable arguments for reducing taxes should be obvious, but as they do not appear to be so to those in Government circles, they will be set down briefly here.

First, lower taxes are necessary to increase market demand (and thus employment)—as distinct from the artificial stimulus to demand more from Government spending.

Second, lower taxes will contribute to the containment, if not the reduction, of business cost, assist the all-important need for strengthening Australian competitiveness at home and overseas, and encourage business.

Third, lower taxes are necessary to take some of the heat out of the economically destructive demands for higher incomes.

In a nutshell, reduced taxation is an indispensable ingredient of the medicine needed to revive the ailing private sector.

It further states:

The simple economic truths underlying prosperity need to be stated and restated: that wealth is not a Heaven-sent dispensation, that it is created out of the hard work, enterprise and ingenuity of the people themselves, not by Governments and politicians and their big battalions of bureaucrats; that standards of living cannot be improved by passing laws or by increasing welfare benefits which we cannot afford, but only by the efforts of the people themselves. The curse of our times is 'big Governments' and wholly excessive bureaucratic interference in our lives.

I refer also to the drop in employment in the small business area, due, first, to the lack of economic activity, and, secondly, to increasing costs. Small businesses have done several things in an attempt to overcome this. The first has been an overall cut in expenditure, which Governments ought to realise is an important factor in keeping its house in order.

They have done so by reducing wage costs and stock levels. However, we can go only so far in reducing wage costs before going out of business. What has the Government done to help small business? It has increased taxes and charges. The Government has increased many charges and I will list some of them: veterinary surgeons fees; hairdressers fees; architects fees; taxi drivers licence permits; number plate fees (which affect all small businesses registering vehicles); chiropodists fees; and fishing licence fees (which have gone up by 33 per cent).

The Government has also increased physiotherapists fees and water rates have risen by 22 per cent. Because property values have gone up significantly, the increase in water rates to the private and small business sector has been significant. The Government also increased business franchise fees in the first week of this session, including tobacco (up 100 per cent); petrol (up 1 cent a litre); liquor (up 33 per cent), and stamp duty on general insurance (up 33 per cent). The f.i.d. is yet to be announced. If it is announced, as suggested, at 4 cents in \$100, a business which turns over \$100 000 in sales, will be faced with an extra cost of some \$400. That is good support for small business! We now have a turnover or cash sales tax as well as a tax on employment; that is, the pay-roll tax system. There has been an insidious increase in tax in this area to many small businesses. The changes introduced have had a significant effect on some small businesses.

One other major increase during the term of this Government for small businesses has been Electricity Trust charges; I referred earlier to the effect on pensioners and fixed-income people. The charges for some businesses have gone up twice in the past 12 months. The withholding tax, which is a Federal and not a State tax, will clearly cause immense cash flow problems for small businesses. It will increase many costs and create difficult administration costs for small businesses. I was surprised to hear the Minister say that he thought that small businesses needed to be looked after, but he was not prepared to take up the case and put a strong argument to the Federal Government. The Labor Government—the helpers of the small business! What a joke!

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

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): 'We want South Australia to win' was the catch cry I heard during the last State election. It came from the Party that won Government and subsequently broke every promise it had made. Before I get on to that, let me look at what I heard in the last half an hour in this House. It was an incredible display. The member for Elizabeth came in here, and the press gallery began to fill up. He got on his feet and began to attack the judgment of the Federal Cabinet—not only the Federal Cabinet, but the highest body of Government security in this country. He attacked the veracity of their judgments, and the legitimacy and veracity of the evidence upon which they made those judgments. It must be remembered that the man he was ostensibly defending (at least in some part), Mr Mick Young, the member for Port Adelaide, was a part of that group of people who made judgment about that material.

I have no idea on what authority or from what source he obtained the material in which he has indicated that Mr Matheson was indeed the nark and the agent who perpetrated the injustice on those members or past members of the Labor Party who have been discredited by the royal commission conducted by Mr Justice Hope. I find that kind of attack—the illogical conclusions from the inconsistencies in the material as presented—quite incredible.

I wonder at the motives of the member for Elizabeth in embarking upon it. I am surprised (although maybe I am not when I think about it) to see that the press people have

left the gallery. In fact, they left after the member for Elizabeth sat down. Quite clearly, the whole tirade was orchestrated. The opinions expressed, I dare say, will find headline space in the print media during the course of tomorrow or, at least, top billing on the electronic media in the meantime. What an incredible performance! It was much like the performance we saw during the last State election campaign.

I refer also to the performance of some Cabinet Ministers who leave cause for concern in my mind, in the minds of members of my constituency, and also in the minds of members in this place. We will take a brief run through, looking at the starters barrier as we move along. In the first instance, we have learnt that there is a new meaning to the word 'fudge' and that, whilst it is not appropriate for members of this place, when referring to untruths uttered by other members in this place, to use the term 'lie', I understand that it is appropriate, when such people are defending charges of having stated untruths, having handled the truth lightly or having fudged the issue, it is appropriate for them to use the word 'lie'.

The Deputy Premier has clearly illustrated that in the defence which he made of his statements and his misleading of this House during the course of the no-confidence debate on that question. He repeatedly used the word 'lie' in the context of 'I did not lie'. It was interesting to me that two groups of schoolchildren who have come through Parliament House since that time have asked me why Mr Wright (our Deputy Premier and the member for Adelaide) was able to use the word 'lie' on television when they were told that the word was unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat immediately. The honourable member will remember quite clearly the incident in which the unparliamentary expression arose. I ruled on it at the time and the same ruling applies: the word 'lie' is unparliamentary.

Mr LEWIS: Then I have no recollection of that incident and I seek your indulgence, Sir, for a further explanation of whether it was indeed unparliamentary of the Deputy Premier to constantly say during his speech on that no-confidence motion that he did not lie. He said that several times during that debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I explained to the Leader of the Opposition when he used the expression, as I recall it, that the 'Hope Royal Commission gives lie to the fact that,' I said that that was in order. He then continued to say that there had been a lie. I ruled that out of order and the honourable Leader, to his credit, apologised and withdrew.

Mr LEWIS: I still have some uncertainty in my mind and will take the liberty of approaching you, Sir, privately for some further discussion about the point rather than taking the time of the House now.

Of course, it was distressing to me that several schoolchildren found it possible for a Minister to be seen standing on his feet in Parliament and then using that unparliamentary term on television on the night-time news. They were amazed that he was able to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a direct reflection on the Chair. I am assuming that perhaps (wrongly, I hope) the member for Mallee is suggesting that I permitted the Deputy Premier, as distinct from the Leader of the Opposition, to use an unparliamentary expression. That was not the case at all. It is not unparliamentary to suggest that a lie has been told. It is definitely unparliamentary to suggest that an honourable member has told a lie and, with all due respect, I would ask the member for Mallee to carefully search the *Hansard* of that day.

Mr LEWIS: I certainly shall. Before leaving the incident to which I was referring, I quote the *Advertiser* of Tuesday

26 July 1983. I refer to an editorial headed 'The question of truth', which states:

Yet no reading of *Hansard* can conceal the fact that Mr Wright failed to answer truthfully the question put to him. He should, therefore, have resigned from Cabinet.

So much for Mr Wright, and he is the Deputy Premier.

In the time left to me, I am concerned to draw the attention of the House to a matter which I regard as grossly unfair. The Public Trustee is allowed to advertise the fact that his office prepares wills for citizens. He advertises that in a grossly misleading fashion, whereas other practitioners in this field are not even allowed to advertise that they provide such a service. The Public Trustee grossly misleads the public in his advertisement, in that he states that he will prepare the will free. It is in no sense free. The service is the most expensive available in South Australia from any source whatsoever. The charge is made against the estate of the person who has a will drawn up by the Public Trustee after his/her death and when the estate is declared. It is not paid during the life of the testator making the will, but paid afterwards.

Dealing with another matter, it is regrettable that I was not able to get information from the Minister for Environment and Planning during Question Time today relating to the way in which the native vegetation clearance control regulations are being applied, or at least not applied. That is very regrettable. I do not complain that it has been necessary in some part to protect the remaining native vegetation. However, I do complain about the way in which it is being handled.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on the next member, I would invite all honourable members, if they are in any doubt, to search the *Hansard* of the two relevant days, because it is a serious matter and I would not like there to be any doubt.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I notice that the clock was turned on when you gave us that advice, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The clock has now been readjusted.

Mr MATHWIN: I wish to grieve on behalf of a number of members of the Government, certainly on behalf of the Premier, the member for Albert Park (Mr Hamilton), the Minister of Community Welfare, and a couple of other members of the Labor Party who obviously will not be able to register their disagreement with the uplift in on-the-spot fines.

It is quite obvious from what these gentlemen have said in the past in relation to the legislation when it was brought into this House originally by the Liberal Government (and from quite a few more objections by the member for Albert Park) that they are unable and will not be able to register their disagreement because they have signed the pledge that they will agree with whatever happens in the Caucus room. If they do not agree, they will be thrown out on their ear; they will not have a job, they will be defrocked, as it were, and will not be endorsed at the next election.

Therefore, they are unable to speak on their own behalf, so I will do it for them because I wish to remind some members in this House what happened. On-the-spot fines have now been increased. I will be quite happy to apologise for the Minister of Education, even though he has been hard on me and my electorate. I will still speak on his behalf against this massive increase in on-the-spot fines. Fines of \$25 have been increased to \$30, fines of \$50 to \$60, and fines of \$80 to \$100 per hit.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That is an overall increase of 20 per cent.

Mr MATHWIN: As my colleague the member for Murray said, that is an increase of 20 per cent. Let us see what

happened when the legislation was originally brought in. Let us have a look at a few of the examples. In an article in the *News* of 28 March 1982, Mr Bannon said that on-the-spot fines should be cut. The article states:

The number of offences attracting on-the-spot fines should be reduced, the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, said today. A review of the schedule of charges should be included for discussion at a meeting tomorrow between the Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, the Chief Secretary, Mr Rodda, the Transport Minister, Mr Wilson, and the acting Police Commissioner, Mr Giles, he said.

He was appealing against 189 ways to be put on the spot, as the article stated. He was worried about this and in fact he challenged it. However, he did not challenge it as heartily as did the very outspoken back-bencher who not only got his name in the paper a number of times but also his photograph in a number of different poses.

One of the photographs depicts him as a grim member, staring into the camera, and the other is of a man with his eyes lifted to the heavens in a manner indicating his saying, 'I will save you; rely on me; I am your member and I will speak for you in Parliament against this shocking situation of on-the-spot fines.' However, the member for Albert Park will be unable to do that this time, because he will not be allowed to do so and because he has been gagged on this matter. However, at that time, on 24 March 1982, the member for Albert Park was reported, under the heading 'On-spot branded a backdoor tax', as follows:

The State Government's on-the-spot fines seemed to be little more than backdoor taxation, the A.L.P. member for Albert Park, Mr Hamilton, said today. 'In the first month of operation, \$514 220 has gone straight into bolstering the Government's coffers', Mr Hamilton said.

The honourable member was angry! It was further reported that in a written reply the then Minister of Transport had informed the member for Albert Park that it was not known how many traffic fines had been imposed during the month of January, although the member for Albert Park had been informed that the sum of \$514 220 had been received from on-the-spot fines in the first month of its operation. A further article appeared headed '\$4 000 000 bonanza tip in spot fine "puzzle"', which was accompanied by a photograph of the member for Albert Park looking up to the heavens and smiling with a little twitch at the corner of his mouth. One could almost see his mouth watering in that photograph. The article stated:

On-the-spot fines for traffic offences will generate about \$4 000 000 annually in Government revenue from motorists and others unaware of what breaks the law. A Labor MP, Mr Kevin Hamilton, said this yesterday, claiming once again police were being instructed to enforce laws which exposed them to further public hostility.

What will happen to the poor old policeman now when he lobs on a person with an on-the-spot fine for \$100, when the person is expecting a fine of \$80? The situation is that when things are different they are not the same! However, the member for Albert Park has not opened his mouth recently concerning this matter. He is not even present in the Chamber to listen to this although I would bet that he is tuned in in his office. Further, a previous member for Mitcham (Mr Millhouse), who has now gone on to higher things, said in the past that he had supported the idea but that he then subsequently thought that it was naughty because the Government was getting far too much money. In regard to the present Premier, his idea now is that he wants to grab as much money as he can so he is now in favour of lifting on-the-spot fines. However, on 3 March 1982, as Leader of the Opposition, he was reported as saying:

The Ministerial statement by the Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, about on-the-spot fines was 'quite dishonest', the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, said today. 'He purported to show that the Opposition had supported the scheme wholeheartedly,' Mr Bannon said. 'To do so he quoted me completely out of context, omitting comments about reservations on the cost saving aspect.'

Therefore, in the past the present Premier publicly stated that opinion. If my memory serves me correctly, at that stage the Leader of the Opposition performed in front of television cameras, looking like he was almost about to cry because of the terrible things that the then Liberal Government was doing to the drivers of South Australia. This was because he did not want to help the State then, as regards money from this source going into general revenue to help the State, because at that time he was in Opposition. Now it is a different story: he wants to get his greedy little hands on more and more money from the poor motorists. A further article published in the *News* of 18 February 1982, headed 'It's open season on drivers', stated:

The Tonkin Government had declared 'open season' on motorists, the A.L.P. member for Albert Park, Mr Kevin Hamilton, claimed today. He said on-the-spot traffic fines and random breath testing could be key issues at the next State election. 'The Government has opened up a can of worms with on-the-spot fines', Mr Hamilton said. He claimed the fines would raise an additional \$4 000 000 a year revenue for the Government. Mr Hamilton was supported by the Opposition spokesman on police matters, Mr Keneally.

Of course now, as Chief Secretary, he is in enough trouble. I hope that the present Chief Secretary will try to do something about the rises that have occurred. The article continued:

Mr Keneally called for a complete review of the fines. Mr Hamilton's attack follows criticism of the new traffic infringement notices by Mr Frank Blevins (A.L.P.) in the Legislative Council on Tuesday.

So, Mr Blevins (from that inner sanctum at the other end of the building) also opposed on-the-spot fines. The member for Norwood was reported at that time as follows:

Labor M.P. and lawyer, Mr Greg Crafter, said today many people who received on-the-spot fines should ignore them and wait for a summons.

He was apparently very upset about the matter at that time. The honourable member is now a Minister, and currently he is away looking at problems in the North of the State.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I refer to what I believe to be one of the most irresponsible documents that the A.L.P. has ever placed in letter boxes in the metropolitan area. That sentiment can be substantiated more and more as the days go by. I refer to a document headed 'We want South Australia to win', containing a photograph of John Bannon, then Leader of the Opposition. The document lists the various promises put up by the Labor Party prior to the last State election. I shall not refer to all of them this evening, because I will have a further opportunity to do so during the Address in Reply debate. I refer particularly to the point made concerning transport fares. The document states quite clearly:

We will keep public transport fares to the absolute minimum in an effort to attract and retain passengers and relieve the pressures on our roadways.

It continues:

We will give priority to upgrading transport corridors from the city to north-eastern and southern suburbs.

I stress that point. The document is clearly designed to deceive the public, not only concerning the statement that further taxation would not be imposed upon this State but also in regard to the fact that it has been carefully worded by experts to deceive the public into believing a stated course of action by the A.L.P., which I submit it had not the slightest intention of following. I refer to the concern of the councils of the southern region, including the city councils of Brighton, Marion, Meadows, Noarlunga and the District Council of Willunga. I should also like to link their

concerns with that expressed by the Glenelg council. All of those councils are concerned about this.

Mr Mathwin: They are very upset.

Mr OSWALD: They are extremely upset. I shall quote from a letter that the Southern Region of Councils forwarded to the Premier wherein it appealed to him to try to redress the mistake that has obviously been made in axing the north-south corridor south of Anzac Highway.

Mr Mathwin: They just wouldn't care.

Mr OSWALD: Certainly, they do not care.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I know that the member for Glenelg appreciated the assistance that he received, but I do not think the member for Morphett needs it.

Mr OSWALD: I do not need the honourable member's assistance, but I appreciated his contribution because I think that what he said was correct. I draw this matter concerning the Southern Region of Councils to the attention of honourable members, because it is a very serious matter. The letter states:

You may be aware that the five councils of the southern region have expressed severe disappointment [a carefully chosen set of words] with aspects of the Government's decision to axe the north-south transportation corridor. Our view is that in the light of anticipated population and traffic growth in the southern region, additional north-south road capacity will be required before the end of the century. May I make it quite clear however that our concern is with the section of the corridor south of Anzac Highway, and more particularly, that section between Anzac Highway and Sturt Road.

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

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Morphett.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr OSWALD: I would like to canvass the Government's reason for axing the north-south corridor particularly in relation to the part south of Anzac Highway, the section between Anzac Highway and Sturt Road. The Minister in various press releases has made it patently clear that he believes the downturn in population growth and traffic volume spread over the whole of metropolitan Adelaide is one of the major reasons for the axing of the corridor. I believe the Highways Department does not concede that view. Certainly, officers in the Department of Transport may have that view and they may be locked into a position of supporting the Minister, but I do not believe that the Highways Department has shifted ground at all.

In a letter to the Premier from the southern regional councils it is relevant to note that they pointed out to the Premier that the Highways Department report of March 1982 clearly demonstrated that the current proposed widening of South Road will not, I repeat, will not meet anticipated traffic growth during the next 15 years. I do not think that Parliament should overlook the fact that the Highways Department itself is unlikely to have materially changed its view since that point of time.

The southern councils are concerned also with many other matters which I would like to raise. I have it on knowledge from the executive officer that the region cannot accept the view of the department and they have asked me if I could quote in a letter to the Premier that they maintain that once deleted from the map, there would not be the remotest possibility that the corridor would be built, given the inherent difficulty and lead time involved in planning and implementing major new transport facilities. It would be fair to say that, if one spoke to members on both sides of the House, they would concede that particular point. The region also believes the Government should reconsider the future of that section of the corridor between Anzac Highway and Sturt Road with a view to retaining the line on the devel-

opment plan and continue to purchase properties as they become available. This will, in the view of the region, not jeopardise the primary thrust of the decision to remove planning uncertainty in the Thebarton-Hindmarsh areas, nor will it seriously affect financial returns from the sale of property, since the Government's land holdings between Anzac Highway and Sturt Road are relatively small compared with other sections.

Southern regions have given due regard to their colleagues in Thebarton and Hindmarsh and are only considering the area that is a threat to them in particular. It would be interesting to look at what some of the Labor Government members think about this decision. The Minister has said that the decision to axe the corridor was based on uncertainty about future transport needs, and implied that the decision does not preclude development for a new north-south facility should future demand warrant it. I pose the question to the Minister, although I think he knows in his own gut feeling, that once that property has been sold, it is highly unlikely that any future Government would ever be in a financial position to repurchase that property.

It is interesting to see what the Minister for Environment and Planning (the Hon. Don Hopgood) said in the local *Guardian* newspaper. He believes the southern region organisation has been chasing a mirage in the advocating of the construction of the freeway. He lives in the safe seat of Baudin. I doubt that he would have had regard to what the community would think otherwise. There are also other comments by the member for Ascot Park. My allocated time is very restricted to debate this matter. You have to have due regard to the collective wisdom of those opposed to this Government action. On the one hand you have five southern regional councils made up of about 70 or 80 men and women who are closely aligned to their communities. There are also the Brighton and Glenelg councils which are gravely concerned about traffic now flowing down Brighton Road and also, to a lesser degree, on Morphett Road as it affects the Glenelg people but to a greater degree as it affects the Marion council.

There are the views of the R.A.A. which I could quote if time permitted, but they are well on record of opposing the Government on the whole proposition. I do not believe the Highways Department has altered the position it held in March 1982. It has experienced traffic engineers advising the Government. Certainly, departmental officers in the Department of Transport may be siding with the Government: I do not know. On the other hand, we have the combined wisdom of the 13 in Cabinet, and I do not believe that they have considered the subject enough. If one balances the wisdom of 13 individuals and their knowledge of transport problems against more than 100 councillors and aldermen in seven councils, plus the wisdom of those who wrote that report from the Highways Department, clearly it can be seen it was a political decision, and perhaps has some semblance of similarity to the decision that a former member for Ascot Park made as Minister of Transport.

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

Mr RODDA (Victoria): I was interested to hear my colleague, the honourable member for Glenelg, raising the issues concerning the 20 cent increase in the tins, as they were known to me, the on-the-spot fines. That is a fairly hefty lift in revenue from the errant motorist. I wanted to have a word about that, with nostalgia, because I was the Chief Secretary when that method of dealing with motorist infringements was introduced. I remember quite vividly the objections we had from the then Opposition to this traffic infringement penalty. I also remember that after these infringement notices came into being, the question of legality

was raised. The present Chief Secretary—and it is not my right to take issue with him—but he was dubbed as being my publicity officer, and he revelled in that argument. Time has moved on, and perhaps it is his good fortune, good that he is now able to pick up the scraps and bits.

It is with some irony that I view the fact that, in times of deflation, the errant motorist is being asked to contribute 20 per cent more for his (in many instances) unwitting action that draws the attention of the law. Although my colleague dealt with this matter more fully, as the Minister responsible for setting up the scheme, and in light of the upbraiding I received at the time, I cannot let the matter pass without commenting on it.

However, I rise to speak tonight about the South-East and specifically about a commodity more valuable than gold in this State, that is, the water supply. It is God given in that part of South Australia, where we share it in some abundance with our colleagues in Victoria. There have been the depredations by man who has sought to move surface water from this area. Over a long period, drains have been installed in the South-Eastern region, some of which have been named alphabetically. One that got rid of an enormous amount of water was drain M, which links up with Mosquito Creek. It was not the intention of the drainage engineers, but water tables were cut through the ranges. Irrespective of how dry the season may be (indeed, we are just emerging from a noteworthy drought), water has been making its way down to the sea from drain M for 365 days of the year.

I draw the attention of the Minister of Water Resources, as I have done on previous occasions, to some thought being given to the weiring of drain M and other such drains. The great hallmark that history is now proclaiming is the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee's consideration of this matter involving drainage in the South-East. That committee had a reference to look at the further extension of drain E, the drain that was to go through the hundred of Short and play its part in removing the surface and subterranean water through that area. I do not think it was engineering or hydraulic considerations that brought those people to the committee but rather the excessive charges emanating from the extension of drain M. It has proved to be a blessing in disguise. Of about 105 witnesses, 99 were opposed to it and we saw the scheme rejected. With hindsight we know that that was a fortuitous result.

A big landholding down there harvests water. Our friend, Mr Murray McCourt, has ideas about water harvesting. I have been invited, as has my colleague the member for Mallee, to see that operation, although unfortunately time has not permitted me to visit the site at Beachport. However, I still have it on my programme as it is an undertaking that we must study. I believe that we should be looking at weiring the drains and controlling water than runs away to the sea when it is not wanted. It is fair enough to get rid of the winter run-off but we are seeing our wet lands become extremely dry lands.

A committee which is not yet reporting was set up to examine the effects of drainage on the wet lands. Drainage has effected the ecology of the South-East. It does not even address the other problem that exists including the coal mine. Despite the assurances that dewatering can take place with little effect, it is falling on terribly deaf ears in the region. I admit that I have deaf ears when we start looking at this matter. It has a very real quotient for the economy of the State. We have seen some of the finest strawberry clover pastures—inherent pastures—become areas of limited production because of excessive drainage. It has resulted in cutting off the water supply to areas which, before the commencement of the drain, had been high-productive grazing land.

I refer also to the disastrous bush fire which went through the area south of Lucindale right through to Mount Burr and Kalangadoo to Tarpeena. It cleared away much debris and has perhaps given us a new vista to examine. Mount Burr and Kalangadoo are adjacent to the perch water table in the Dismal Swamp area, where I think peat is still burning. It is bound up in an intricate and important source of water supply which is the mainspring of much of this State's production. In the 10 minutes available, one is not able to address this matter fully other than to stress that a great deal of caution has to be taken in the area. I refer also to the proposed development of a mine in the area to the north-west.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I refer tonight to the fishing industry and, in particular, to the Minister of Fisheries. It seems that the Government has reached a new low in its term to date, after only nine months in office—and, in the case of the Minister of Fisheries, less than nine months. I refer to part of an answer the Minister gave in another place to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition about the recent controversy with AFIC. Part of the Minister's answer stated:

If these people claim that they cannot afford to pay the new licence fees, I will be happy to look at their fishing returns and their income tax forms.

That is an example of the Minister's thinking—that he is able to look at the forms. In case some people believe that that is not what the Minister is saying, we can take the matter further by looking at an interjection by the Hon. Mr Cameron, 'You can't do that,' to which the Minister replied:

Just a moment. If it can be clearly demonstrated that the community should continue to subsidise them, I will be happy to recommend to Cabinet that that be done—

that is, that the fishing returns and income tax forms be looked at. This would seem to be a gross invasion of the privacy of these fishermen, and I am very surprised that the Minister made such a statement. He, as Minister, should surely be aware that the returns are for research purposes. They are not there to check up on fishermen: they are not there to see how big a catch they have made or what sort of income they are making. Those returns are there to help protect the fishing industry for the future, and it appears that the Minister has little regard for that but would apparently see the returns as an ideal opportunity to investigate just how much the fishermen are making.

We all know that taxation is supposed to be confidential. I wonder where the confidentiality is here. I wonder who is possibly next on the hit list. Will it be the market gardeners, dairy farmers, graingrowers, stock producers, or woolgrowers? As the *News* put it, the Fisheries Minister, Mr Blevins, has threatened to check the income tax returns of fishermen who have complained that they cannot afford higher licence fees, and thankfully the *News* was able to make investigations at the Australian Taxation Office, a spokesman for whom said that the State Government would not be allowed access to tax forms to determine a person's income.

If one looks at the rise of the Minister one will see how he came to power. I refer to an article in the *News* on 27 April this year entitled 'Former tugboat worker becomes new Fisheries Minister'. In that article, the Premier, Mr Bannon, said:

Mr Blevins would be well equipped to provide a fresh approach to the portfolio.

A fresh approach? I think that he could have said a disastrous approach, because that is exactly what it is. An article in the *Stock Journal* on 28 April states:

South Australia's new Minister of Agriculture, Mr Frank Blevins, M.L.C., has been quick to reassure the rural community that he has no intention of socialising the State's rural industries.

In that article he states:

I intend to implement an open-door policy with the producer organisations as much as is possible.

If one considers what he has written in a letter, then I think that a country such as Poland would be happy to have the Hon. Frank Blevins as its Minister, and I think that Lech Walesa would have a new foe to attack in that country. However, it does not seem appropriate to have that type of person in South Australia. I refer to a letter which is well known to members in this House and to many members of the public. The letter from the Minister to Mr Michael Vandepier, the President of AFIC, states:

The Government has considered a number of options for the reduction of licence premiums and the recovery of management costs.

I love the 'open-door policy'. The letter states that 'the Government has considered' and then it goes on to specify.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He has seen the fishermen on many occasions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: 'Make licences non-transferable'—to make them non-transferable is another way of saying, 'Let's try to ruin another business.' The third point he makes in that letter is as follows:

Distribute profits from authority holders to a wider group of participating fishermen, i.e., skippers and crew;

Yet the Minister says that he has no intention of socialising the State's rural industries. I would put the fishing industry under the heading of rural industry in this case. It is certainly a primary industry. If distributing the profits amongst the skippers and crew is not an example of socialisation, then I would be happy to have from the Government a definition of 'socialisation'. That letter was dated 1 July and was obviously received some time after that date. The last sentence in the letter states:

I would seek AFIC'S response to the Government's proposals by 22 July 1983.

That is three weeks or less for a response to proposals that were an overwhelming change and damning to the industry. The net result was very predictable: first of all, there was a call from the fishermen for the Minister to resign. That was at a meeting of about 500 fishermen. An article in the *News* on 30 July states:

The meeting called for Mr Blevins's immediate resignation . . .

There was also a response from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Olsen), who said on 19 July that Mr Blevins must either withdraw threats to the fishing industry or resign, and I would say so, too. After the example that I read out earlier showing that he is apparently prepared to look at income tax returns and fishing returns, I think that the Minister should resign for the benefit of the fishing industry in South Australia.

One can look at the attitude of various people to Mr Blevins's letter. Mr Puglisi, the General Manager of Australian Bight Fishermen Pty Ltd said in a telex that, if Mr Blevins goes ahead with the proposals, at least 500 jobs will disappear because 15 years of research and management will be destroyed. Yet, we heard from this Government in earlier days that it wanted to promote employment and encourage people to have jobs. However, one Minister seems to be able to have the power to wipe out hundreds of jobs at the same time. Mr Puglisi also stated:

I cannot comprehend how one man's decision can potentially destroy the livelihood of hundreds of workers in our factories.

Mr Blevins's comment on that was that he had attempted to start rational discussion on problems facing the industry. Attempted to start rational discussion! Certainly he had unleashed a powder package sufficient to blow the whole industry out of South Australia. I hope that the fishing industry will not give in to the demands of the Minister of

Fisheries and that that Minister will be removed from his position so that fishing in this State can continue on the positive course that it has followed for years.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I intend to agree with some comments made earlier today by another member in relation to the retention tax that will apply on the cash economy. Over the years I have expressed concern at how those persons on fixed salaries are unable to exploit the tax system as do many of those involved in the cash system. In the past, I have suggested that one of the ways to help remove that anomaly is for people to have identity cards with their photographs, name and, of course, a computer number thereon. 1984 is not far away. A lot of people have the attitude that that would interfere with personal freedoms and the privacy of individuals. I still do not agree with that. I did not when I raised the subject initially, and I still do not agree with the attitude expressed by many.

The result of the tax applied by the Federal Government in an attempt to catch up with some of the cash economy will be disastrous for certain sections of the community and I refer to those persons who work in the cash economy area, in the building trade and, to a lesser degree, in the transport industry. There is no doubt that in the building industry at least 5 per cent will be added to the labour component. Those who have had the opportunity to see the volume of forms and bookwork that must be completed by people in the industry to conform with the Federal Government's requirements would realise that there will be considerably more office work to be done by business houses, whether large or small.

The small subcontractor, the supplier of materials, or those involved with bricklaying or foundation work, are small operators who will have to do a lot of extra bookwork, which will tie up their time. Payment for their time so spent is just as important to them as it is to anyone else. Therefore, there will be an added cost. It will cause a liquidity problem for that section of industry, because in many cases the subcontractor will be submitting an account to the builder for \$5 000, or perhaps \$20 000, of which the builder will have to retain 10 per cent. If the subcontractor is able or willing to separate the labour content from the material content, that will be 10 per cent of the labour content. There is no doubt that the person putting in the quote initially will add something to the labour content to cover himself because of that retention commitment by the principal contractor.

The main contractor must return the money immediately to the department at the end of the month. There will be times when a contractor will have paid out money that he has not collected, because he will not be able to collect his money until reaching a draw stage on a contract which may be a month or six weeks after the retention of the tax on behalf of the Federal Government. The result will be that there will be a liquidity problem within the industry and more unemployment within the industry. Further, there will be a higher cost of building, particularly the building of homes. We all know that, every time Government interferes with any section of our lives, costs increase, except in the field of handouts where people on the end of the line who are taking those handouts do not feel the effect of the measures taken to enable those handouts to be made.

Over 10 years ago I said that the cash economy was a serious problem that was getting worse. I know that every Parliamentarian is aware of this, but we have never been prepared to take up the challenge. There is only one way we can stop it to a greater degree than we have in the past, which is a better way than the use of a tax such as that

which the Federal Government has now implemented. Many people do not like the idea of a compulsory identity card, but there are some great benefits to society in having it, and most other countries in the world have this system.

I might just add that one of the provisions implemented by the Federal Government in relation to this retention tax is that if a private householder employs a contractor and pays the contractor more than \$10 000 he or she does not have to retain any tax. It is ridiculous to say that you can spend \$10 000 in the cash economy and thus retain that money: it could be all for labour, because the owner could buy the material. Labour accounts for at least 20 per cent or 25 per cent of the cost of building an average house. On a larger house it is getting up to 45 per cent of the total labour cost. Therefore, \$10 000 could be considered to be a lot of money, but we are exempting that group from the system.

I refer to the benefits of an identity card. Within our community at the moment there are many illegal migrants. We have had two amnesties since 1974, giving people the opportunity to stay here if they give themselves up. We have found that there have been many thousands of them. They are working for employers who have helped to get them into this country. Quite often they are working for these employers, who may have a similar ethnic background, at very low salaries, because illegal migrants cannot afford to go and squeal; if they did, they might be deported or have to pay a penalty. Therefore, they are prepared to work at lesser rates. An identity card system would improve that situation.

Secondly, we could make it an obligation that an employer who pays a person \$1 000 or more for work done must inform the department. This could be done by legislation. Employers could be obliged to disclose that they had employed Mary Jane or Joe Blow, supplying details of that person's identity card, with a penalty applying to both parties if disclosure was not made. Much of the cash economy would be eliminated by that method. I believe that that problem is serious enough to warrant an identity card just for that purpose. Further, under-age drinking in hotels is such a serious situation now that both sides of politics are concerned about it. I know that you, Sir, for one have been raising the matter for a long time, for which I give you credit because it is becoming a major problem within our younger society, as hotelkeepers cannot tell who is 15, 16 or 17 years of age. If people were issued with an identity card at 18 years of age, that problem could be eliminated. What harm would it do to issue people with identity cards? People should be proud to say that they have a membership card and that they belong to Australia, a great club. It would be the same as belonging to any other club. If people want to belong to a football club or have an account at, say, John Martins, they are happy to have a card to identify them.

Why not have a card which would help with the problem of under-age drinking, for example? People might immediately say that we are heading towards a police State, although it could help the police with some of their investigations. Would that harm anyone other than a person who is breaking the law? I hope that we in Australia can accept the proposition of having identity cards, which do no harm and which benefit a society. They could be used to get rid of the cash economy problems and would involve a better method than that which has been introduced by the Federal Government. I hope that the Federal Government will reconsider the tax and that it will get rid of it and introduce identity cards, which would help in many areas of concern to our community.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): It is my intention to bring to the attention of the House yet again the complete and utter

dishonesty of the Government and members of the Government in relation to a number of situations that have occurred since the election last year. First, I will refer to the promises made by the Premier. I will then move along his front bench and perhaps even refer to some of the backbenchers in the Government Party to show the utter and complete disregard that members of the Government have for the truth and for the public of South Australia. First, I would like to have recorded in *Hansard* a number of promises that were made by the Premier prior to his election last year. In his policy speech made in 1982 the now Premier stated:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow State charges like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

All members opposite would be well aware of the pamphlets issued by A.L.P. candidates prior to the election which had listed on one side the charges that the then Liberal Government had imposed in relation to taxation. They condemned the then Government for the increases which, when compared with what this Government has done, were very minor indeed. For example, as I said, coming back to the Premier's statements, he referred to transport fares, which this Government has increased by 48 per cent. He referred to electricity charges, which this Government has already increased by 12 per cent and will shortly increase by another 6 per cent. He referred to hospital charges, which this Government has already increased by 20 per cent and has announced that it will again be increasing shortly. Let us have another look at a statement from the now Premier, again in his policy speech of 1982. He said:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties—
and I wonder how long that will last—
and will not introduce new taxes.

I wonder what he calls f.i.d. If the financial institutions duty is not a new tax, I would like to know what it is. Not only that, but it will obviously be introduced at a rate higher than in any other State in Australia. At the moment the only States with f.i.d. are Labor States—New South Wales and Victoria—with 3c in \$100. This Government will introduce a financial institutions duty with 4c in \$100. This tax would have to be the most iniquitous tax that any Government could dream of. It will penalise any person who puts money into any savings institution. In other words, if one wants to save money, put it in the bank or any society, or invest it in any way, one will pay a tax on it. Not only will one pay tax on it when the money is put in, but one will pay tax on it when one takes the money out. Any time one puts anything on a credit card one will be taxed. Yet, this Government has a Premier who stated before his election that he would introduce no new taxes! The quote goes on:

... nor increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.

Let us look at what this Government has done. It has put water rates up 22 per cent; S.T.A. fares have been increased by 48 per cent; as I have said, ETSA charges are up 12 per cent and going up another 6 per cent; hospital fees are up by 20 per cent; business franchise fees on tobacco have been doubled; petroleum products taxes have increased by 1c a litre and, of course, that will hit every person who uses a private car or public transport, and every person who buys goods from a supermarket because the companies which transport goods to those supermarkets will have to pay this additional tax. That will be passed on to the consumer by increased prices in the supermarket. Liquor licence fees are up from 9 per cent to 12 per cent; stamp duty on general insurance is up from 6 per cent to 8 per cent; and, as I said, the financial institutions tax, which will be the highest in Australia, will soon be in operation. Again, I will quote to

the House what the Premier stated in his policy speech. He said:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes, nor increase the existing level of taxes during our term of office.

Is it any wonder that this Premier has absolutely no credibility with the public of South Australia? As I stated before, when we have a Premier who is so totally and utterly dishonest, is it any wonder that he protected his Deputy, who misled this House and put forward untruths on at least three occasions? What other statements do we have from the now Premier? He said:

This Government [referring to the then Liberal Government] will not get away with drip feed taxation or back-door tariff increases.

He went on to refer to electricity and water charges and on many occasions he—both in the House and in his election promises—made statements that were quite categorical that there would be no new taxes and no increases in taxes. We now have in South Australia not only the taxation capital of Australia; it is the inflation and unemployment capital of Australia. Members opposite still try to blame the previous Government for this, when it is entirely due to the total mismanagement of the economy by the present Government. Its total incompetence in financial management has led to the situation we now have to face. Families in South Australia will have to pay between \$12 and \$13 a week extra to pay for the taxes this Government has introduced. This is the Government that says that it represents the little people. All I can say is that if this is the Government which represents the little people, Lord help the little people. I can certainly state from the feedback in my electorate that it is the little people—the middle and lower income earners—who will swing away from this Government in droves and re-elect a Liberal Government at the next State election. It is the little person—the person on the middle and lower income—who has been savagely dealt with. These are the people whom this Government appealed to when it was running for election late last year.

An honourable member: They were sold a pup.

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly. These are the people who returned this Government to office and in turn will throw it out. As I said before, I know from experience, as a Government member from a marginal seat, the feeling that exists if one believes, perhaps, that the Government has not taken the right step. All I can say is that if I were the member for Unley or Brighton or Henley Beach I would be extremely worried about my future because those members have been returned by the people whom their Government has really penalised and hit harder than any other Government in South Australia has ever done.

We find that Housing Trust rents have been increased at a rate far greater than the previous Government had ever dreamed of. Again, this is the Government that is supposed to look after the little people and supposed to have at heart the interests of the people who are not financially well off—and they are the people who have been penalised so savagely.

We find that we have a Deputy Premier who has misled this House, and even the *Advertiser* in its editorial has made it quite clear that in its opinion the Deputy Premier should have resigned or the Premier should have sacked him. But, when one has a Premier who is so utterly dishonest, what can one expect him to do but protect a Deputy who is not quite so dishonest? The thing that really galls me is that now the public of South Australia expect their politicians—their members of Parliament, their elected representatives—to be dishonest. In other words, because of the actions of this Premier and this Deputy Premier all of us who are members of Parliament are now being looked at as people whose word cannot be taken. Speaking personally, I find

that extremely galling, indeed, because I take great pride in the fact that I will always be honest and straightforward, but because of our Premier and Deputy Premier I, like my colleagues on this side of the House, am being tarred with a brush that has absolutely nothing to do with us, and I want to put on the public record my utter condemnation of the Premier and his Deputy for what they have done.

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

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Certainly, my colleagues have adequately canvassed the impact of the increase in taxation on the people of South Australia.

An honourable member: You tell them more about it.

Mr BAKER: I do not intend to tell them more about it because this will be repeated again and again. The people of South Australia will understand that the Labor Government of South Australia has no feeling at all for the people whom it represents. It is utterly unscrupulous in the way that it operates and, in fact, has set South Australia back another 10 years—back into the days of the Dunstan decade of mediocrity—and there were mediocrity days. We did not achieve anything in that period and we are not achieving anything today. It is all very well for the Premier to say that he will balance his Budget, but a balanced Budget on the basis of these revenue-raising measures is unacceptable. I would like to address myself to the question of spouse rebates. We have seen in the *News* tonight a report that 'the unions will fight the Budget axe on spouse rebates'.

I am pleased, because the intention of the Government (and I presume it is the intention of the Government to axe this particular measure) reflects the moronic application of second-class principles by the Labor Party, and we are poorly served both in the national and State sphere by a Labor Party which has no regard at all for the people it represents, or intends to represent. That Party has one principle for itself and another principle for the rest of Australia. It is about time Australians as a whole understood that the Labor Party will destroy; it will never create. Obviously, by these moves, that Party intends to kick Australians in the solar plexus, as it has on each occasion it has been in Government. I would ask the members opposite whether they support the move to axe spouse rebates; I would be interested in their reply. I notice they are somewhat silent.

Mr Trainer: You know that we are too polite to interject.

Mr BAKER: Of course, any move in this direction is counter to what is happening around the rest of the world. As members opposite may realise (there would be very few who would realise) there are moves in many of the western countries to be more supportive of families, more supportive of females, more supportive of children and nuclear family units. Measures have been introduced in France, U.S.S.R., Germany and various other countries which have made available more incentives for the retention of the nuclear family.

The interesting part about the spouse rebate is, as members opposite would understand, that it provides the greatest assistance to those people on low incomes. As people would understand, persons on the lowest income under the existing scheme reap the greatest benefit. Quoting from an article in the *News*, it says: 'Some lower income families with children can claim up to \$963 a year' which happens to be about \$20 a week. Further up the scale there is the general rebate of \$830. What is being suggested and leaked in the normal fashion is that we should do away with this rebate. Who will it hurt? The members opposite know who it will hurt; it will hurt those people in their electorates.

Mr Ashenden: The low-income families.

Mr BAKER: The low-income families who do not have the ability to survive without the extra \$20 per week. We do not hear anything from the members opposite. It is typical of the Labor Party members that they seem to forget what they stand for when they get here. They never criticise the decisions made which affect the people in their electorate. Certainly they have not been very vocal on the taxation increases which affect the members of their electorate; we have not heard one word from these people.

Mr Ashenden: They support it.

Mr BAKER: They support it; they do not mind if their people are being crucified by taxation increases.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BAKER: So the general premise is that the Australian Labor Party has a total disregard for the people of Australia. I understand that the member for Unley supports the increase in taxation.

Mr Ashenden: He has said so.

Mr BAKER: Yes, he did. I hope that he makes it known to his electorate; I am sure they will be delighted at the next election—

Mr Mays: What are you going to do about teachers?

Mr BAKER: The member for Unley supports the increases in taxation which will affect everyone. Perhaps we can read chapter and verse to all the members of the Unley electorate as to how they will be affected by these increases and how it started from the minute the Labor Government was elected. I am sure they will be absolutely delighted to know that their member is actually representing them in this way.

I will come back to the spouse rebate situation because there is a fundamental principle involved. As members opposite also understand, what we have today is a large number of people available for the work force; there are insufficient jobs available. One of the things the spouse rebate has done in Australia, and certainly other measures in other countries have done, is to be able to provide some small amount of income, some small amount of independence to those people who are home looking after children. In this case it does provide, not an adequate income, but at least it provides something to assist them. In principle, it has probably prevented a large number of women who have been perfectly content at home with their children from entering the work force. Now the Labor Government is intent on destroying this relationship. Far be it for me to tell them what to do, but I will. If they should proceed with this measure there is going to be an increase in the number of people wishing to seek employment because they will no longer have the security of a small amount of income which the members opposite support.

Inherent in this proposition is the destruction of the nuclear family because it preserves in some way the special relationship between the family, including mother, father and child. It is abhorrent to me that when the rest of the world places some importance on this relationship, Australia is heading in the opposite direction. It is time that members of the A.L.P. stood up against their masters in Canberra, expressed their opinions and said: 'There is a need out there, people do need this measure, it is important to them.' I reiterate the point that it is not affecting the high-income families but only the low-income families. Many people can do without the spouse rebate, but the people who have little income cannot.

It is incredible to me that members opposite can continue to support a Party which hits at the heart of the things they profess to believe in. They have done it by lying down and accepting the taxation measures being bought before this House. They have done it by accepting the dictates of Canberra, and they will continue to do so because they lack morals, any sense of decency, and any fibre whatsoever.

My second point, which I briefly reiterate, is that Australia has the highest inflation rate of the O.E.C.D countries. It has incredible problems on its hands. Those problems are exacerbated by a very high inflation rate which must be brought under control, and it does no good for either Federal or State Governments to increase taxation at a time when we all have to buckle the belt.

Mr Mayes: What are you going to do about the teachers?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Mayes: Reduce them?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BAKER: We have to restrict—

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

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 16 August. Page 238.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): Prior to seeking leave to continue my remarks last evening, I was talking about the need for alternatives to the present prison system in this State. I was referring particularly to the community service order scheme introduced by the former Liberal Government—a scheme which is proving to be working very well indeed. I believe that that system provides the very real prospect that, by working alongside community-minded volunteers, by assisting persons less fortunate than themselves and by giving something back to society, such experience will provide a source of character building for the offender and will assist in restoring a sense of personal dignity.

It is recognised that there will always be a need for secure custody of dangerous offenders from whom we need protection and that prisons will be retained as an important back-up sanction where alternatives fail. Much has been said in the past about alternatives and much will be said in the future. However, I suggest that the Government look closely at the expansion of the community service orders scheme which is working very well indeed.

I refer now to matters relating to the police in this State—another section of the Chief Secretary's portfolio. I wish to comment in relation to police powers. I do so, recognising that the Opposition today gave notice that, as shadow Chief Secretary, I will be introducing legislation to increase police powers in this State. I refer to a letter I received from a member of the force in which it is made quite clear why we have taken the action that we have. The letter relates to an article which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* earlier this year concerning the erosion of police powers during the past decade. The letter states:

To have a review of the police powers, to gain, preserve and submit the evidence in its entirety, can only enhance a better understanding in our efforts to abide by our chief objective, the preservation of law and order, which can only gain further and substantial assistance from the members of the public in our so-called democratic society. The erosion of our powers has caused, without doubt, a vast deviation in the favour of the criminal, with such explosion that it is now uncontrolled, and can only be arrested with controlled dignity, conscience and concerted effort by responsible people, for the benefit of the community in general and not for the devious few.

The letter continues:

One does not have to be astute to know that a number of our judiciary at all tiers of courts have difficulty in coming to terms with the meanings of words in our dictionaries, or constructive assessments of some of the sentences which they deliver.

The writer of the letter goes into detail and points out quite clearly that the comments are not used in a derogatory sense in any way but rather as an illustration in a supportive speech. The letter continues:

So often we have heard some person from the bench in delivering his findings utter words, 'I must impose a sentence which is a deterrent' and then later in his findings delivers words of 'Because of your previous good record,' or similar, the penalty is reduced considerably or offender is released on a good behaviour bond. Similarly, utterance of words, 'The crime which you have committed is a most serious crime, and the public have to be protected' or similar. Later in the judgment the offender is sentenced to an X number of months imprisonment and reduced to Y number of months, and not to be paroled before Z number of months. In essence he virtually gets no punishment for his so-called serious crime. Alternatively, the offender receives X number of months imprisonment, but suspended on his entering into a good behaviour bond.' Again no sentence is forthcoming in a constructive form. I deplore the suggestion that a good behaviour bond is a sentence; as we have seen so many times, these bonds are broken and no further action is taken.

I will not refer to all of the remaining section of the letter but will quote the final paragraph as follows:

I realise that this matter is a very volatile and controversial subject, but consider there can be some resolution to overcome those who are the perpetrators of atrocious and violent crimes, whilst the victims are virtually left lamenting and dejected. There can be no description available for these individuals.

I am sure that many people in the community feel that way. I express my concern also on assaults on police, which is a very grave matter and one which I would hope the Government is looking at closely. I have some figures which only go up to 1980. I have also been given information but have not had the opportunity to finalise figures for the last couple of years. I was concerned to learn that, in 1971 there were 191 assaults on police, with the use of a weapon on 86 different occasions. In 1975 there were 264 assaults with weapons used on 257 occasions; in 1978 there were 301 assaults with weapons being used on 271 occasions. In 1979, with 330 assaults 270 occasions involved a weapon. We then see a staggering increase from 1979 to 1980. Whereas in 1979 we had 330 assaults on police, in 1980 we had 628 assaults on police in this State. That is quite staggering and needs to be examined by the Government.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That was in your Government's day.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not blaming the present Government for those figures—I am just stating facts. If the Minister wants to have a guilt complex about it, I am quite happy. However, I am concerned about the situation. I understand that during the past two or three years there has been a massive increase in the number of assaults on police. When I have those figures I will be pleased to bring them before the House to prove the point that I am making. That is one of the reasons why we have given notice today that we will be introducing legislation to strengthen police powers. I believe—as does the Liberal Party—that it is essential that that should occur. I could say much on this issue as I have a great deal of information. However, I do not have the time to refer to all such material tonight but I certainly intend to do so on another occasion.

I now refer to the magnificent success of the blue light discos in this State. I had the pleasure of attending the annual general meeting of delegates from all the branches of the Blue Light Disco Association recently. I was pleased to receive a copy of the Chairman's annual report for this year, which states:

Although we cannot claim the credit for initiating the idea of blue light discos, that belongs to the Victoria Police, we can take great pride in that once made aware of the system we moved smoothly and effectively in extending its benefits into South Australia and it is interesting to note that other States are now following suit. The public goodwill which has been generated has been overwhelming and no praise for the volunteer members of our force who have ensured its success is adequate. Both male

and female members have participated and the contribution made by many wives and partners of members of the force must not be under-estimated either. They all are a great credit to themselves and our force. I also place on record our gratitude for the valuable assistance given by community groups, clubs and private individuals to blue light discos. So too to the many sponsors in both local and statewide spheres. Their financial and moral support has been invaluable. I dare not mention names here for reasons which I am sure will be obvious.

This first year has exceeded our most optimistic expectations. When I first put forward the idea of blue light discos in February 1982 and later got the system established, I knew it would go well but really only anticipated setting up perhaps 10 or 12 branches in the first year. The enormous response from both members of the South Australian Police Force and the general public resulted in 33 branches being established in the short space of less than 12 months with seven additional ones preparing to begin.

While in Government we gave all the support we could to the Police Force in setting up these blue light discos. I want to publicly commend the South Australian Police Force for the effort it has put into making these occasions a success. As the father of one of those who enjoys the opportunity to attend these discos, I would commend all involved.

This time last year I referred to the need for an improved police communication system, a system upon which the operation of the police is almost entirely reliant. I understand that there has been very little commitment on the part of the Government to improve that situation, which continues to pose a very real problem within the force. I do not think that I need to spell out to members in this House the importance of that communication system. I understand that the situation has now developed to the point where the injection of funds to upgrade the entire radio system is one of the most pressing urgency. I again direct that to the attention of the Chief Secretary and I hope that, in bringing down the Budget this year, the Government will make an allowance for funds that are very much needed in that area.

We have an excellent Police Force in South Australia and it is recognised throughout Australia as being one of the best (if not the best) in Australia, but it can work effectively, as I have said so many times, only if it has the correct tools of trade to enable it to carry out its responsibility. Of course, the need for adequate communications is paramount, and I hope that the Chief Secretary will give that matter his immediate attention.

I also hope that there is some effort on the part of the Government to find a solution to the accommodation problem facing the Police Force in this State within the city area. A number of administrative and support units are housed in several leased premises, and it is hoped that the coming year will see the development of plans to consolidate the accommodation of police requirements, in the metropolitan area particularly. Again, I bring that to the attention of the Chief Secretary.

It would be my desire to say much more about these matters. However, bearing in mind the time, I am not able to do so now. Much could be said about the last eight months of this Government as far as the Police Force is concerned, because we have seen some incredible happenings. We have seen the Government's attitude in regard to concealed weapons (commonly known as the guns issue), where I believe that the Bannon Government left the South Australian Police Force totally out on a limb. I am sure that the majority of people in South Australia were most concerned about the attitude of the Government on that matter. I believe that it was only as a result of the Police Force and the Police Association digging in their heels that they were able to be successful on that issue. I hope that the Government (particularly the Chief Secretary and all those who have to do what they are told by their conference) have learnt from that experience and will not try to do anything quite so stupid again.

We then saw the setting up by the Chief Secretary of a committee to look at complaints against police. Once again (and my colleague the member for Light earlier referred to this), I refer to matters relating to the lack of consultation on the part of the present Government. If ever there was an example of the lack of consultation, there was in this situation, because the Chief Secretary obviously received advice (probably political advice), took that advice, and did not bother to seek consultation with the Police Department. It was made very clear that the Police Department was not very satisfied (and I support its feelings about this) and demanded further representation. I would suggest that the Chief Secretary was very wise to agree to consider the request from Mr Hunt (then the Acting Police Commissioner, and now the Commissioner) to review the composition of the proposed committee to examine ways of investigating complaints against the police and to have a senior representative of that department on the committee.

I could say much more in support of the South Australian Police Force. I hope (and I know) that the legislation which I will have the pleasure of introducing into this House within a couple of weeks will give strength to the police and will provide the tools of trade that are very much needed. I am sure that it is recognised by many people, if not by the Government, that the present legislation is very restrictive, and it concerns me greatly that legislation to expand police powers was ready to roll when we came out of Government some nine or 10 months ago. Of course, the present Government has refused to take any action on that legislation and it has been left for the Opposition to bring in a private member's Bill. I look forward to the support of the Government for that legislation. I want to speak briefly about matters relating to the other portfolio responsibility which I have in Opposition, that of environment and planning.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You are only giving it four minutes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am giving it only four minutes now, and I look forward to spending much more time in the future discussing an area which to me is of great importance because, as the previous Minister for Environment and Planning, I brought about many improvements to that portfolio. It is an area in which I will always continue to have a particular interest.

May I say how delighted I am with how the new Department of Environment and Planning is working at this stage. Much thought went into the structure of that department and much effort went into the introduction of legislation dealing particularly with the planning associated with that department. Of course, there is a new executive structure as well. I am particularly pleased that that department is in its present condition, enabling it to carry out Government policy.

I referred earlier to matters raised in the Governor's Speech concerning a proposed review of the Planning Act. I will be particularly interested to see what action is taken in regard to amendments to the Planning Act. Some time ago I asked the Minister for Environment and Planning whether he would keep me informed of any amendments that were likely to come before the House. Since that question was asked I have heard absolutely nothing about the progress of the preparation of that legislation.

I made it my business to keep the previous shadow Minister for Environment and Planning up to date with moves that the former Government was taking in regard to bringing the legislation before the House. I am particularly disappointed that the Minister has not had the courtesy to do that. We have also learnt something from the Governor's Speech about matters relating to vegetation clearance and extensions to national parks. We have heard nothing about

any proposed legislation in regard to Aboriginal heritage or clean air, and I look forward to hearing something from the Government about those matters.

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I am pleased to have the opportunity of partaking in this debate.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Speak up, Peter.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I find that if I speak quietly I get more attention from the Opposition as they strain to hear every pearl of wisdom. I will not disappoint the honourable member: when I seek to make a point I will make it clearly and loudly. In the meantime, he can strain his limited hearing to ensure that he does not miss anything. Initially, let me say that I want to add my voice to all the pleasantries and proprieties that have been uttered by each and every member who has spoken in the debate. I do not want to delay the House for 10 minutes or so by going through a long list of things that are seen as being the proper proprieties, except that I want to say something about my sadness at hearing of the death of John Coumbe, whom I believe was one on the most decent and gentlemanly people to sit in this House—certainly in my time. I had a very warm personal affection for him as did many other members, and I was very much saddened to hear of his death. I want to place on record my condolences to his family.

I listened to the Governor's Speech with considerable interest. Now that we are back in Government (and I am on the back-bench, therefore having the opportunity of participating in this debate) I want to continue the practice that I have engaged in during recent years while we were in Opposition of to some extent aping some of the Governor's comments. He always comments on the way that the economy has been developing and how the State has been improving, and I seek to do likewise. I can report to the House that regrettably my observations of the electorate that I represent indicate that the situation is no better now economically than it was when we last had one of these debates. In fact, if anything, the situation may in some respects be worse than it was at that time. Certainly, I believe that there is a larger group of people who are classified as long-term unemployed than there was previously in the electorate of Elizabeth. There are also more people living on social security benefits and there are more single-parent families than there were 12 months ago.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Your Leader's not keeping up to his promises.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: A lot of the blame for this can be placed all over. I am not about to lay blame specifically on the current Government, because we have hardly had the opportunity to start putting our policies into place. At the same time, if the Deputy Leader can contain himself for a moment, I point out that I am not about to blame the policies of the previous Government for this situation. I think that it is a great tragedy (and I have said this on previous occasions) to hear in this House the debate that goes on day after day with people talking as if South Australia is some sort of island, isolated from the rest of the country and the rest of the world. I do not believe that that is the situation and I think that most people privately do not accept that situation either.

The fact is that we are a part of a nation and the world, and many of the problems economically that are blighting South Australia at present are problems that have not been caused by Government but by attitudes which the community has had and which many of the people in this House have created. I would not isolate myself from that criticism. Certainly, we have had a tendency to accept the sorts of thinking that has been foisted upon us by many people who

would class themselves as international experts. We have heard a great number of comments of how Australia inevitably, simply because of the fact that in Australia we are able to do some things better than others, for example, mine ore, that we have an advantage in that area, but that because of a small population we have a disadvantage in regard to the manufacturing sector and that therefore we must sit by and watch our manufacturing industry decline and fall.

I think that that situation is absolute rubbish and we should not be prepared to accept it. I will have much more to say about that in a few moments. Before doing so, I want to deal with the situation in which South Australia and the world finds itself at present. There is no doubt that the deindustrialisation of Australia, and particularly of South Australia, is well under way. Regarding the situation in which we find ourselves, there is no doubt at all that even if the best scenario being preached by the international capitalist economists at the moment is correct (and that is that there is a big resurgence in the American economy which will then flow to the Australian economy, then to the South Australian economy and eventually to Kapunda, Elizabeth and everywhere else around the place which will get the benefit of it), there is no doubt that that scenario is basically a fallacy, at least as far as South Australia is concerned. I say that simply because, if one looks at the industrial base that now exists in South Australia and compares it with what existed in 1977 or 1978, for example, one will see that a large number of companies in this State have closed their doors for ever.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They do not even believe that the American resurgence that you referred to will even flow on to Europe.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member is bearing witness to what I was saying. I am very sceptical about the whole scenario, but I want to restrict my comments to South Australia specifically at the present time, because it may be that in the Eastern States—in Sydney and Melbourne—where corporations have contracted rather than closed, there are the opportunity, the skills and the potential for an expansion if the upturn occurs. But, in our State, I am putting to the Parliament that many of the industries which previously existed—household names for generations—have disappeared. They have closed their doors for ever.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Which have you got in mind?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: To use the honourable member's own electorate, is it Hawkes, the manufacturer of weighing machines?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That is not big time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, a small one.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: That is in Light.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In Light, sorry. Hundreds of small industries throughout the State, I venture to suggest, have closed as a result of the economic recession and the de-industrialisation of Australia. I believe that that situation has occurred for three reasons. The most obvious is that there has been an economic recession (or depression; call it what one likes). The second reason is that our manufacturing management, particularly (although commercial management to a lesser extent), has been pretty inefficient and amateurish in the way in which it has operated. I thought that it was very interesting—and I do not want to make a big fuss of this—to read the *Advertiser* of Friday 12 August and see an article headed, 'Businessmen pay \$240 to hear their faults'. It simply went on to say that a Mr Plossl, an American, had been invited to Australia to address executives around the country because he is the world's foremost authority on production and inventory management. I do not know whether he is or not; I certainly do not take the advertising

blurb to be an indication of that, but nonetheless about 40 executives were prepared to pay \$240 to hear him list their faults.

I was very disappointed that I missed the opportunity. It is a clear sign that we are not entrepreneurial enough in this country. I would have been perfectly happy to accept \$240 a head from 40 executives to tell them what I thought was wrong with them, and I could have made a very good fist of it. However, I have missed the bus and this gentleman, being more entrepreneurial than our local spruikers, has been and taken their money and left their ears ringing.

What he had to say was pretty worth while. There is developing in our State a realisation that what we saw with the Bank of Adelaide, for example, was really only the tip of an iceberg. From my discussions with many people in the business community there is now developing, as I said, a realisation of the fact that many of our managerial practices are pretty amateurish. This article states:

Adelaide business leaders paid \$240 a head yesterday to be abused for complacency, inefficiency and bad management.

It went on to say:

Everyone is knocking the workers, but it is management that is at fault. In the past decade Australian business had to work very hard to lose money and succumb to international competition. Now they have to wake up.

He concluded by saying:

Too few companies were using the modern tools available in planning and controlling consumer programmes, software packages and techniques. Too many managers are not even convinced they exist. For some industries it was too late. The Japanese had increased their share of the U.S. machine-tool industry from 5 per cent to more than 50 per cent.

The article concluded by saying:

It is also patently obvious that ignoring workers is self-defeating. With more communication we could increase productivity by 10 to 30 per cent without it being necessary to work harder—only smarter.

I think that there is a lot of truth in that article. As I said, that is the second reason, I believe, why South Australian and Australian business has fared so badly.

The third reason, however, is the fact that we have allowed, as a deliberate Government policy of both Labor and Liberal Federal Governments, jobs to be transferred off shore. I make no apology whatsoever for being a totally committed protectionist. I believe that, unless we defend our own industry in our own country and jobs here, it will not be very long before there will be very few jobs, and our standard of living will decline even further.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Who pays for the protection?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I always find that sort of comment very interesting, and I would like to debate this sometime with the Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: I'm interested in your views.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Well, I do not know enough about this to be able to go into great detail. I am able to comment only on the fact that the Japanese, who are always held up as the doyens of efficiency in industrial production, of course have protection which would absolutely make our protection here in many cases look like Mickey Mouse stuff.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They have protection, but it would be a completely unequal fight if they did not have any. They buy our iron ore; they turn it into steel. They buy the energy and turn it into cars.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the member for Elizabeth can be heard in silence.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Their productivity is higher.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I simply make the point that the Japanese find it necessary to have protection, and we ought to do likewise. If we do not, the effect inevitably

will be the continuing de-industrialisation of this country to the point where we will be left simply as a quarry and a lot of people living on social securities which, of course, because of the fact that the country will be declining in wealth will be decreasing in real terms.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: And a granary.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We may be a granary, but even the green revolution throughout the 1970s to some extent has meant that some of the Third World countries have made a pretty substantial improvement in that area. I believe that we have to look pretty carefully at this situation and try to work out ways in which we can arrest the decline not only here in South Australia but nationally.

Just before going on to some suggestions as to how that might occur or what we should be doing about it, it is interesting to look at a table that I have which indicates the degree to which Australia's standard of living has declined relative to other countries.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Compare it with productivity, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Sure.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Deputy Leader has been called to order at least six times during the day. I hope that this will not be a continuing pattern. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I did invite the Deputy Leader to a debate. He may not have—

The SPEAKER: That is out of order, too. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was just making a point that I was inviting him to a debate later—not this evening. He may not have heard the word 'later'. The article states:

Australia's standard of living has been steadily deteriorating relative to other countries over the past 30 years. In the period after the Second World War Australia had the second highest living standard in the world, but the latest O.E.C.D. figures for 1981 show that Australia has slipped to sixteenth place.

I read an article the other day which indicated that Australia had now slipped to nineteenth place; in the past 12 months another three or four places. There are only 23 countries in the O.E.C.D. I think that is a frightening situation. We are inclined in our country to complacently sit back and think 'Isn't this a great place to be. Isn't this the lucky country etc. etc.' Facts and figures are starting to clearly show that, whilst it might be in natural terms the lucky country, the sort of job that we are doing with it in the way that we are running it is leading us into a situation where, more and more, we are becoming a second-rate economic power.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I think that is a pretty worrying scenario and one that we ought to spend a lot of time considering in this place and elsewhere. It is not, in my view, related very much to wage rates in this country, and I take the point that the Deputy Leader mentioned before—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I hope that the Deputy Leader is not going to continue with his current conduct.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:—when the member made an interjection referring to productivity; indeed, it is the case that we must improve productivity in this country but you will not necessarily improve productivity by screwing the workers wages down harder and harder. Productivity, more and more, relates to the amount of capital investment, the amount of high technology and the brainpower of the workers rather than the sheer pay packets which are taken home. When one looks at the real wage levels in this country, the pay packets which ordinary people are taking home (not

the pay packets of members of Parliament and company directors and the like), it is a pretty dispiriting situation indeed. I would like to remind members of the sort of pay levels that apply in many jobs in this nation.

Many of the pay packets that people take home are only in fact marginally above the social welfare payments. For example, semi-skilled or unskilled railway workers take home about \$220 a week, if there is a dependent spouse; if not it is about \$204 a week. A lady's dress machinist in the clothing industry nets about \$190 with a dependent spouse, and about \$170 without one. Cannery process workers take home about \$222 a week, and about \$204 without a dependent spouse.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The increase in charges must have a dramatic effect on what you are talking about.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No doubt, and I will get on to the standard of living and how it has declined. Shop assistants net \$206 but without a dependent spouse it is \$186 (some of these wages are boosted by over-award payments). If there is health insurance, fares to and from work and other costs peculiar to their jobs, wages can be often down to about \$170 a week or less. If the worker and his or her dependent spouse apply for the dole, they would receive about \$148 a week, possibly some rental assistance, a travel concession, pay no health insurance and receive certain other benefits.

With some workers working between 35 and 40 hours a week, the effect is likely to be that they would only be about \$20 a week better off than if they were on the dole. That is a pretty telling situation and, for those people who keep demanding that we should have a decline in the wage levels in this country, they need to take those sort of statistics into account, because it is quite false and totally presents an unreal picture to quote average weekly earnings. It is the mean weekly earning that one needs to look at ('mean' is a very appropriate word in that context).

Over the past 12 months there has been a tremendous decline in the take-home pay of ordinary workers in this country. That may well be another reason why, when this so-called economic recovery that everyone is hoping for starts to bite, we may find that its impact is not nearly as good as we are hoping for. What I am saying underscores the fact that, if people receive very low wages, as a consequence they have very little disposable income and have very little in the way of money which can be spent on consumer durables, the whitegoods industry, motor vehicles, etc., and all those traditional products of industries that are established in South Australia.

I was interested to read in the *Financial Review* of 3 August that the Bureau of Statistics reported that for 1982-83 adult male ordinary earnings rose by 6.8 per cent, well under the inflation rate of 11.2 per cent (these are national figures) as measured by the June consumer price index; this represents a fall in real wages of more than 5 per cent. If the wages have fallen 5 per cent, logically it follows that the purchasing power also has fallen by 5 per cent. From where are people going to get the money to buy the consumer durables which will give us the hoped for consumer-purchaser led recovery? It is highly likely that we may not see very much of a recovery in the area of consumer purchases.

We are seeing no recovery in the area of unemployment. We are seeing a situation, which we are being told by the pundits around the place (the apologists for the system) that there will be a big delay, that there will be an overhang in the way that the unemployment figures decline as the economy picks up; perhaps 12, 18 months we are told. I am very sceptical about that prospect, because, if one looks at the situation one sees that there are about 1 000 000 people in this country who are willing to work but who cannot

find jobs. It may be a higher figure than that because there are many people on invalid pensions and other pensions who would be willing to work either part time or full time if they could but who are unable to do so. If we were to make real inroads into finding jobs for those 1 000 000 unemployed people and for the people coming on to the labour market over the next 10 years, we would probably need a growth rate in the economy of about 7 per cent. I have never heard anyone suggest that we are going to achieve a growth rate of 7 per cent over the next few years. If we were honest in our approach to the unemployed, we should have to admit that to them and also the fact that long-term unemployment is with us and that the policy makers, who are making the decisions at the present time, have very few ideas as to how to get the economy going and how to provide jobs for those people. I think the situation is a disaster. If ever we need to declare a national disaster, it is the disaster of having a million unemployed people. I could go on and speak about this matter for some minutes longer but I do not intend to do so because I think enough rhetoric has been spoken about the 1 000 000 unemployed, etc. However, I do think it is worth dwelling on the fact that, to provide any real solution to that problem, we would need at least a growth rate of around 6 per cent to 7 per cent over the next 10 years. It is an enormous task and one that I have not heard any of the policy makers indicate can be achieved.

One of the suggestions that has been made is that, in South Australia, we can solve part of this tremendous problem with the development of high technology industries—the so-called high-tech dream. I was pleased to hear the other day the Premier making it quite clear that, whilst he believed that developments in the high-tech area would be an important component of any assault on the unemployment problem in South Australia, he did not see high-tech as any sort of panacea. I take up that point, stress it and emphasise it as there is far too much gobbledeegook in the community that the go-buzz word is that high-tech will provide the solutions and be a panacea for our problems. I do not believe that and was interested to read an article on page 20 of the *Business Review Weekly* of 2-8 April this year. I find the *Business Review Weekly* a very worthwhile magazine in many respects. An American article in that magazine, headed 'High-tech dream, low-job reality', states:

High-tech is the new messiah, or so the languishing business communities across the United States believe. Competing in a wild scramble to attract new and established high-tech companies to their areas, State and local governments have overlooked a fundamental—that high-tech is not a high-employer.

Most economic development agencies know they stand little chance of attracting Hewlett-Packard or I.B.M. to small towns in the boondocks but millions of dollars are being scraped together to create venture-capital funds to attract and keep new high-tech firms. Larger cities are considering 'science foundations', tax concessions and 'research parks'—development areas designed to attract groups of high-tech industries.

The article continues:

The major flaw in the race for high technology is that, even taking a broad definition of the term, it will still create only a maximum of one million jobs by 1993 [in the U.S.], fewer than half the jobs which have been lost in manufacturing [over that period].

We can apply those figures fairly and squarely to our position. In fact, that article, to some extent, has a nasty ring about it when it talks about research parks. Whilst I commend both the former Government and this Government over the development of high technology assistance through the development of Technology Park, we have to be extremely careful not to provide the community with a feeling that some high technology developments are going to be a panacea for the unemployment problems that exist presently. If we are going to have any real impact in improving the unem-

ployment situation in our State and, to a lesser extent, in our nation, that improvement is going to have to be through the basic manufacturing sector—the sector which Tom Playford so wisely recognised as the way forward for this State.

We have to look carefully at where and how Tom Playford applied his ideas. We have to learn, to some extent, from the sort of development that occurred over that period and we have to advance and develop some of those ideas and cul out ideas, the time for which has passed. Tom Playford's idea was that, through making South Australia attractive to international and national capital, large industries would locate here and we would gain the benefit of that. It was a highly commendable strategy for that time. I make it clear that I did not agree with many of the policies that Playford applied in making South Australia, in his view, an attractive proposition for investment. Nonetheless, I do accept and agree with the general thrust. That sort of approach, however, will not work effectively in the 1980s and the 1990s. It will not work for two reasons: first, many of the Playford developments depended very much on the small home-grown industrial base. There were many small manufacturers in this State who, with the addition of some large international capital investments in plant and equipment, were able to expand their businesses dramatically to become the household words that we know today.

Mr Evans: They also had a low-cost structure that helped them.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, but the honourable member must remember that the sort of international capital that Playford was able to attract here was principally attracted to this country because we had a politically stable climate at that time. Now there are many other Asian countries which, given the length of life that one expects to get from industrial plant in this day and age (about 20 years), appear much more attractive to international capitalists. I refer to such countries as the Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, South Korea, and the like. If the honourable member is suggesting that we should try to make ourselves competitive with those countries, he had better get up and say so in this Parliament. Those people who argue that wages and conditions in this country have to be made competitive with overseas wages and conditions, have to take that argument to its logical conclusion; namely, that people in this country ought to work for about \$27 for a six-day week. At least in the Philippines it is a Christian country and one gets Sunday off. However, if one goes to Taiwan one works a seven-day week.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Who suggested that?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Many people; Liberal Party members and others of conservative bent are constantly dictating to the Australian people that it is necessary to make, as they put it, wages more competitive in this country. What they mean is more competitive with overseas wage levels.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Not necessarily.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It certainly does not mean with Japan as its wage level is higher. I hope that by competitive they mean increasing wages and I doubt that that is the case in Japan. Getting back to the Playford doctrine, any international capitalist responsible to his shareholders would be absolutely crazy if he were to invest in Australia or, more particularly for the purposes of this argument in South Australia, when he can set up a plant in South Korea and produce goods and services for half or less than half the cost he can in Australia.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: What is the answer?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: We are not going to get those sort of people to invest in our State. We are, however, as individual citizens of the State, all committed to the future of the State. There are thousands of small businesses

around this State which could be encouraged to expand and develop their businesses in this State to a much greater extent than has occurred in the past.

I mentioned earlier the criticisms that the visiting expert made of business people in South Australia. To a large extent, those criticisms are correct. One of the most important tasks we have to undertake in this State is to upgrade the quality of our management; not only of our management but also of our marketing people and our technology generally. I wish to concentrate on the question of small businesses and the management and marketing problems that they have. Many people to whom I speak in the small business area will tell a great tale of woe about the terrible problems they are having in fighting to survive in business. I am not so crude as to say to them brutally that the reason they are having those troubles may be because of a lack of ability to operate. However, in talking in the Parliament in an objective fashion rather than subjectively dealing with individuals, I am sure that many members of this Parliament who think about these things are well aware of the sort of problem to which I refer.

There are people who are technically expert at producing individual products but who are a management disaster area in terms of staff relations and certainly in the area of marketing. Often small business people in my area come to me complaining about how difficult it is for them to get finance. Members of Parliament are not supposed to be finance brokers. However, on many occasions I have been able to refer these people to banks and other bodies which have been able to assist them in their needs. When it finally comes to the crunch, some of these people have said to me, 'I cannot get any money. It's bloody hopeless. The whole situation is a disaster.' One sits them down and says, 'Have you been to a bank?' and they say, 'Yes. They want me to bare my financial soul, and I am not prepared to do that.' When one sits down with them and talks quietly about the situation, one finds that the business they have developed has been their whole life's work; their own personal ego is very much mixed up in the business and, in a sense, they are affronted that the banks insist on poking their noses (as they say) into their private financial affairs and hog-tying them with mortgages over their private houses.

Very often these problems can be overcome. There is a whole range of financial packages available from banks and building societies if one has the management or business skill of being able to go about getting these things in the correct manner and in the manner in which banks expect. If one goes to a bank manager, the first thing he will say is, 'I want a balance sheet from last year.' Some people say, 'Well, you can't have that. My accountant hasn't done it yet.' The manager says, 'What about a budget for next year?' They say, 'We don't keep a budget. We don't work on those sorts of things. I know what is going on in the business, how many orders are coming in and how much production is going out. We don't need a budget.' Bank managers immediately think that this is a pretty ramshackle sort of show. They are not very interested, simply because the banks are used to operating in a particular fashion, and obviously that is the way that they have drawn up their manuals for lending. The manager at the local bank is not able to go outside the criteria.

That is an example of the sort of problem that exists and, in my view, is very widespread in much of the local industry in our State. We have to find a mechanism by which we can encourage many of these small business proprietors in the State to expand their business with assistance. I believe that it is desirable that we change our approach to Government assistance to small businesses.

At the moment, assistance is available to some extent to people who can fit into a type of strait-jacket. If one's

business fits into the sort of criteria available for Government assistance, then well and good: one will get it. However, dozens and dozens of business men are regularly turned away by the State Development Corporation (or whatever its latest name is) not because their business is a bad business, or because their future is heading towards bankruptcy, not because they are technically expert in the way they operate their business, but simply because they are unable to fit into the criteria for Government assistance.

I think that we ought to turn the whole procedure around. I believe that, instead of the Government setting down the criteria and saying, 'If you can fit into this strait-jacket of requirements you will get assistance,' we should turn the whole thing around and make an appeal to business people on behalf of the community. Let us use a bit of xenophobia on behalf of South Australia and say, 'We are appealing to the business community to expand and develop their businesses. We ask them to come forward to talk to the Government about what sort of assistance that business believes would be useful to it.' I think that, if that sort of approach were taken, it might enable one to get into a dialogue with the industry in a much freer fashion about what sort of assistance could be provided.

I am not saying that people in the business community are necessarily the best judges of what sort of assistance they need. Referring to many of the small business people to whom I have talked (and I am no expert), I do not believe that they really have an appreciation of the sort of level at which they ought to be operating.

I know of a business (I will not mention the suburb and that will protect it) that makes what are known as end-on-grain chopping boards similar to those which butchers use. It makes them largely for domestic use. They are a beautiful piece of kitchen equipment. We had one installed in our kitchen a few years ago and, when I went to see this chap, he said that he was sorry that he could not make it because he was booked out on orders for about 18 months. I said, 'Well, you are doing pretty well.' He said, 'Yes, I have more orders than I can handle.' I had a long chat with him and when he found out that I was a member of Parliament (I should not put this on public record) he jumped the queue for me and I got it in a month.

He had a long chat with me about the situation, and I thought that it was very interesting. What he had to say was this: he had more orders than he could handle. He did not particularly want to expand his business because he would have to employ a bookkeeper. I said to him, 'Have you ever thought about the fact that you can get an accountant to put in three or four hours a week to keep your books for you?' He said, 'I did not know that I could get that sort of assistance.' I said, 'You can, and it may be worth while. What about taking on an apprentice or two, because this is the sort of skill that should be made available to other people in the community so that it can be carried on after your retirement.' He said, 'I thought about that, but if one employs people one has to pay pay-roll tax.' I explained to him that, if only one or two were employed, pay-roll tax would not have to be paid.

As I pointed out, he is technically a whiz at making these end-on-grain chopping boards. However, I can say without hesitation to the Parliament that, as a business man, this man is a disaster area.

A wellknown firm in Adelaide produces exceptionally good period furniture. I had a friend in Melbourne who buys this furniture for his retail store. He was telling me the extraordinary story of how he has to buy from this firm. It is not possible to order in pantehnicion loads, which is what he wants. He has to actually have an agent here purchase on a weekly basis the surplus production of this firm until they finally get a load that can be put into a

pantehnicion and sent to Melbourne. To some of us this sort of thing is breathtaking. However, it clearly goes on in the business community.

I mention those few examples, because I think that it is desirable to take quite a different approach in the way that we encourage businesses to develop. I am not talking about spoon-feeding: I do not think that that is possible. However, I think that it is possible for us, as a Government, to recognise that South Australian businesses are very weak in two particular areas, namely, marketing and management. In regard to management, I refer to all the skills that go towards being able to manage a business. I think that, with the right sort of approach, we could encourage many small industries in South Australia to expand and develop to a far greater extent than has occurred in the past. I do not want to be pulled down for saying this: I know that it is a cliché. However, counting them all (which includes every little deli), there are more than 50 000 businesses in South Australia. One would only need each business to employ one person on average and we would make a massive inroad into the numbers of unemployed in this State.

I think that it is possible to do that. That is the sort of project that we ought to set our minds to, because I believe that there are many examples of small businesses that could be developed in South Australia that would lead to a resurgence of our manufacturing base. In relation to international investment, there might be one or two examples related possibly to resource exploitation, but the reality is that never again in our lifetime probably will there be a Chrysler or a G.M.H. in this State. Therefore, we must pull ourselves up by the boots straps and find our own way of doing that.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: We must help rather than hinder.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I agree. That does not simply mean falling into the sorts of clichéd responses that so often mar this type of debate in this House and elsewhere. I readily concede that there is an argument for some careful look at the problems of youth unemployed. It may be possible to develop some scheme to ensure that young people are subsidised by the Government in their employment to a much greater extent than that which occurs at the moment so that it would cost employers a lot less to employ them. We must look with an open mind at many of these suggestions.

Before concluding my comments this evening, I want to refer briefly to the housing situation in relation to unemployment and the relief of unemployment. I want to place on record my congratulations to the State and Federal Governments for the way that they are going about dramatically increasing the number of houses that are to be built. I understand that with the tremendous increase in funding that is occurring as a result of the Federal and State Labor Governments priorities we are looking towards building more houses in South Australia during the next financial year than has ever occurred in the past. I think that that is a great achievement and one that will be one of the highlights of this Government's period in office. That will relieve the unemployment situation in the building industry to a very great extent, and I suspect that it will even lead to a situation of concern as to where sufficient numbers of skilled tradesmen will come from to be able to build all of those houses. That is a matter that will need a great deal of careful planning.

I would like to make a couple of suggestions about where I think we could make some modest additional effort in endeavouring to increase the housing stock, because it makes me sick in the stomach to think that about 28 000 families and individuals in this State are on the Housing Trust waiting lists. I think that that is an absolute disgrace. It is a disgrace to each and every member of this Parliament, because we all know of the sort of pressure that there is for

housing at present. Quite frankly, in the past we have done precious little about it.

I have two suggestions that I want to make. First, I think that we should introduce a scheme along the lines of an unemployment relief scheme to provide grants to upgrade old cottages around South Australia. There are thousands and thousands of these, particularly small stone cottages which largely are spread throughout the rural areas of the State and which are slowly but surely in a state of decline because they are not being upkept properly. Possibly the people living in them are getting aged and cannot maintain them. If one travels interstate and talks to people there, as I do reasonably frequently, one finds that they compliment South Australia for two things: one is the container deposit legislation, something that people mention frequently, and the other concerns how delightful South Australia is rurally because of all the old stone cottages. In Tasmania, one notices the numbers of wooden cottages there and people from Tasmania, particularly, think that the stone cottages here are something exceptional—and they are quite quaint. I think it would be a great idea if we were to provide a type of unemployment relief scheme to provide assistance to people to upgrade old cottages and old houses.

I know that there would be many problems with that sort of scheme, and it would have to be looked at very carefully. The Government cannot hand out large amounts of money to people to upgrade cottages on their own land so that they can simply flog them off and make a capital profit. Quite obviously, some rules and regulations would have to be drawn up to stop people from profiteering out of the scheme. I think that that would provide a tremendous boost to the tourist industry in South Australia and to employment throughout the State. It would add to the housing stock substantially, and at the same time would assist in protecting South Australia's heritage.

One or two other aspects of this are worthy of consideration, and I refer to the fact that it may well be found that in some of these country areas there are large numbers of aged retired tradesmen who would be prepared to undertake that sort of work, those who would not otherwise be prepared to go and work on building estate type housing. I think that we could use the skills of these people to develop the built-up environment to a great extent. I think that that is a suggestion that is well worth further consideration.

Finally, I want to refer to another suggestion that I have been making for some time in relation to housing. Obviously, the State Government is quite strapped for cash in this forthcoming Budget. It would be very difficult for us to find any additional funds for anything, much less in regard to increasing the amount of money for housing over and above that which has been provided for. However, in my view there is a source of cash that could be made available and which would make some important inroads into the shortage of housing in South Australia, and that is that concerning the power of small Government statutory authorities to borrow. I think that it would be a worthwhile project to consider the setting up of, say, 20 or 30 small statutory authorities around South Australia purely and simply for the purpose of borrowing the money to set up these housing authorities in country areas such as at Naracoorte or Mount Gambier and places like that where there could be a committee of say one person from local council, possibly one from the Housing Trust and one to represent people on the local Housing Trust waiting list.

I do not want to get into the details of that tonight during the four minutes that I have remaining, but I simply point out that each of those authorities would be able to borrow \$1 200 000 in the first year and \$800 000 in the second year. They would be able to build, for example, aged cottage accommodation, or whatever was needed in a particular

area. Whilst this would involve some subsidy of the rentals by Government, it would enable us to build 300 or 400 more houses, particularly in country areas.

I suspect that when the shortage of labour, which I am quite sure is going to occur in the building industry, starts to bite, it is more likely to have a serious effect in the metropolitan area than in country areas. For that reason it would be well worth building houses and aged cottage flats on this sort of scheme in country areas.

I am particularly attracted to the idea of putting up aged cottage accommodation in places like Port Hughes, Wallaroo, Moonta, Victor Harbor, and the like. I will not speak on behalf of anybody else, but I will make the comment—and I will probably get slaughtered for it elsewhere—that the idea of the Housing Trust building more and more aged cottage accommodation in Elizabeth and offering people who, for example, have lived most of their lives in Plympton or somewhere an aged cottage in Elizabeth West is pure madness. They would be much better off to be offered aged cottage accommodation in a place like Moonta or Victor Harbor, to which they would be just as happy to go, I might say. I have had several people in my office who have said that they would like to have done that sort of thing—areas where one already has good services and support systems for aged people instead of having to establish them, as we are now in Elizabeth. There seems to be a lot of merit and sense in that sort of idea.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, I am not suggesting that we build thousands of houses—just a reasonable increase.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Groups strategically placed throughout the community.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Certainly. I believe that that suggestion is well worth while and I hope that it may be taken up with a view to implementation at some time in the future. I think that I have nearly had a fair go tonight and I conclude simply by congratulating the mover and seconder of the resolution. They did a good job, and I look forward to hearing further contributions as the debate progresses.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I would like to use my time tonight to talk about history and how the benefits of our history become a valuable tool to draw the community together. Kingston House is one of the oldest historic buildings remaining in the Brighton area. Sited on the three-acre reserve above the Kingston caravan park at Seacliff, it stands as a memorial tribute to the early pioneer's name that it bears. In 1836 George Kingston received the appointment of Deputy Surveyor-General to the new province of South Australia. His accomplishments as a surveyor included the discovery of the Torrens River, the survey of the city site, and the succession of Colonel Light as the Chief Surveyor of South Australia. In 1851 he entered the Legislative Council and played a prominent part in winning for the colony a democratic Constitution. He was elected first Speaker in the House of Assembly and received a knighthood in 1870.

Mr Mathwin: He was a good Liberal.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! The member for Brighton is making this speech, not the member for Glenelg. The honourable member for Brighton.

Mrs APPLEBY: In 1893 Charles Kingston became Premier of South Australia for a period of six years. While in office, the Kingston Government enacted significant pioneering legislation, including the Married Womens Property Act and womens voting rights. He assisted in drafting the Australian Constitution, and was a Minister in Federal Government from 1901 to 1903.

In 1839 George Kingston purchased an 80-acre section of land, and erected a small lathe and plaster home on site, calling it 'Marino'. The name 'Marino' has two meanings, the first being water, and the other from an Aboriginal word 'marrana', meaning hands or paws, which describes the shape of the hills as they meet the sea. The house was leased as an inn and by 1840 the Marino Inn had become a popular tourist resort. In 1851 the inn was given up and Kingston made the house his summer residence, extending it considerably.

After the death of George Kingston the house became the property of his son, Charles. There were no children in his marriage and on the death of his widow in 1919 the house was left vacant for many years. In 1924 the Brighton council petitioned the State Government to purchase the property and the immediate grounds for use as a public reserve. The house has since been used in various ways, including a tourist hostel in 1927 and more recently an art gallery and tea rooms.

Unfortunately, there has been no organised plan for maintaining Kingston House, and over the years it has slowly deteriorated until, in 1981, concern for its future prompted renewed action to save the house. The State Government became involved by listing the house on the Register of State Heritage and the Register of the National Estate. Through the Department for the Environment and Planning this State Government has allocated \$75 000 for the restoration of the exterior and structural repairs.

At an inaugural public meeting held at Marino on 30 May this year the Kingston House Development Committee was formed of members of council, Government, local government service groups, members of Marion CYSS project, and residents of the community. This committee has formulated a set of objectives. The first of these is to seek to establish secure financial and moral support for the leasing of Kingston House by Marion CYSS as primary tenants. The second is to compile and present a submission to the Department for the Environment and Planning for registration of interests. The third is to ensure the ongoing direction and management, in conjunction with the primary tenants, in the use of Kingston House to benefit the whole community.

As is obvious from these objectives, Kingston House is to be used for the full benefit of the community. This project fits the criteria of several avenues of funds to ensure that this historic house as part of our community will be preserved for the benefit of all to use.

The proposal has received support in principle from the State Government, the Brighton council, local and federal M.P.'s, and many individuals from the community. The proposal has been taken up by a committee elected at the public meeting, and they have since worked steadily to gain support and planning for the implementation of the proposal.

Proposed uses of the House already planned include a permanent home for the Marion CYSS project, community arts and crafts, a place for preserving and exhibiting historic artifacts relevant to this important era of South Australia's history, and meeting rooms for the use of the community, and the grounds are to provide a passive recreation area

enhanced by facilities for children, youth, families and the aged.

As State members, I as the member for Brighton and the member for Mawson have both been involved in working along with this committee for the benefit of this project. It is important that where a project is going to benefit and draw the whole community together in a situation now where communities are dividing and splitting, families are dividing and splitting, we should have something substantial in the electorate to enable people to meet and gather and create a centre of the community. The fact that the Marion CYSS scheme is going to use it as its residence will draw and involve the younger people, the MUCH groups and the mature age unemployed, and I think that it deserves all the support it can be given.

I wish to compliment the whole committee on the effective way it has gone about its job in recording the history of the area as well as making sure that this proposal comes into action. I would like to conclude this by saying that if this project is completed I am sure that it will become a project of which South Australia can be proud and a project that will be unique.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: (Chaffey): As the member representing the principal wine producing area of Australia, and being a significant wine grape producer in my own right, naturally I was interested in the article appearing in today's *News* and which stated:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, still fears a wine tax may be imposed in Tuesday's Federal Budget.

The Premier obviously has no more faith in the honesty, integrity or credibility of the Prime Minister than we on this side do at this time; otherwise he would not be taking this stand or it would not be necessary for him to take this stand. In fact, the Prime Minister clearly indicated prior to the last Federal election that no wine tax would be imposed by his Government. The Premier has quite clearly confirmed our fears that there is no honesty, integrity, or credibility in the present Federal Government. The article, with which I have no argument whatever and which I fully support states:

He will fly to Canberra tomorrow to make a last effort to avert a tax. Mr Bannon will meet the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, the Treasurer, Mr Keating, and the Industry and Commerce Minister, Senator Button. He will tell them the ailing South Australian wine industry cannot afford the imposition of a wine tax.

The Federal Government first considered a wine tax when it framed its mini-Budget in May. Despite repeated requests, the issue has not been ruled out since then. In June, Mr Bannon presented Mr Hawke with a detailed South Australian submission opposing any wine tax. It said the tax would reduce the State's wine sales by \$45 000 000 a year and cost grape growers about \$10 000 000 per year.

I fully agree with the comments made by the Premier, but surely that must be the ultimate act of hypocrisy by the Premier when we look at his actions in relation to the wine grape growing industry, particularly the irrigated areas. I point out that the vast quantity of wine grapes in Australia is produced under irrigation. A further article in the *News* of 16 August, headed 'Growers will have to turn to handouts', states:

Cost-of-living handouts to wine grapegrowers will soar because of higher water charges imposed by the Bannon Government, it is claimed. The South Australian Wine Grapegrowers' Council says irrigators cannot sustain a 28 per cent increase in water costs. 'They're not making enough money off their fruit blocks to meet existing commitments,' said council spokesman, Mr A. Preece.

The increase would force dozens of growers to seek household support from the Agriculture Department. The department's Rural Assistance Branch already is paying almost \$500 000 a year to about 60 Riverland growers. The money—up to \$8 000 a year for a family of four—is paid to growers whose property incomes are judged unviable. The scheme is federally funded.

Mr Preece said water, electricity, fertiliser and labor costs already had exceeded the gross incomes of many producers. 'The industry cannot afford this rise, particularly when so many canning fruit growers are going into wine grapes,' he said. Many growers were earning less than \$5 000, and would need a 40 per cent rise in their returns to cover the additional impost.

'The Government should be trying to encourage the industry back on its feet—not push it further down the drain,' Mr Preece said. 'Unemployment in the Riverland has jumped 100 per cent in the past year, and this is going to bolster it again.'

This must surely be the ultimate act of hypocrisy on the part of the Premier in the action that he has taken. While I fully support what is stated in the press and his intention, certainly it does not tie up with own action.

I would like to refer to some statistics from the 1981 census data made available to me from the Australian Bureau of Statistics in relation to average incomes in South Australia. It is interesting to note that in the income bracket between \$1 000 and \$10 000 the percentage of people in the Riverland is far above the average for the State. Once we get into the income bracket above \$10 000 and up to \$26 000, the percentage of people in the Riverland receiving incomes in that bracket is far below the State average. Looking at the income between \$1 000 and \$10 000, some 70.8 per cent of all people living in the Riverland fall into this category, whereas the average for the State in the income bracket between \$1 000 and \$10 000 is 64.5 per cent. That is, a significantly lower percentage of the State is in that category as compared with the residents in the Riverland.

Going to the \$10 000 to \$26 000 bracket some 23 per cent of people in the Riverland are in that bracket, yet in the \$10 000 to \$26 000 income bracket, the State average is 29 per cent of the population, significantly greater than for the Riverland. This trend was evident in the 1976 census and the figures indicated at that time a very similar situation. What is more, this problem has not improved over that period of time. For the Premier to be saying now that the Federal Government's imposition of the wine tax is going to be a shocking affair is something with which I fully agree: it is going to be a shocking affair, as will the effect it will have on the industry.

I come back to what I said earlier. It is probably the most hypocritical action I have seen when considering the action that he has taken in South Australia by imposing on the wine grape growing industry a 28 per cent increase, which, one as has clearly been demonstrated by industry leaders, the industry can ill-afford. He has admitted in the figures that he has provided that any such increase in tax or the imposition of a tax on the wine industry would cost the grape growing industry \$10 000 000 a year, which he says the industry cannot afford. Yet he has been prepared to do completely the opposite with his own Government and place the imposition on those people which they cannot withstand. I think it is an appalling situation when we have the Premier making what I believe is a stance but which, if it is made in all honesty, is an admirable stance.

However, when it is made in such circumstances, there can be no honesty or credibility whatsoever as a result of that stance. I trust that he will be successful in his approach to the Federal Government—I had my doubts. Certainly, if we go on the performance of the Government in South Australia and the broken promises of the Bannon Government since it came into power in South Australia, absolutely no concern whatsoever is shown for election undertakings. Obviously, the Federal Labor Government has no more intention of sticking to its undertakings given to the people of Australia prior to the last Federal election than the Bannon Government has demonstrated at this stage.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I appreciate your generosity, Mr Deputy Speaker, in recognising me once

again. In a moment I will refer to the world situation. Before I do so, I will comment briefly on the contribution that we had just heard from the honourable member. I would have thought that there is no doubt some good politics in it for him tonight in getting up and banging the drum, getting hold of his contribution and sending it off around the Riverland to tell people what a good person he is in opposing the wine tax. If he were seriously interested in defending the interests of the wine-grape industry, I suggest that in making a general protest about the possibility of an imposition of a wine tax (which we, in this Parliament, would unanimously oppose), it may have been more productive if he had gone on to say that, if there is to be a tax, let it be a sales tax and not an excise tax. I would have thought that, had the honourable member wanted to make a constructive criticism and comment—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Inevitably, it was. The point, as the honourable member well knows, is that it will have a serious impact on his electorate if it is an excise tax. If it is a sales tax, it will have a lesser impact. If he were not so keen on making political points and were genuinely concerned to assist his electorate, he may well have made that point instead of simply banging the political drum.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I believe that promises ought to be kept. I do not deny that, but the honourable member continues to make political points.

About once a year I find it worth while to get up this House and bang my head against a brick wall by talking about international affairs—something which never bothers or interests members opposite, nor does it enter their heads. I have to go through the ritual of explaining that I am one of those people who think that the real enemy in international affairs is the bomb itself—not whether it is the American, Russian, Chinese, or any other bomb. Whichever one goes off, it will make a hell of a mess of the world. I wish it were possible for people like ourselves to get the message through to Mr Andropov and Mr Reagan that we have some rights in this world and on this planet and that we do not want it destroyed by the antics of the super powers.

It is worthwhile, even in this Parliament—as far away as it is from the centres of world power—to make that point and to place on record the fact that at least one person in this Parliament is a little concerned about the way things are going. I happen to own a little bit of this planet. It has taken me much time to pay off even half the mortgage, and I do not want to see half my life's efforts go up in smoke when the bomb goes off. I think that we as a Parliament could be doing a lot more to apply pressure around the world and to insist that the madness of the arms race be limited. I know there are no accurate figures on this but I was reading the other day that \$1 000 000 per minute is being spent on the arms race throughout the world. If we look at the situation and do our arithmetic, we are spending around \$1 440 000 000 a day on the arms race. The mind reels when one thinks about the figure.

An amount of \$1 440 000 000 is being spent on weapons of death and destruction at a time when our nation's economy and the economies of all the world's nations are gurgling down the drain and reeling under the economic crisis that has struck the world at the present time. It surely must be the ultimate obscenity. It goes on when tens of millions of children die every year from starvation. To my sorrow, we in this House seem to spend very little time considering such things. I do not suggest that this Parliament can do very much but I believe that we can at least, by resolution or otherwise, express the fact (platitudinous as it may be in a sense but, nonetheless, a worthwhile effort) that we are all concerned about where this craziness is going. It seems

to be totally out of control. If a member of this place went out and random picked someone in his electorate and asked that person whether he or she thought that Australia and the world ought to be rushing headlong towards Armageddon, I have no doubt what the ordinary person's answer would be; namely, that we should cut the arms race, save the money we are spending and make it available for more worthwhile humanitarian purposes.

We are locked into a system that just keeps on pushing and forcing us towards the inevitable destruction that, sooner or later, I believe will befall the world. We do not have much say in what is going on. I often read reports in *Time* and *Newsweek* and feel very much like a disfranchised citizen of the world. Nobody in the U.S.S.R. has much say in what their Government is doing, and neither do individual Americans. On the other hand, we who are tied in with the American alliance—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Not always the Government—it's the power behind the scenes.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is right. As a nation we are tied in with the American alliance and do not have a say in who is going to press the button on our behalf. I feel insecure when I think about that situation. It may not be much comfort but we would have greater comfort if we were an American citizen and knew that, in some tiny way, we had an influence on what is going on. A further suggestion I make is that we, as a Parliament, should try to exercise

some limited influence on both the Russians and the Americans by possibly forming ourselves a committee for peace and justice with the intention of occasionally sending off telegrams to a U.S. Congressman, the Pentagon, the Kremlin or elsewhere telling them that we minuscule mortals in Australia have a view on where the world ought to be going and that we are not prepared to sit back and let them make the decisions that affect our future without at least putting in a protest word from time to time. I do not know whether that idea will be taken up at any stage or whether it will lead anywhere. As a Parliament, I think that if we are to exercise our responsibilities on behalf of the people we represent we must take some interest in that matter. All the micro-matters that we discuss from time to time will be of absolutely no consequence if the bomb goes up, because we, as well as the trees, the ants and the rest of the animals and all the that life exists on this planet will all go with it.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: You should make some representations to the select committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I believe that that is a good suggestion, for which I thank the honourable member, and I will look at doing that.

Motion carried.

At 10.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 18 August at 2 p.m.